Political independence in Africa during the early 1960s and mid-1970s inspired Africans to fight for independence in other spheres of life, including education. In East Africa, the development of higher education which reached its apogee in 1963 with the establishment of the Federal University of East Africa happened within the broader political context of the time. Having succeeded in bringing the British colonial government to its knees, the East African political and academic leadership vowed to Africanize the higher education sector epitomized by the Federal University. They called for the Africanization of academic and administrative staff, the curriculum, as well as teaching and research methods. But the development of higher education in East Africa happened both as part of British hegemony in the region and as a result of African agitation for higher education. Britain wanted to insulate Africans from potential politicisation if they travelled abroad. East Africans on the other hand needed higher education facilities that would produce manpower needed to consolidate political independence and ensure economic independence from Britain. In both instances, the motivating factor behind the development of higher education was political.

The spirit of nationalism which swept through East Africa united the region against the British. Once political independence was achieved, national interests prevailed over regional interests. In the process, the development of higher education was negatively affected. Therefore, the demise of the Federal University in 1970 did not come as a surprise. The university was a still born entity. It was accompanied by many challenges from its inception to its eventual collapse in 1970. This confirms the view that “education and politics are inextricably intertwined.”
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Foreword

Background to the study

This book is based on my doctoral thesis titled: ‘A Political History of Higher Education in East Africa: The Rise and Fall of the University of East Africa, 1937-1970’, which was completed at Rice University in America in 2004. The book is a product of many months of hard work at different research institutions in Africa and abroad. It is about the role played by politics in the development of higher education in East Africa.

I started conducting research for this study at Fondren Library at Rice University in Texas, USA where I had access to volumes of Parliamentary Debates from the House of Commons and the House of Lords in Britain covering the period between 1920 and 1970. I also used that opportunity to scan the literature on the development of higher education in different parts of the African continent in preparation for an overview chapter on the subject. Between September 2002 and June 2003 I conducted primary research at the archives housed at Jomo Kenyatta Memorial Library at the University of Nairobi and also used the Kenya National Archives (KNA). Both institutions hold tons of information on different aspects of East African history. I spent time digging through dusty documents such as reports on National Assembly debates held in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania and on the proceedings at the East Africa Legislative Assembly. I also looked at Senate and Council meetings of the University of East Africa and its constituent colleges, correspondence documents and newspapers. At the end of this exercise I was able to piece together the intriguing and eventful history of the development of higher education in East Africa and demonstrated the role played by politics in the entire process of setting up the university in 1963 as well as its eventual demise in 1970.

The African Studies section at Jomo Kenyatta Memorial Library gave me access to the hard to find information documents on higher education in East Africa – some of which are not published or available elsewhere. This included speeches delivered by East African academics and politicians at different moments. I also had informal conversations with East Africans who were either involved in some of the University Colleges or knew something about the issues I was keenly addressing. This was an enlightening experience although the interviews were not used as the methodology for this study.

Before returning to America I spent a few weeks in South Africa where I used the libraries at the University of Cape Town (UCT) and at the University of the Western Cape (UWC). I also used the City Library and the South African National Library in Cape Town as well as the Bellville Library. I then returned to Rice University to write my dissertation under the guidance of the late Professor E.S. Atieno-Odhiambo, an eminent scholar of Kenyan descent and Professor Elias Bongmba, a reputable scholar originally from Cameroun. Another Pillar of strength for me was Professor Edward Cox, a renowned History Professor from the Caribbean.

I finished writing my dissertation and defended it successfully. Soon thereafter, my friends and colleagues pushed me to revise my thesis for publication. However, my teaching and research obligations at UWC where I resumed my work as a lecturer in the History Department soon after
graduation kept me preoccupied. I also got involved with the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) through one of the prominent African scholars who was working at their Cape Town office at the time, Professor Yaw Amoateng. This was academically enriching. I temporarily put my dissertation aside and focused on conducting research for the HSRC and lecturing at UWC.

I left UWC in July 2006 to assume a government position where I served as a senior research analyst on foreign political developments and a policy advisor. It was at this time that I had a chance to start revising my PhD dissertation before my mind was attracted to other things. Parallel to this project I was also part of the Multinational Working Group (MWG) on Higher Education, which had been put together by the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA). I wrote a chapter focusing on the critical appraisal of higher education policies in post-apartheid South Africa. I also invested part of my time writing my first book on the social and political history of my rural village, Ingwavuma (far northern KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa) which was subsequently published in Germany in 2010.

The present book is written at a time when higher education is receiving specific attention in Africa in general and in South Africa in particular. Although written from the historical and political science viewpoints, the book has policy implications and is a contribution to the reconfiguration of the landscape in African higher education. It has more relevance in South Africa where numerous changes have been introduced in the higher education sector since the advent of democracy in April 1994 and more so since 2004. The book is inter-disciplinary in its approach, tackling educational, political and sociological issues. It is both a historical and political source which cuts across various disciplines.

**Research method**

Webster’s New Unabridged Dictionary and Longman Dictionary, define the concept method as ‘a way or manner of doing’. Methodology on the other hand is, according to Longman Dictionary, ‘the set of methods used for study or action in a particular subject’. Different research methods were used in this study. To ensure reliability of information, I analysed a wide range of documents that talk about the development of higher education in East Africa and on the African continent in general, particularly Anglophone Africa. These documents include:

(i) Reports: Commission reports, reports by different Working Parties, newspaper reports and reports by special committees;

(ii) Debates: Parliamentary debates that took place in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Britain and those that took place at the East Africa Legislative Assembly;

(iii) Acts: Parliamentary and University Acts;

(iv) Letters: Correspondence between different individuals and institutions regarding the Federal University of East Africa and its constituent colleges; and

(v) Minutes: Minutes of the meetings of the Academic Boards, University Councils, and Senate Committees at the constituent colleges and also at the Central Office of the Federal University. Document analysis and archival research thus formed the core of data collection for this book.
The structure of the book

The book is organised as follows:

It has three parts. Part I has one Chapter (Chapter 1) which provides a broad overview of the development of higher education in the British Empire as background to the study. With regards to Africa, the Chapter traces the development of higher education from the early 1920s right up to the 1960s and demonstrates how different African constituencies in Anglophone Africa responded to this development at different moments.

Part II comprises three Chapters (2-4). It focuses specifically on the rise of the University of East Africa. Chapter 2 explores the process of establishing the University of East Africa from 1937 to 1963. Chapter 3 discusses the politics behind the establishment of this Federal University by analysing different reports and other sources discussed in Chapter 2. The Chapter locates the Federal University of East Africa within the broader context of British imperial policy. Chapter 4 builds on Chapter 3; it provides the political context in which different constituencies interpreted the development of higher education in East Africa and how they perceived the Federal University once it was established.

Part III comprises two Chapters; it explores the factors that led to the demise of the University of East Africa. The main argument is that while the establishment of the University was indeed a worthwhile project, natural and human factors predetermined its fate. Chapter 5 discusses a wide range of problems that dogged the University of East Africa from the outset, demonstrating how each problem contributed to the University's eventual collapse in 1970. Chapter 6 builds on Chapter 5 and focuses specifically on the role played by nationalism and independence in the demise of the Federal University. Chapter 7 forms the conclusion of the whole book. It provides a synthesis of the key issues discussed in the preceding Chapters and demonstrates the relevance of the present study in education policy-making in contemporary Africa, not only in East Africa which is used as the case study, but the study's importance to: East Africa, South Africa and the entire African continent now and in the future.
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Introduction

*During the last half of the twentieth century, higher education has become a key institution in societies around the world. Nearly everywhere national systems of higher education have grown tremendously in size and scope in response to increased demand for access and the growing need to train experts for an expanding array of advanced occupations.*

The development of higher education in East Africa has a long history. For many years, the process was characterised by political wrangling, negotiations and compromises by black and white constituencies. What eventually became the federal University of East Africa (UEA) in 1963 was a saturation point of a process initiated by British authorities as part of the colonial thinking about imperial integration from the 1920s – an initiative that was later embraced by East Africans in the late 1950s. During the inter-war period the British Colonial Office started formulating a standard policy on African education for its African territories. As part of this initiative, on 24 November 1923, the Duke of Devonshire, Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed a Commission under the chairmanship of W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and tasked it to investigate and report on matters of Native Education in the British Colonies and Protectorates in Tropical Africa. The main goal was to advance the progress of education in those Colonies and Protectorates. The Commission concluded its work and submitted its Report to Devonshire early in 1925. The latter subsequently published the Report as Command Paper No. 2374 in March 1925. This marked the early stages of the process of developing higher education in East Africa.

One of the key recommendations of the Ormsby-Gore Commission was that the time was opportune for some public statement of principles and policy which would prove a useful guide to all those engaged, directly or indirectly, in the advancement of native education in the African continent. Thus, although the primary focus of the Ormsby-Gore Commission was not East Africa *per se*, this memorandum laid a solid foundation for the development of higher education in East Africa.

As discussed in the following chapters, the actual process that culminated in the establishment of the UEA in 1963 began with the publication of the De la Warr Commission Report in 1937. The Commission had been set up by Ormsby-Gore, who had been promoted as Secretary of State for the Colonies, to examine and report upon the organisation and working of Makerere College in Uganda, which had begun its operation in 1922 and of the institutions or other agencies for advanced vocational training connected with it. One of the Commission’s key recommendations was that there was a need for the establishment of an inter-territorial University College in East Africa. However, the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 disrupted the implementation of this process somewhat.

In August 1943, Oliver Stanley, the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed the Asquith Commission and tasked it to consider the principles which would guide the promotion
of higher education, learning and research and the development of universities in the British Colonies; and to explore the means through which universities and other appropriate bodies in the United Kingdom might be able to co-operate with institutions of higher education in the colonies. The Asquith Commission presented its Report in June 1945 and proposed the establishment of Colleges in the colonies where they were non-existent and the upgrading of those that were already in place. These [Asquith] Colleges would have a ‘Special Relationship’ with the University of London and would be monitored by the Inter-University Council (IUC) formed by British universities until they were ready to stand on their own as independent institutions of higher learning. The Asquith Commission endorsed the earlier recommendation made by the De la Warr Commission regarding the upgrading of Makerere College into a fully-fledged regional University College. Consequently, in September 1947, William D. Lamont, Principal of Makerere College, submitted the first formal application to the University of London seeking admission to the ‘Special Relationship’ programme. The application was accepted in November 1949 and Makerere then became the University College of East Africa serving Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

Meanwhile, the Royal Technical College (RTC) was established in Kenya in 1954 and admitted its first students in 1956. In 1955, the IUC and the Advisory Committee on Colleges of Arts, Science and Technology (ACCAST) appointed the First Working Party on behalf of the East Africa High Commission (EAHC) established in January 1948 as a regional administrative body. The First Working Party was tasked to review the provision for postsecondary education in East Africa. Its Report was published in 1956. While acknowledging the fact that Makerere was already at an advanced stage of development regarding higher education, the Working Party argued that the development of higher education and specifically the provision of university education in East Africa had to remain the concern of all three territories.

A Second Working Party, appointed in 1958 at the request of East African governors, agreed on the need to establish a University College in Dar es Salaam. This third College opened in 1961. The Provisional Council of the University of East Africa was established in June 1961 to draw the statutes and rules that would govern the envisaged University. Then, the University of East Africa was inaugurated at the Royal College in Nairobi on 28 June 1963. The three University Colleges physically located in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika thus became the constituent colleges of the Federal University of East Africa. The University ceased its operation on 30 June 1970 due to political and economic reasons, some of which were already incipient from its infancy. On 1 July 1970, national universities were established in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania thus confirming the collapse of the Federal University of East Africa.

The main objective of this book is to establish the salient reasons why higher education was developed in East Africa and specifically why the Federal University was constituted. Also, the book will identify the factors responsible for the collapse of this regional institution in June 1970. Another objective of this book is to demonstrate how the history of the University of East Africa sheds light on colonial and post-colonial policies on education – especially higher education – as a contribution to educational planning in contemporary Africa. The overarching aim is to establish the role played by politics in the development of higher education in East Africa and specifically in the rise and fall of the UEA. The book is divided into three parts, each of which tackles an aspect of the broad theme of this book.
PART I

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE: AN OVERVIEW
CHAPTER 1

The genesis of higher education in the British Empire: an overview

Introduction

The development of higher education in Africa is one of the topical subjects in the historiography. This chapter explores the history of higher education in the continent by discussing its tradition, how the process unfolded, and the role played by philanthropic organisations. The chapter uses examples from different countries to illustrate key points. It discusses the views espoused by different constituencies regarding African institutions of higher education and then provides a critique of the literature on higher education in East Africa as a justification for the present study. The chapter introduces Commissions, Committees and Working Parties that played a vital role in the development of higher education in Anglophone Africa, but does not discuss them in detail.¹

The tradition

People do not think or act outside the broad confines of a particular heritage; they face their problems with knowledge and wisdom transmitted to them by their predecessors. So, tradition is inescapable, whether one reaffirms or repudiates it. Indeed, even those disposed to reject tradition entirely do well to bear it in mind, since it is at the very least their point of departure.² Therefore, it is prudent to value tradition in this study.

Ashby (1966) makes reference to Sankore in Timbuktu, the Qarawiyin in Fez and Al-Azha in Cairo and concludes that higher education is not new in Africa. This view is shared by, among others, the Africanist scholar, Basil Davison.³ However, Ashby briskly warns: “but the modern universities in Africa owe nothing to this ancient tradition of scholarship.”⁴ He bases this submission on the known fact that the Islamic curriculum obtaining at the institutions in North

¹ Except the two Phelps-Stokes Commission Reports published in 1922 and 1925 respectively, details about the rest of the commissions, committees and working parties are provided in Chapter 2 and they are analysed in Chapter 3.
and West Africa was medieval and its technique was mainly to learn by rote. Furthermore, the curriculum’s truths rested on authority, not on observation or critical inquiry. Ashby maintains that the indigenous systems of education obtaining in sub-Saharan Africa were not fit to fill the void in the Islamic curriculum because they were inward looking, conducted by members of the extended family, and directed to ensuring conformity with social customs and acquiescence in the hierarchy of the community. For these reasons, the motivating factors were totally different.

Arthur Porter concurs with Ashby. He concedes that for over a thousand years students gathered at Africa’s ancient city of Fez to argue about ‘subtle points’ on Islamic science. While acknowledging that the University of Al-Azha in Cairo was established in 970, more than two centuries before Oxford, England’s oldest university, was founded; that the flowering of commerce, religion, and learning took place in Timbuktu under King Kankan Musa; and that in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries Gao and Timbuktu prospered as cities of learning when Europe was still engulfed in The Hundred Years War, Porter, like Ashby, concludes: “But the traditions of higher education to which present day universities in Middle Africa can lay claim derive not from the far East or Old Africa, but have come from Europe.” In his other work (1974), Ashby sees the university as “a mechanism for the inheritance of the western style of civilization.” He argued that it preserves, transmits, and enriches learning, which means that the pattern of any particular university is a result of heredity and environment.

Hanna subscribes to Ashby and Porter’s views but his statement is cogently worded. He concedes that higher education is not new in Africa, but “in its contemporary manifestation little [emphasis mine] is owed to the ancient tradition of scholarship which flourished in Timbuctoo and other former centers of Islamic education.” Overall, there is consensus among scholars that Europeans are the architects of African higher education as it stands today although there are certain aspects that predate European invention.

European universities trace their origins to the Middle Ages. Salerno and Bologna in Italy and the University of Paris are often cited as three earliest universities in Europe; Britain’s Oxford and Cambridge Universities followed later. One of the known social functions of these universities was “to produce Christian gentlemen and the officer class.” Once established, universities in Britain resolved to create uniformity in two ways. First, they designed curricula of similar content to ensure that a degree from one institution was not different from those obtained in other universities. Second, they were all administered by a Council and Academic Board/Senate.

The East India Company (EIC) played an instrumental role in exporting British systems of education to the East Indian colonies. In 1792, Charles Grant, recently returned employee of the EIC, urged Britain to communicate to India her own ‘superior light’, a knowledge not only of Western philosophy and science but of Christianity. Although no immediate action was taken,
the EIC Act of 1813 authorised the Governor-General in Council to direct that from any surplus revenues of the Company a sum of not less than one lac of rupees be set aside for –

... the funding of colleges, schools, public libraries and other institutions for the revival and improvement of literature and encouragement of the learned natives of India and for the promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the British territories of India.10

In 1817 Hindu College in Calcutta became “the first institution to introduce Hindus to Western learning, and later to provide on the higher side of its work the nucleus of Presidency College.”11

Ideological differences between Calcutta and London regarding the medium of instruction to be used in Indian institutions took center stage at the meetings of the General Committee of Public Instruction appointed by the EIC after the 1813 Act. The saturation point of these debates was the publication of Thomas B. Macaulay’s Minute on 2 February 1835. Ashby recalls that the controversy that had opened between Calcutta and London in 1824 came to be pursued within the committee and that by 1835, the cleavage of opinion over the competing claims of oriental and occidental learning was of such a nature that the secretary felt obliged to submit the issue to the arbitrament of the government. By so doing, he prompted the brilliantly tendentious minute of Macaulay. This precipitated the solution to the dilemma posed by the educational clause of the Character Act twenty years before. In essence, Macaulay narrowed the issue to the need for a decision on the medium of instruction to be adopted in the higher education financed by the government. Noting the inadequacy of the vernaculars, he concluded that the choice lay between English and the oriental classical languages. On grounds of utility, and the intrinsic merit of the literature to which it would give access, he asserted the superiority of English and discovered a further justification for it in the analogy of the impulse Britain received from an alien literature three centuries before. Ashby writes:

Had our ancestors acted as the Committee of Public Instruction has hitherto acted, – had they neglected the language of Thucydes and Plato, and the language of Cicero and Tacitus, and had they confined their attention to the old dialects of our own island, had they printed nothing and taught nothing at the universities but chronicles in Anglo-Saxon and romances in Norman French, – would England ever have been what she is now? What the Greek and Latin were to the contemporaries of More and Ascham, our tongue is to the people of India.12

Until the 1850s, several discussions between India and London revolved around the establishment of schools and colleges and the medium of instruction to be used in those institutions. The dispatch written by Sir Charles Wood in 1854 on behalf of the directors of the EIC and addressed to the Governor-General of India in Council “marks the first occasion on which an initiative coming from Great Britain was directed to the foundation of universities in a dependent territory under the British crown.”13

11 Ashby and Anderson, Universities, 49.
12 Ibid., 51.
According to the EIC, the aim of educating Indians was primarily to train a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. 14 The EIC resolved to use education as an instrument to preserve and spread British culture. Such practices sustained the uniformity already ingrained in Britain. The dispatch unabashedly stated that the education it wished to extend to India had for its object “the diffusion of the improved arts, science, philosophy and literature of Europe; in short of European knowledge.” 15

By the time Britain developed higher education in Africa in the 1940s, she had already built 15 universities in British India and had also established universities in Ireland and Australia. But even at this time the underlying philosophy had not changed. The attitude was still that such Universities should fulfil the same social purposes as the British universities, that is, to train a small class of people to perform specific tasks. Like their parent institutions in Britain, the universities established in British colonies in Africa were organised strictly as self-governing corporations, each with a Senate and a governing Council. However, unlike Islamic institutions, “they were to develop as centres of independent thought and critical inquiry.” 16 The curriculum was modeled on the British pattern to ensure that the new universities “should become part of the imperial family of universities.” 17 Thus, the first universities in Africa “were imports, their purpose the indoctrination of a foreign culture.” 18 This is the historical context.

The development of education in Africa followed a similar pattern. With regard to higher education in Anglophone Africa, there are three types of universities with which Britain got involved at different times in the twentieth century: 19

(i) those that evolved from long-established earlier institutions: the University of Sierra Leone which started at Fourah Bay College, established by the Church Missionary Society in 1827, and the University of Khartoum in Sudan which was preceded by Gordon Memorial College, founded by Lord Kitchener in 1898;

(ii) those that grew from the London family: University Colleges at Legon at the Gold Coast, Ibadan in Nigeria, Makerere in East Africa, and Salisbury in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe); as well as

(iii) those that were established as fully-fledged universities after independence.

These include the University of Nigeria at Nsukka, which was founded by Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe in 1960. In East Africa such institutions are: the University of Nairobi in Kenya, the University

14 Ibid., Ashby & Anderson, Universities, 148; and Pattison, Special Relations, 1-2.
15 Cited in Ashby, African Universities and Western Traditions, 1.
of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, and Makerere University in Uganda which became independent institutions at the dissolution of the Federal University of East Africa in 1970.

The process unfolds

The University Colleges that were established in Africa after the Second World War owe their existence to a number of Conferences, Commissions, Committees as well as Working Parties. The process began with the first World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 wherein Commission III was tasked to determine the form of education that would accompany evangelism. The Commission resolved that the application of industrial education to Africa was urgent.\(^{20}\) The conference then urged governments to play a more active role in the development of education in the African colonies. In 1912, the Colonial Office in London convened the British Imperial Conference on education. Professor L.J. Lewis, lecturer at the University of London, Institute of Education, recalled years later that in 1912 the calling of an Imperial Conference on education carried with it the promise of a widened concern for education, and implicit in that concern the possibilities of development. Whatever that promise may have amounted to it disappeared with the outbreak of war in 1914.\(^{21}\) When the war ended, the United States, not Britain, took the lead in the development of education in Africa. This was due in part to the fact that American missionaries had been less handicapped by war demands and pressures either in terms of resources or direct involvement in the war. According to Lewis, this was due, in part, to “the preponderance of missionary effort in that continent, in part, because of the contrast between educational ideas pursued in Africa and those pursued in Hawaii and the Philippines, and, in part, on account of the trustees of an American philanthropic foundation deciding that the time had come for them to pay attention to the African part of the objective laid down by the founder of the trust in her will.”\(^{22}\)

In 1919, the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society made an appeal through the Foreign Missions Conference of North America for a survey of West African Education, a move that has been considered an important landmark in American, British, and African co-operation. The Society suggested that the Phelps-Stokes Fund\(^ {23}\) be asked to undertake the survey. The request was accepted and the first African Education Commission was appointed. Thomas Jesse Jones, once director of research at Hampton Institute in Virginia, now working as the Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, was appointed as Chairman of the Commission.\(^ {24}\)

---


22 Cited in Ibid., 32-33.

23 The role played by The Phelps-Stokes Fund and other philanthropic organisations is discussed below.

24 Other members were: James Emman Kwagyer Aggrey, a distinguished African from the Gold Coast; Mr and Mrs Arthur W. Wilkie of the United free Church of Scotland, who were working for the Scots Missionary Society in the Gold Coast; and Henry Stanley Hollenbeck, from Milwaukee, Winsconsin, who worked for twelve years as a medical missionary in Angola. Mr Leo A. Roy of New York City, who had intimate knowledge of Negro education in America served as secretary to the Commission. Reverend John T. Tucker of the American Board in Angola was a member of the Commission when it started but had to resign due to the illness of his wife.
The Chairman of the Commission travelled to England, Belgium, France and Switzerland in April and May 1920 consulting with colonial officials and representatives of various missionary societies. Subsequently, the rest of the Commission spent a month in England doing preliminary research before sailing for Africa on 25 August 1920. The Commission visited Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Congo, Angola, and South Africa. It published its Report in 1922. One of its key recommendations was that African education had to be geared towards creating self-respect through self-help. This would be achieved by substituting bookish learning with the learning of skills and by taking the community into consideration when making educational plans. The first Phelps-Stokes Commission set forth a philosophy of education that was deemed relevant to the needs of the societies. It committed itself to the adaptation of school curricula in Africa to the natural and social environment. The publication of the Phelps-Stokes Report prompted Britain, France and Belgium to issue policy statements on education in their respective African territories. According to Wilson, whatever the frustrations and failures at the periphery in the African territories, the Phelps-Stokes Report had an abiding and continuous influence at the center of responsibility in Britain and upon the thinking of far-sighted individuals and groups in African and British territories themselves and in the United States among the comparative few but sometimes quite remarkable people who were interested. Thus, the urge and insight which produced the Phelps-Stokes Report “were not dissipated.”

Another conference was held at the Colonial Office in London on 6 June 1923. The British Missionary Societies and the British government decided to have a survey of East Africa. They derived inspiration from the 1922 Phelps-Stokes Commission Report and from the conversations they held with Anson Phelps Stokes, President of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and with Thomas Jesse Jones when the two were in England in the spring and summer of 1923. Furthermore, the serious situation in Kenya and the desire of all the responsible officials concerned to meet it in the wisest and most constructive way was specially emphasised as making an early report desirable. The visits of African educators to America which the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in cooperation with Governments and missionary societies, had helped to render possible, made the importance of the proposed Commission more evident. These British visitors were convinced that the American experience in dealing with the African Negro “was particularly valuable, and that if a suitable Commission representing Great Britain, the United States and Africa, could be created and financed, it could render East Africa a very important service.”

The first Phelps-Stokes Report became an influential document. Its reception by missionary societies and different governments encouraged the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund to appropriate $6 500 for the East African survey. They authorised the Commission to East Africa

---

26 Wilson, Education and Changing West African Culture, 38.
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28 In attendance at this conference were: the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of States for the Colonies, W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, Dr Thomas Jesse Jones, the Governors of Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Nyasaland and a representative of Tanganyika.
at their meeting of 21 November 1923. Like the first one, this Commission was under the chairmanship of Thomas Jesse Jones.

The Report of this Commission was published in 1925. It stated that facilities for advanced education, even of secondary grade, in the countries visited were inadequate and thus argued that the demand for such education could not long be delayed. It noted that already a few Native pupils requiring special training for technical, agricultural or teaching service, as well as those who desired to enter the professions, had gone to Europe or America to continue their education. The necessity to do this was deemed a serious handicap to Native Africans with the capacity for advancement. The cost was almost prohibitive, the break from all African surroundings, and the entrance into the perplexing and conflicting tides of European or American life fraught with danger to the mind and morals. That a number of Africans had successfully passed through the ordeal was greatly to their credit. It was noted: “No one knows, however, the price they have paid in physical endurance and in mental and moral strain. Nor does anyone know how many young Africans have in the process been lost to a life of service for Africa.”

The second Phelps-Stokes Commission recommended inter alia that Africans needed higher education that would enable them to understand the essentials of their own development, to distinguish the false from the true, the realities from the unrealities. It was felt that through higher education, Africans would be able to realise the advantages and disadvantages of European colonisation of Africa and to contrast both with the advantages and disadvantages of independent countries such as Abyssinia and Liberia.

The conference held at the Colonial Office in 1923 considered a memorandum submitted to The Duke of Devonshire by the Education Committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland. In that memorandum the Missionary Societies described the state of African education as unsatisfactory. They stressed the importance of co-operation among missionary organisations and also called for more involvement from the British government. To this effect, they proposed the appointment of an Advisory Committee that would provide professional advice on educational issues in Anglophone Africa in general. The Secretary of State for the Colonies consented and subsequently set up the Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies. On 25 July 1923, W.G.A. Ormsby-
Gore announced in Parliament that there had been a crucial conference at the Colonial Office consisting of the African Governors and Colonial Secretaries, and that the future of Native education in Africa had featured immensely in the discussions. He argued that government wanted to avoid making mistakes at such a critical stage: “We want to explore the experience of the work as to what is the best and most helpful form and type of education that we can give to the Africans for the purpose of giving light to New Africa.”

He reported that they formed a Permanent Committee, and that he would shortly get a permanent Secretary to advise on this issue. The first recommendation of the Advisory Committee was published in 1925 in a memorandum titled: ‘Education Policy in British Tropical Africa’. This memorandum set out a comprehensive policy for the development of African education. On higher education, it noted that “As resources permit, the door of advancement through higher education in Africa must increasingly be opened for those who by character, ability and temperament show themselves fitted to profit by such education.” In 1927, a Colonial Conference acknowledged the irrefutable importance of the Committee’s activities and thus recommended that its activities be expanded to include all areas within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. On 1 January 1929, L.C.M. Amery, Secretary of State for the Colonies, replaced the old Committee with a new Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies (ACEC). The latter Committee subsequently published its first memorandum in 1935.

In 1932, Directors of Education from Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar held a conference in Zanzibar to discuss educational matters in the East African region. The conference was followed by the appointment of a sub-committee by the Colonial Advisory Committee to advise on specific issues regarding the development of education in East Africa. In 1933, the British Colonial Office adopted the sub-committee’s Report. One of its recommendations was that there was a need for an immediate and publicly announced programme of university development in Africa. The Report further recommended that colleges in Africa had to be raised to full university status. Gordon College and Makerere College would provide a sufficient nucleus for higher education in Sudan and East Africa respectively, while colleges at Yaba and Achimota in West Africa would be supplemented by Fourah Bay College. For reasons discussed in Chapter 3, British Governors in East and West Africa delayed submitting their views on the recommendations contained in the Report as requested to do. Only Phillip Mitchell, Uganda’s Governor, showed interest in it and embraced the idea of setting up the De la Warr Commission in 1936. This began the process that would culminate in the establishment of the University of East Africa in 1963.

Hong Kong; Sir James Currie, former Director of Education in Sudan; Sir Michael Sadler, Master of University College, Oxford; J.H. Oldham, representing Protestant Missionary Societies; Bishop of Liverpool; and Hanns Vischer, who pioneered western education in Northern Nigeria.

37 Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa. Memorandum Submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British tropical African Dependencies. Cmd. 2374, 1925, 4.
39 See Chapter 2 for details about both the Conference and the Sub-Committee.
On 23 November 1942, Oliver Stanley succeeded Lord Cecil as Secretary of State for the Colonies. In 1943, Stanley appointed the Asquith and Elliot Commissions to study the education situation in the British colonies and in West Africa respectively.\footnote{For membership and terms of reference of these Commissions, see Chapter 2. The political context in which both Commissions were set up is discussed in Chapter 3.} They presented their Reports to Oliver Stanley in mid-1945. One of the key recommendations of the Asquith Report was that there was an urgent need to establish University Colleges in the British colonies. The Elliot Report made a similar recommendation for West Africa. Subsequently these Colleges were instituted in sub-Saharan Africa and in the West Indies. The Asquith Report was Britain’s blueprint for the export of universities to her overseas colonial subjects. In 1946, British Universities established the IUC to oversee the development of the new colleges. Between 1947 and 1970, no less than eight institutions in Africa and the West Indies had become universities through the Asquith scheme. Thus, the years from 1945 to 1948 “stand enduring on the credit side of the balance sheet of British colonial policy.”\footnote{Ashby & Anderson, \textit{Universities}, 233. See also: Ashby, \textit{African Universities and Western Traditions}, 21.} During this time, British colonial higher education policies took a better shape, culminating in the establishment of the first Asquith Colleges in 1948.

Although the Asquith Colleges were perceived as autonomous institutions, they were entirely modelled on British universities. They had a ‘Special Relationship’ with the University of London, a device that had already worked in the development of British universities such as Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, Reading and Birmingham. The Asquith Colleges attained their independent status only in the 1960s when most African countries became independent. Yet even then, the metropolitan culture still dominated. Similar institutions built by other European metropolitan powers were linked to those metropolitan powers. For example, the University of Dakar in Senegal was incorporated into the French culture. Lovanium at Leopoldville was established independently of the Belgian University, Louvain, but its staff came from Belgium and the curriculum was similar to that of Belgian institutions. In the end, Lovanium portrayed a Belgian character just like the University Colleges in the British Empire discussed above also reflected a British outlook.

The politics behind the establishment of the Asquith Colleges is encapsulated in John Hargreaves’ article: ‘The Idea of a Colonial University’ in which he looks at the rationale for establishing these colleges. Hargreaves holds that Britain wanted to use University Colleges to produce well-educated men to whom she would gradually hand over responsibility for the administration, the technical services and for the taking of political decisions. This educated class would work in partnership with its colonial masters to build up the structure needed for a modern state, as envisioned by the British authorities. Thus, by building institutions of higher learning, Britain wanted to produce “an honest administration, capable of utilizing modern science and technology to sink shafts of modernity deep into the traditional African societies. In short, the foundation of such universities as Ibadan was part of a British strategy for gradual and controlled decolonization.”\footnote{John D. Hargreaves, “The Idea of a Colonial University”, \textit{African Affairs}, Vol. 72, No. 286 (January, 1973): 27.} Johnson argues that the creation of African universities and other institutions of higher learning offered a new role to the expatriate expert – that of teaching and training the new generation of African graduates.\footnote{Marion Johnson, “Expatriates in African Studies”, \textit{African Affairs}, Vol. 88, No. 350 (January, 1989): 79.}
The fact that earlier institutions of higher learning in Africa were appendages of their European counterparts had many disadvantages. The metropolitan degree structures did not always fit local needs. For example, the medical programme of Louvain provided a minor place for pediatrics and preventive medicine. It failed to prepare students for conditions where infant mortality was high. Similarly, the London single-subject honors programme offered at Yaba College was too narrow. It offered little help to Nigerian graduates from whom a wide range of competence was likely to be demanded in the job market. However, despite these disadvantages, the period from 1919 to the early 1960s stands out as the most important period in the history of higher education in Africa.

**Philanthropy and higher education in Africa**

Philanthropic organisations played a cardinal role in the development of higher education in Africa. The Phelps-Stokes Fund was just one of many institutions. Other philanthropic organisations in the list include: the Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, Russel Sage Foundation, Nuffield Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation. The global importance of these organizations was felt soon after the end of the First World War. The Russel Sage Foundation that was established in 1908 promoted social research. The Rockefeller Foundation, which was incorporated in New York State in 1913, concerned itself with health issues and thus provided substantial financial support for the League of Nations Health Organization after the war. It mainly sponsored research on health-related topics but also funded other projects. The Carnegie Corporation, founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1911, was one of the very first American philanthropic organisations to be active in the support of education. It first made ‘block grants’ to universities for general programmes. In the 1930s it started funding specific projects. The Carnegie Corporation found the work of the Council on Foreign Relations (the promotion of globalism) impressive and thus funded its projects too. Until the 1930s, funds from the Carnegie Corporation met part of the cost of running


46 The travelling expenses of Dr Shantz, a member of the second Phelps-Stokes Commission, were met by the Rockefeller Foundation.


the ACEC referred to earlier. Grossman (1982) holds that academic social scientists and foundation officials became new reformers post-World War I. By the 1920s the social scientists saw philanthropists as “a fountain-head of resources necessary for the construction of a science of society and for enabling social scientists to contribute to the improvement of their society.”

The Carnegie Corporation’s financial support to East Africa started even before Makerere became a University College in 1949. In the early 1940s a grant of £1 350 from this Corporation made it possible for the college to start collecting standard texts. When the IUC started implementing the recommendations of the Asquith and the Elliot Reports, it soon realised that it would need more financial support to be able to do its job effectively. Thus, it turned to the Carnegie Corporation. Through such help it was able to fund medical research at Makerere College and build libraries at different University Colleges in Africa. The money was also used to appoint renowned librarians to establish libraries. In 1953, Stephen Stackpole and Alan Pifer (both of whom had experience in the educational needs of the less developed countries) took over executive responsibility for the Corporation’s commonwealth programme. Under their leadership the Corporation “soon began to exercise what gradually became a distinctive, in some ways unique, influence in relation to the development of higher education in Africa.”

In June 1954, Stackpole and Pifer invited to New York Walter Adams from the IUC and Mrs E.M. Chilver, who was Secretary of the Colonial Social Science Research Council to discuss the educational and research needs of the new university institutions. The meeting led to “a committed Carnegie interest in higher education in Anglophone Africa … and clinched a new orientation in the corporation’s Commonwealth activities.” The Carnegie Corporation subsequently sanctioned a policy of support for the new University Colleges. So, from 1954 the Corporation put its weight behind the development of higher education in the British colonies, especially those located in the African continent.

In June 1955, the Carnegie Corporation sponsored and attended a conference of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of overseas universities associated with the IUC held in Jamaica. This conference provided Stackpole and Pifer a golden opportunity to get to know these administrators and discuss with them any proposal they had in mind about higher education in the British Commonwealth. The Corporation also provided funding for some delegates to visit American institutions to see if they could learn something that would be of use in their home institutions later. Stackpole and Pifer, in response to the independence euphoria that swept through the African continent in the 1960s, began directing their support to programmes that would better equip these universities for the pressures of independence. Among other projects, they funded local staff training and the strengthening of the relationship between the universities and the

51 Before joining the Corporation, Pifer had paid a fact-finding visit to Africa on behalf of the Fulbright Commission. Early in 1953; previously he had attended the 1962 Tananarive conference on higher education in Africa, Stackpole had made an exploratory visit to a congress of the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth held in Britain.
52 Maxwell, Universities in Partnership, 47.
53 Ibid., 48.
societies in which they were located. The Corporation also helped the IUC meet some influential people in different governments, universities and other funding corporations.

The arrival in New York, in 1957, of Sir Andrew Cohen as the United Kingdom’s Permanent Representative to the United Nations Trusteeship Council was undoubtedly a boost to the development of higher education in Africa. He had been Uganda’s Governor for five years (1952-1956) and had previously served as Under-Secretary for Africa in the Colonial Office between 1948 and 1951. Thus, he understood Africa’s educational needs. Alan Pifer, who had visited Cohen in Uganda, met him and they discussed how the Carnegie Corporation could be of assistance to Africa. In 1958 the Corporation funded another conference at Gould House, Ardsley-On-Hudson convened to discuss the prospects of American participation in the development of higher education in Africa.

Other funding institutions also made a significant contribution to the development of higher education in Africa. In 1955 the Nuffield Foundation made an unspecified grant towards the cost of the new Faculty of Education building planned at Makerere so that research and conference rooms could be incorporated. The Foundation added £40 000 for the maintenance of research fellows at Makerere and another £21 000 towards a Faculty of Science’s programme of Swamp Research. In 1958-1959 it made another grant of £7 750 for Swamp Research at Makerere. Meanwhile, the Rockefeller Foundation donated $35 000 to Makerere’s Faculty of Agriculture. Ford Foundation made a grant of £9 000 for the training of Makerere’s laboratory technicians.54

When African countries achieved political independence in the early 1960s, they continued receiving financial support from their former colonisers and from different philanthropic organisations in other countries. According to Mckay, between 1961 and 1965 the Rockefeller Foundation appropriated over $3 million for Ibadan and two and a half million dollars for the University of East Africa. The University of Khartoum received $362 460 between 1959 and 1965. From 1963 to 1966, the Carnegie Corporation made grants of more than $1.7 million under its African programme, largely in support of teacher training and curriculum development initiatives among different African universities.55 Therefore, the development of higher education in different parts of Africa owes its success in great part to the generous philanthropic organisations.

A quick survey of the development of higher education in three African countries (Nigeria, Ghana and Sudan) will put into context the discussion on the development of higher education in Anglophone Africa and highlight the similarities in the manner in which institutions of higher education evolved in these countries.

The survey

Nigeria

The roots of higher education in Nigeria can be traced back to the colonial times “when Nigerian leaders demanded a University as a means to their own emancipation.” 56 But like the people in other British colonial territories, the Nigerian people “were subject to the pleasures and displeasures of the Colonial Office, which determined all policies – economic, social and political.” 57 Before the creation of the colonial government, Nigerian education, as elsewhere in Africa, was the prerogative of the missionaries. As in elementary and secondary education, the Christian missions played a major role in early higher education in Nigeria. Consequently, the initial aim of higher education in Nigeria was to train Nigerians to serve the church. It was only in 1926 that the missionaries de-emphasised higher education. 58

Until 1930, no institution of higher education had been established in Nigeria. Africans had to travel abroad for higher education. The Yoruba sent their children to Britain and they were later joined by Ibibio Union from Eastern Nigeria in the early 1930s and the Ibo State Union followed suit. In 1932, Yaba Higher College admitted its first students in a temporal venue in Lagos. On 19 January 1934, Sir Donald Cameron, the Nigerian Governor, officially opened Yaba College. It was the first higher educational institution and “the first institution of higher learning in the country, organizationally speaking, that merited the name ‘college’.” 59

Yet, Yaba College was not the kind of institution Nigerians had been yearning for. Soon after the College had started operating, Nigerians expressed their dissatisfaction, inter alia, about the fact that the requirements to enter the College’s Medical School were similar to those required in Britain. They interpreted this as the government’s deliberate attempt to limit and control opportunities for higher education. They further argued that it was wrong to have the entrance examination and the duration of the course similar to that of British universities while Nigerians trained at Yaba College were not recognised outside Nigeria – not even by the British Medical Council. Despite these complaints, the College remained the only credible institution of higher learning in Nigeria until 1939.

In 1943, Oliver Stanley set up the Commission on Higher Education in West Africa to report on the organisation and facilities of the already existing centers of higher learning in British West Africa. Stanley tasked this Commission, chaired by Colonel Walter Elliot, MP for Glasgow, to make recommendations regarding future university development in this area. After its investigation, the Elliot Commission presented two Reports to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Minority Report recommended that one University based in Ibadan would best serve the interests of British colonies in West Africa. The Majority Report, however, recommended the establishment of at least on University College in each of the British West African colonies.

58 In 1926, a Christian Mission Conference in Le Zonte decided that education was a state function. It was agreed that primary and secondary education would remain in missionary hands while the government focused on technical and higher education.
In June 1945, the British Parliament accepted the Majority Report. In July the Labour Party defeated the Conservative Party in Britain’s general elections. Clement Attlee became the new Prime Minister while George Henry Hall became the new Secretary of State for the Colonies. Arthur Creech Jones, who had submitted the Minority Report, became Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. The new leadership reversed the decision made before the elections and accepted the Minority Report. There was an outcry from West Africa, especially from Ghana. Hall responded by sending the IUC to West Africa in 1946 to study the education situation and make its recommendations. The Council under William Hamilton Fyfe endorsed the Majority Report and confirmed the site already selected by the Ibadan Native Administration. Creech Jones, who became the new Secretary of State for the Colonies towards the end of 1946, conceded defeat. In May 1947, Dr Kenneth Mellanby from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine was appointed Principal-Designate of the anticipated University College, Ibadan. He transferred Yaba Higher College to Ibadan. On 18 January 1948, former Yaba Higher College students became the first students of the University College, Ibadan. The College joined the ‘Special Relationship’ Programme with the University of London.

The new University College received criticisms and praises from different sectors. Members of the public considered the institution to be an alien college and a branch of the University of London in Nigeria, since the curriculum was largely designed for the English not the Nigerian environment. No changes could be made to the curriculum before London’s approval. Dennis Austin recalled: In the early period of the foundation of the University College of Ibadan after the Second World War, many of the newly appointed teachers, registrars and vice-chancellors – Africans and British alike – struggled to establish themselves in the period before and after independence. In his view, many seemed be ‘unanchored souls’, carried backward and forward on a current that had no clear direction. They were uncertain of the nature of the university and its place in Nigerian society. He lamented that the students were African-speaking and English-taught. The College was locally established but linked through the arrangement for external degrees to the University of London. Importantly, “it was also a federal institution in a land that lacked definition.”

Driven by the post-World War II spirit of nationalism and independence, Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe proposed to establish a ‘Nigerian’ university, as opposed to ‘a University in Nigeria’. Under his leadership, in May 1955, Nigeria’s Eastern Region Assembly passed the University of Nigeria Act. In 1957, Dr Azikiwe wrote to the IUC informing it about this development. In November 1958, he talked to Dame Lillian Penson, the new Chair of the Senate Committee at the University of London, and John Lockwood, a member of the University of London Senate Committee, and told them that the new university would be a full university from the outset. Dr Azikiwe solicited funds in Europe and America. British and American academicians who came to Nigeria to inspect and advise wrote good reports and agreed to help in any way necessary. The

60 Ghana had the money to build its own college if needs be. See: Pattison, Special Relations, 50.
University of Nigeria atNsukka was ceremonially opened on 7 October 1960 as part of week-long celebrations marking Nigeria’s independence on 1 October 1960. Her Royal Highness Princess Alexandra of Kent laid the University’s foundation stone on behalf of the British Queen.

Meanwhile, the Commission appointed by the Federal Government’s Education Minister in 1959 to conduct an investigation into Nigeria’s needs in the field of post-school certificate and higher education for the next twenty years had recommended the establishment of three universities in addition to Ibadan: one in Zaria (Northern Nigeria), one in Lagos (in the South), and the University of Nigeria already planned by the government of Eastern Nigeria. The University of Lagos opened in 1962 and Ahmadu Bello University in Zaria was opened in October 1962. Although no university had been recommended for Western Nigeria, the regional government put pressure on the Federal Government and opened the University of Ife in October 1962. Ahmadu Bello, Ife and Nsukka were regional universities. The universities of Lagos and Ibadan were federal institutions. Of these, Nsukka “was the first of the ‘independence era’ Universities, conceived as a result of Nigerian initiative rather than as part of British colonial policy for her overseas territories.”

Ghana

The Gold Coast, as Ghana was known before independence, made several efforts to develop its education system. In 1908, Governor Sir John P. Rodger appointed a Committee and tasked it to revise educational rules and establish training institutions for teachers. His successor, Sir Frederick Gordon Guggisberg, kept the momentum. When the Phelps-Stokes Commission submitted its first Report in 1922, it had the following to say: “The educational interests, activities and plans of the Gold Coast Government are very significant and surpass those of all other colonies.” Achimota College, established by Governor Guggisberg in 1926, offered education from nursery school through secondary education to teacher education, and even up to the beginnings of a university department of engineering. But these were feeble efforts. When Governor Guggisberg proposed that Achimota College be linked with the University of London to maintain international standards, the Gold Coast Advisory Education Committee opposed the idea, fearing that it would mean Achimota losing the opportunity to develop the indigenous system of higher education it had already started. In 1944, the Colonial
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64 The Chairman of this Commission, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, was Eric Ashby. Other members were: J.F. Lockwood, G.W. Watts (all three from Britain); K.O. Dike, Senator Shettima Kashim, S.D. Onabamiro (from Nigeria); and R.G. Gustavson, H.W. Hanna and F. Keppel (all from the United States of America). Its Report was submitted to the Nigerian government in September 1960. Copies were distributed to the Nigerian Federal Legislature at its first meeting after independence in October 1960. It was later published under the following title: Investment in Education. The Report of the Commission on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria (Lagos, 1960).
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Government in the Gold Coast approved a scheme drawn up by the Department of Education to provide a staff of highly qualified Africans to work in training colleges and secondary schools and become supervisors. This scheme provided for higher education and professional training at Achimota or in the United Kingdom.70

Serious attempts to develop higher education in Ghana began in 1948 with the establishment of the University College of the Gold Coast. The circumstances leading to the foundation of this institution are similar to those that gave birth to Ibadan University College in Nigeria. The Majority Report of the Elliot Commission had recommended the establishment of a University College in the Gold Coast. When the Labour government reversed this idea, the Gold Coast expressed its willingness to raise funds to build its own university. Governor Alan Burns appointed a Committee to advise on this matter. In its Report, the Committee recommended that the Gold Coast could have a university evolving from Achimota provided it had capital and recurrent funds. This view was upheld by the IUC delegation, thus forcing the Secretary of State for the Colonies to allow the Gold Coast to go ahead with its plan. Bruce Pattison recalls that the Gold Coast could have its university if it bore the entire cost and it virtually did so. Compared with the other colonial university colleges, the Gold Coast received very little from the British government through the CD & WF, and it built, equipped and maintained a fine university largely by its own efforts. Therefore, “it can be proud of the achievement.”71

In May 1947, David Balme was appointed as Principal-Designate and, by an Ordinance, the University College of the Gold Coast was established in 1948. Balme then soon formally applied for the College’s admission to London’s ‘Special Relationship’ programme. Governor Burns officially opened the College on 11 October 1948 and the IUC appointed the staff. Therefore, although the people of the Gold Coast decided to found their own University College when Britain accepted the Minority Report,72 evidence suggests that the University College in the Gold Coast was part of the Asquith scheme like all other University Colleges referred to above.

In 1951 a College of Technology was established at Kumasi to train the personnel that was desperately needed for the economic, technological, educational and social development of the country. Both these institutions, one at Achimota (later moved to Elgon Hill) and the one at Kumasi, were made possible, in part, by grants from Britain through the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts of 1945 and subsequent years.73

From February 1951 the Gold Coast gained self-government. Educational policies reflected the aims of the new leadership. Thus, ‘The Gold Coast Revolution’ “was as much an educational as a political one.”74 In April 1951, Balme reported to the College Senate Committee that there might be political pressure in the near future to turn the University College into an independent university.75 In 1959 Balme’s postulation was confirmed. The University College expressed its

71 Pattison, Special Relations, 50.
72 Alexander Kwapong, Address to the Congregation of the University of Ghana, 26 March 1966, in Minerva, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Summer, 1966): 542.
73 Graham, The History of Education in Ghana, 176-177.
75 Pattison, Special Relations, 143.
wish to end the ‘Special Relationship’ with London. The government responded by appointing a Commission in 1960 to look into the possibility of the University College of Ghana and the Kumasi College of Technology becoming a single independent university. The Commission recommended the establishment of two separate universities and stressed the need to Africanise them. In 1961, the College of Technology at Kumasi became Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology. The University College at Achimota became the University of Ghana. In October 1962, the University College of Cape Coast was founded. It was established in special relationship with the University of Ghana and only assumed independent status in 1972 as the University of Cape Coast.

**Sudan**

The development of higher education in Sudan began in 1898 when Lord Kitchener founded Gordon Memorial College. The foundation stone was laid in January 1899, with the first college buildings being completed in 1903. Subsequently, a technical training center and an industrial workshop were added. Lecturers who taught at Gordon Memorial College were expatriates just like in Nigeria and Ghana. The difference is that Sudan was not a British colony but an Anglo-Egyptian condominium. The majority of staff members were Egyptian Muslim scholars from Al Azhar and they paid more attention to Islamic studies. The end of World War I marked the beginning of a new educational policy in Sudan. Bashir argues that this was due to two reasons. First, the end of the war allowed free movement within Sudan and also between Sudan and countries such as Egypt. The second reason is that there was a conscious effort by education authorities to pay serious attention to education. The general public called for the ‘Sudanisation’ of the teaching profession and wanted the Egyptians to leave. The problem was that there were few Sudanese who were trained for the positions held by expatriate staff. For example, the Sudanese had to go to Cairo, Beirut and London to train as doctors.

This evident dearth of doctors led to the establishment of the Kitchener School of Medicine in Khartoum in 1924, followed by a School of Law eleven years later. Political developments between 1935 and 1936 gave further impetus to the development of higher education in Sudan. The Anglo-Egyptian treaty signed in 1936 ended the exclusion of Egyptians from Sudan. People of Egyptian nationality could now be considered for employment in Sudan. Although the Sudanese government was not prepared to restore to the Egyptians the share in government service they had enjoyed up to 1924, the signing of this treaty meant increased competition for jobs between the Sudanese and the Egyptians. The need to develop higher education became more urgent.

After the Report of the De la Warr Commission, schools for agriculture and veterinary science commenced in 1939. When the Asquith Commission began its work in 1943, two of its
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members (H.J. Channon and J.F. Duff) visited Sudan.\textsuperscript{80} In 1944, the Council of Gordon Memorial College was constituted. On 1 January 1945, schools of law, agriculture and veterinary science, science and engineering as well as arts (except the Kitchener School of Medicine) were united to form the new Gordon College which was inaugurated the following month. In December 1945, Gordon College invited Professor Lillian Penson to visit and advise it on how to proceed towards university status. After responding to her recommendations (one of which was the inclusion of two IUC members in the College Council), the College Council applied to the Senate of the University of London for possible admission to the ‘Special Relationship’ Programme. The application was successful and Gordon College was admitted on 22 May 1946.

In 1951, the Gordon College and the Kitchener School of Medicine combined to form the University College of Khartoum. The Ordinance establishing this University College came into force on 1 September 1951. There was political pressure for the University College to reflect local character. Also, the Sudanese Government expected the College to play a key role in the ‘Sudanisation’ project. Such expectation accelerated the need for the University College to become a fully-fledged independent university. On 21 April 1954, the Principal of the University of Khartoum wrote to the Secretary of the Senate Committee giving formal notification that the council of the College had approved the recommendation of the Academic Board that appropriate action should be taken to raise the status of the College to university status by 1 July 1955 or soon thereafter. It was not until 1956, the year in which Sudan achieved independence, that the University of Khartoum Act, 1956 raised the college to full university status, with the right to award its own degrees. In 1957 the University College of Khartoum was constituted into an autonomous institution. Thus, “Khartoum was the first college to enter into Special Relationship and the first to become an independent university. Both in its entrance and its exit it was the model for all the others.”\textsuperscript{81} The 1957 University Act provided for a Chancellor appointed by the Head of State on the recommendation of the University Council. This move threw the University deep into politics.

The discussion thus far has focussed on the development of higher education in the British colonies and the role played by the British government and philanthropic organisations in this process. What is evident is that when these countries achieved independence they expected institutions of higher learning to work with the governments to consolidate the newly achieved independence. They articulated their views boldly.

** Views on universities**

**The African vision**

From the start, African politicians perceived their new institutions of higher learning in political terms and this worsened after independence. By 1960 independence had become a popular
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\textsuperscript{80} Sudan asked to be included in the list of countries to be visited by the Asquith Commission through the Foreign Office. When other colonies received funds from Britain through the Colonial Welfare and Development Fund, Sudan did not qualify for those funds. What enabled it to even think about establishing a college was a gift of £2 000 000 from the British government in recognition of its support to the allied forces during the Second World War. It decided to use half of that money to establish a university.

\textsuperscript{81} Pattison, *Special Relations*, 142.
phrase in Africa, prompting Harold Macmillan, British Prime Minister, to talk about the ‘Wind of Change’. It was in this context that 1960 was dubbed ‘the Year of Africa’. Once African politicians had achieved independence they devoted their time and effort to finding ways to consolidate it. They vowed to work tirelessly so that they could do better than Britain had done.

Eric Ashby’s Commission on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in 1960 studied the education system in Nigeria. In its recommendations it tied educational policy to social planning and strongly recommended the expansion of science facilities and students at the universities. The Report of this Commission had a profound impact on African education in general although its focus was primarily on Nigeria. It prompted African leaders to state their vision about the African continent’s education system.

Two UNESCO-sponsored conferences were organised, one from 15 to 25 May 1961 and another one from 3 to 12 September 1962. The first conference was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in accordance with resolution 1.2322 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its eleventh session. UNESCO’s General Conference decided “to convene a conference of African States in 1961 with a view to establishing an inventory of educational needs and a programme to meet those needs in the coming years, and to invite the United Nations, the other Specialized Agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency to co-operate with Unesco in the preparation and organization of the Conference.” The main purpose of the Addis Ababa Conference was “to provide a forum for African states to decide on their priority educational needs to promote economic and social development in Africa and, in the light of these, to establish a first tentative short-term and long-term plan for educational development in the continent, embodying the priorities they had decided upon for the economic growth of the region.” The conference outlined the needs and costs of building a modern educational system in Africa. The African Education Ministers who assembled there set themselves three specific goals:

(i) six years’ universal, compulsory and free education for all children by the year 1980;
(ii) entry of 30% of primary school children into secondary schools; and
(iii) provision of higher education for up to 20% of those who completed secondary education.

Reflecting on this meeting about four years later, L. Gray Cowan, James O’Connell and David Scanlon recalled that the meeting at Addis Ababa was a milestone in African education. For the first time, African educators were deciding the future of African education. While criticism was
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leveled at the literary and humanistic quality of British and French education, “it was recognized that it had provided … an introduction to the liberal political philosophy of the West.”

The second conference was held in Tananarive (now Antananarivo), Madagascar at the invitation of the Government of the Malagasy Republic. It was convened within the framework of resolution 1.14 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its eleventh session “and constituted as such as a follow-up as well as a complement to the Conference of African States on the Development of Education in Africa held in Addis Ababa in May 1961.” It set out:

(i) To identify possible solutions to:

(a) problems of choice and adaptation of the higher education curriculum to the specific conditions of African life and development, and the training of specialised personnel for public administration and economic development techniques;

(a) problems of administration, organisation, structure and financing encountered in the creation or development of institutions of higher education both from the point of view of the institutions themselves and from the wider angle of national policy; and

(ii) To provide data to the United Nations, its Specialized Agencies, and to other organisations and bodies concerned with international co-operation and assistance, for the development of their programmes in aid to and use of institutions of higher education in Africa.

In its Report, the conference plotted targets for the same period (1980) at the level of University education. It resolved that there had to be an expansion of higher education in the African continent. Consequently, public expenditure on education among African countries increased by 12.5% against a 6.5% increase obtained in the developed countries. Subsequently, Heads of African Universities assembled in Khartoum, in Sudan to discuss the establishment of an Association of African Universities.

As far as African leaders were concerned, education was not only the means by which centuries of ignorance was to be wiped out, it was also the means to train and develop the skills and high-level manpower to replace the erstwhile colonial official and to staff the new and expanded political, administrative, social and economic institutions. These African leaders regarded education as the necessary and indispensable instrument for achieving the goals they had set themselves, that is, nation-building and economic and social development. President Kenyatta of Kenya intimated:
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Any undergraduate could tell you that, to develop a country, it is necessary to increase education and expand welfare and economic services. And this is not a superficial truth, since it is the basic objective of all our striving.91

These leaders felt that the educational system they inherited from their colonial masters was unsuited to their requirements. They resolved to train Africans who would take up the jobs that had previously been reserved for the white colonial administrators and to restructure the education system so that it became relevant to the local African needs. President Nyerere of Tanzania emphasised the need to destroy colonial education inherited by his country.92

What was the African leaders’ vision? To address this question adequately, we must consider a list of other questions once posed by Professor Bethwell Ogot about an African university:

Should it be a repository of Western ideas and an enclave of neo-colonialism? What kind of research should it engage in? What should be its relations with the rural areas? What kind of co-operation should it have with African and other foreign institutions?93

These are some of the questions African leaders such as: Julius Nyerere of Tanzania; Milton Obote from Uganda; Jomo Kenyatta from Kenya; Kenneth Kaunda from Zambia; Kwame Nkrumah from Ghana and Nnamdi Azikiwe from Nigeria asked themselves. Their overall response was that unlike the colonial universities they had inherited from Europeans, an African university had to reflect an African character – not only in terms of the student population but also in terms of its administrative and teaching staff, the curriculum, syllabus and the method of teaching and research.

Dr Davidson Nicol, Principal of Fourah Bay College, and Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, member of the Senate Committee at the University of London met Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe in Cambridge in the early 1950s and asked him what he expected the University College in Ibadan to teach. His prompt and instant reply was that it must teach African history, African music, journalism, and linguistics. Seeing that Ibadan did not meet these needs, Dr Azikiwe played an instrumental role in the establishment of the University of Nigeria at Nsukka mentioned above and then introduced these subjects. West African nationalists and politicians from Nigeria, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, Senegal and Gambia argued that University education from the West was outmoded. Others even stated that Europeans promoted this form of education so that they could come to Africa and exploit minerals and other products while Africans learnt subjects such as Latin, which were neither relevant nor contributed anything to Africa’s development effort.94


African leaders used different platforms to outline their vision about an African university in post-independence Africa. Speaking with reference to Ghana, President Nkrumah, Ghana’s first President, maintained that it was important that there had to be no doubt whatsoever in their minds as to what was the role of a university in a developing country such as Ghana. The university was to become the academic focus of national life, reflecting the social, economic, cultural and political aspirations of the people. It had to kindle national interests in the youth and uplift citizens and free them from ignorance, superstition, and indolence. A university “does not exist in a vacuum or in outer space. It exists in the context of a society and it is there that it has its proper place.”\(^95\)

President Nkrumah’s message was clear: a university that was despondent to the needs of the nation was not welcome in the new political dispensation. President Kenneth Kaunda concurred with President Nkrumah in stating: “The University should be part and parcel of the community it serves ... the University must act as the custodian of the national heritage which it must help to create.”\(^96\) Most African leaders perceived a neo-colonial institution of higher learning as a threat to Africa’s hard-fought independence.

Under the colonial rule, the main concern of the European administrators and academics was the maintenance of academic standards. Indigenous knowledge or input from the local communities was ignored. In President Nyerere’s view there had to be a solid line of demarcation between a colonial and a post-colonial university. He launched a scathing attack on universities that promoted the stratification of society. His view was that the problems that beset our countries are many but that some were peculiar to East African countries. He argued that one of the legacies of all bad systems, social and political, is the stratification of society into ‘the haves’ and ‘have nots’. Whenever these divisions of society are wide, he continued, “reform becomes imperative; and when this reform is resisted, or is not rapid enough, an explosion can be expected.”\(^97\)

Some African leaders looked to the national universities to assist them in promoting nationalism and Pan-Africanism. Speaking at the inauguration ceremony of President Kaunda as Chancellor of the University of Zambia, President Nyerere talked about the dilemma facing the Pan-Africanist in post-colonial Africa. The Pan-Africanist was expected to be conscious of and be loyal to the African continent while concerning himself with the freedom and development of his nation. President Nyerere strongly believed that the challenge was not insurmountable. Late in his address he outlined the role an African university could play in promoting Pan-Africanism by asking a series of questions, including the following:

> Why cannot we exchange students – have Tanzanians getting their degrees in Zambia as Zambians get their degrees in Tanzania? Why cannot we share expertise on particular
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subjects, and perhaps share certain services? Why cannot we do other things which link our intellectual life together indissolubly?98

He urged universities to put proposals before national Governments, and to demand from politicians a reasoned answer to see if there could be no agreement. The overall vision of the Anglophone African leaders about national universities was that these institutions had to be Africanised in all respects, not just in terms of their physical location. President Obote highlighted the advantages of teaching localised knowledge, arguing that it is not possible to describe fully or to convey in words the importance of indigenous literature and works of art in the development of a young nation. He added: “The same is true in the case of the importance of the arts in regard to the daily lives of a people.”99

President Obote further argued that the Dark Continent would only be fully illuminated and reflected effectively by her sons and daughters possessed of the power of originality of expression. If the original force or power of imagination and expression were indigenous and applied to local conditions, the full meaning of that work of art would immediately be recognised even by the people who had never been to university before. Reflecting on his own experience, he demonstrated how disadvantageous it was to imbibe Western values. He recalled a poem about daffodils he once studied as a student at Makerere. He could not appreciate the poem because its theme was unfamiliar to him. As a result, he almost failed his examination. To ensure that other Ugandans did not fall prey to this kind of teaching, he closed his speech by posing a rhetorical question:

May I expect that the Principal at Makerere University College will not continue to give us golden Shakespeare, golden Michaelangelo and golden Beethoven, but Rubadiri, Zirimu and Kakooza and other African writers, musicians and artists?100

President Kenyatta, speaking at the dissolution of the University of East Africa in 1970, expressed his unshaken belief that a university has a major role to play in the development of a nation. He maintained:

The primary object of higher education in the difficult early years of a new country is to produce the technical and professional manpower needed to promote and control all aspects of development.101

The call for African universities to refrain from being appendages of European academic institutions was not confined to those universities that were once under the ‘Special Relationship’ scheme with the University of London and other renowned European universities. Emperor Haile Selassie made a similar call, arguing that the university had been established to achieve a particular goal. He stated:
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A fundamental objective of the university must be the safeguarding and the developing of the culture of the people it serves. This university is a product of that culture; it is a community of those capable of understanding and using the accumulated heritage of the Ethiopian people. In this university men and women will work together to study the wellsprings of our culture, trace its development, and mold its future.\textsuperscript{102}

The discussion thus far shows that African leaders had a clear vision about the future of higher education in Africa. There were specific tasks they expected national universities to perform. However, the idea of ‘an African vision’ about these institutions should be treated with caution. While this idea was salient in the 1960s, not all African politicians embraced it. Some fervently believed that imbibing the values of the West would ensure that the revered high academic standards were maintained and that the degrees obtained from African universities were recognised abroad. Thus, the response by Africans to Western education and their vision about African universities was not always the same.

\textit{The people on the spot}

Politicians were not alone in advancing the views discussed above. Academics shared the same sentiments. These scholars wrestled with a number of issues regarding the tertiary institutions in which they were working. Among the topics on which they articulated their views were the following:

(i) the role of the university as an academic institution;
(ii) the university’s relationship with the society in which it is located;
(iii) the need for the Africanisation of the university in terms of staff, curriculum, syllabus and teaching and research methods;
(iv) the university’s linkages with the West;
(v) academic freedom and university autonomy; and
(vi) university planning in the new political environment of the 1960s. Each of these themes is discussed separately below with the aim of gauging the essence of the debates that emerged between different scholars on each of them.

\textbf{The role of the university}

William Lamont, Principal of Makerere College from 1946 to 1949 identified two roles of a university anywhere: first, that it should strive for the advancement of learning and dissemination of knowledge; and second, that it should concern itself with the training of young men and women for service in public and professional life. When the debate regarding the role of the university took center stage in the 1960s in the wake of the spirit of nationalism and independence, Lamont’s successors echoed his views.

\textsuperscript{102} Emperor Haile Selassie, “An Address by the Emperor of Ethiopia at the Inauguration of Haile Selassie I University”, in the \textit{Voice of Ethiopia}, 18 December 1961.
Arthur Porter, Principal of University College, Nairobi from 1964 was one of the first scholars in the 1960s to think aloud about the role of the university in a changing society. He argued that African universities, like all others, should perform two basic functions:

(i) they must transmit knowledge from one generation to another through effective teaching; and

(ii) they must expand the existing body of knowledge through research.\(^{103}\)

But he conceded that the role of the university could not be presented as a standard narrative because it is complex and contested. He demonstrated this complexity by discussing the dual role of the university, arguing that the university must be an institution of cultural change and, at the same time, be an institution of cultural preservation. Porter argued that a university in developing Africa –

... must on the one hand serve as an instrument for change according to a programme of national priorities determined by the decision-makers, and on the other hand, it must remain, like any true university, a centre of independent thought and critical inquiry.\(^{104}\)

Both these functions were deemed necessary for the university to remain a relevant institution in a country. In another article, Porter maintained that the university in Africa had to be many-faced. It had to be a service institution, like a public utility training individuals to meet high-level manpower needs, preparing broadly educated men and women for leadership in civic life and providing a general reservoir of informed talent. It also had to be perceived by the outside world as an institution which contributes to the advancement of knowledge through the excellence of its scholarship and its research programmes. In short “it must strive for international reputation.”\(^{105}\) Thus, the university had to serve the nation and still remain a member of the international community of scholarship. The thrust of Porter’s argument was that the university is by nature multi-faced, multifaceted and possesses contested identities.

**University relations with the society**

The relationship between the university and the society was another of the themes that preoccupied the minds of the scholars. Key questions included the following: Would the university concern itself with the maintenance of international standards and ignore its immediate society when deciding on issues such as entrance requirements and degree structure? Would the university focus its attention on the teaching of pure knowledge, which did not solve the problems faced by the society in which it was sited? How much say would the society have on the functioning of the university in terms of administration and teaching? The people on the spot grappled with these and other questions.
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Lamont stated that it was the responsibility of the university to provide the society with the necessary manpower. He cited the training of teachers for secondary schools, and for the medical, veterinary, and agricultural professions as a direct responsibility of the university. Lamont perceived this training of teachers as reciprocating because the society hosted and financed the university. In his view, the university had a moral obligation to respond to societal needs. Porter espoused the same view, arguing that universities should serve their societies, contributing in a meaningful and direct way to the social and economic problems of their countries and the African continent as a whole. In his view, if the society faced a problem on health, politics, or religion, the university had to provide a solution. But unlike Lamont, Porter considered both the immediate and the broader societies as potential beneficiaries of university establishment in their areas.

David Wasawo, Deputy-Principal at University College, Nairobi, subscribed to the views articulated by Lamont and Porter. However, he went on to argue that the task of the university was more than just producing manpower for the society. His view was that –

... it is necessary not only to examine our own society and make some hard and realistic decisions on our social philosophy, but also to ensure that the kind of high level manpower we are producing is that which is going to be conscious and committed to the African philosophy.106

Wasawo’s view was that the university could not produce manpower in a dispassionate manner. He fervently believed that the university had to strive for the creation of a certain kind of society – one that was committed to an African social philosophy. Wasawo unabashedly stated that East Africa was ready to produce the desperately needed high-level manpower, which would not only help the society in its development effort but contribute towards shaping the mentality of the society so that it appreciated and promoted an African philosophy. He maintained: “We accept this charge and are continually conscious of it in the planning of our courses and in the organisation of the life of our students.”107 According to him, producing high-level manpower had to be the short-term objective of the university – the long-term goal being the creation of a society that would embrace an African social philosophy.

Bernard De Bunsen, who succeeded Lamont and later became the first Vice-Chancellor of the Federal University of East Africa, did not subscribe to the portrayal of the university as the provider and the society as the receiver of services whereby the former determined the nature of the relationship. Instead, he called for a symbiotic relationship between the university and the society. For the university to remain alive, responsive, and healthy, de Bunsen argued that its members had to study and comment on different aspects of societal activities. Likewise, the society had to freely criticise and applaud the university when necessary. De Bunsen further proposed that the society had to be involved in the administration of the university so that it could have a say in the preparation of the students who would return to serve it after completing their courses. In this regard, De Bunsen applauded Makerere University College for adopting British practices aimed at strengthening the relationship between the university and the society. He stated:
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I believe the practice of the civic universities of England, which we have adopted at Makerere, in having governing councils with a small majority of laymen drawn from the public or local government is a right one. Such councils are in miniature meeting grounds of academics and the public.\(^{108}\)

In his view, if the relationship between the university and the society was to be sustained, the two had to work jointly.

The views espoused by these scholars aimed at inculcating trust between the university and the society it served. However, there were subtle tensions in the views articulated by these scholars. How much influence would the society have on the university? Would the students humbly submit to the university to train them to become its agents that would lead the society towards a specific direction as Wasawo suggested? Would the university have its immediate society as the main focus or would it consider the broader African society and thus the global society? To what extent would an African university be influenced by the broad theoretical assumptions about the nature of the relationship between the university and the society? These were some of the contentious issues the people on the spot could not resolve completely. Another area that became the locus of the tensions between different interested parties was the question of the Africanisation of the university in terms of the curriculum, syllabus, teaching and research methods, administrative staff, faculty and culture in general.

Africanisation

For African universities to be relevant to the needs of the local societies, the faculty and administrators argued that they should be Africanised. The general feeling was that unless the university trained its students on how to tackle societal problems obtaining in Africa it would be perceived by the society as an ivory tower. Similarly, a university that looked at African health problems, religions, cultures and political institutions through the Western lens inevitably made itself vulnerable to criticisms. These were the guiding assumptions on which Africanisation was premised and conceived by people on the spot.

Porter argued that one way of making African education relevant was through a rigorous programme of Africanisation of content material as well as of teaching personnel. He maintained that this would achieve two objectives:

(i) it would ensure that the university was not estranged from its society; and
(ii) it would enable the students to adjust easily to the university and enhance their effectiveness when they returned to their respective societies after completing their various academic qualifications.

Cranford Pratt, first Principal at the University College, Dar es Salaam, shared Porter’s views, intimating that failure to replace expatriate staff and Western curriculum in African universities was a disservice to students. Expatriate staff used examples from the metropolitan countries,
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which African students could not easily grasp thus resulting into their low academic performance. Secondly, the promotion of Western research topics did not arouse students’ interest in doing research on topics that were pertinent to Africa. This minimised students’ contribution to their societies. Pratt regretted that some of his colleagues in Dar es Salaam were conducting research on Shakespear or other unfamiliar topics that did not help students appreciate the African continent they lived in.

The question of Africanisation was compounded by the fact that there was still uncertainty as to whether it was advisable to sustain relations with the West. Would it be possible to keep expatriates and still Africanise universities? Would the expatriate faculty be willing and, if so, be able to Africanise its teaching and research methods? To what extent would the African academics – most of whom had received their training from Western universities – embrace the idea of Africanisation? These were some of the many intriguing questions during the early days of university establishment in Africa.

Linkages with the West

The relationship between African universities and the West was the locus of a number of tensions. In essence, there were two diametrically opposed arguments, one saying that African universities had to reflect an African character and the other one saying that these universities, like their counterparts elsewhere, had to subscribe to internationally accepted practices with regard to admission policies, degree structure, etc. These adversarial views meant that African universities had to be simultaneously different from and similar to other universities in the world all at the same time. There were already inherent tensions in these parallel positions which would prove hard to resolve.

Lamont set the tone in 1948 when he stated that university education in East Africa, however unique it may be in certain details, “must clearly conform to the substantial requirements of university education elsewhere.” In his view, an African university had to epitomise universities elsewhere; the relationship between an African and a Western university had to be clear. However, Lamont further argued that naturally, a university could not rely on outside guidance to disseminate knowledge. Instead,

... it must fall back upon its own depth and breadth of vision, upon its own grasp of the ideal of which it is itself the custodian. If its own vision and wisdom fail, then its enterprise will languish until the vision returns. If the light within it be darkness, then will that be darkness indeed.

The thrust of Lamont’s second view was that it was the task of each university to decide on a modus operandi that would enable it to fulfil its own vision.

The conspicuous tensions in Lamont’s submissions can be gleaned from Porter’s argument. The latter suggested that African universities needed a rigorous programme of Africanisation

of content material and of teaching personnel. Yet he conceded a role for experts from outside Africa, arguing:

> It seems to me therefore that the University of East Africa and its constituent Colleges need expert professional advice on the form and content of a full plan of co-ordination so that they may provide each country with the trained manpower necessary to permit the most effective leadership.\(^{111}\)

According to Porter, although the University of East Africa had to portray an African outlook, it could not abruptly cut ties with the West, which already had vast experience on university affairs. Porter sustained this view in another article where he reasoned: “much help is still required from outside by men and women ready and willing to put their skills at the disposal of Africa.”\(^{112}\) Implicit in this comment was that Africa was ready to stand alone.

De Bunsen’s view was that there was much to be gained by sustaining ties with the West; and that the new faculty should continue to be trained abroad. The rationale for these positions was twofold. First, African students had to get exposure and experience different from the one to which they were accustomed in their home institutions. Second, sending students abroad for postgraduate study would ensure that there was continuity when the expatriate staff left. This view reiterated the need for expert knowledge.

Another site where some tensions were located was on the question of academic freedom and university autonomy. Given that any freedom has its limitations, how much freedom could the university’s staff and students enjoy? To what extent could the university be autonomous from the state? What would be the nature of the relationship between the state and the university? These became complex questions.

### Academic freedom and university autonomy

These two concepts can easily be misconstrued. The people on the spot battled with understanding the concepts in their general usage in the West; ascertaining the feasibility of applying these broad conceptions to the African context; and identifying the uses and abuses of the concepts by university administrators, faculty and students as well as the possible repercussions thereof in any given moment.

One of the first questions the people on the spot wrestled with was establishing whether there was a need for the university to be free in the first place. Lamont reasoned:

> It is the consciousness of this heavy responsibility for keeping alive the love of learning and devotion to truth which makes the universities so jealous of their freedom, so resolute to defend the right of their teachers to probe and question beliefs ordinarily taken for granted, to search the universe and to report what they see.\(^{113}\)

---

In his view, universities needed freedom in order to be able to perform their teaching and research duties.

De Bunsen concurred with Lamont and addressed the above question as follows:

Here I think we reach the heart of the matter. The justification for the freedom of the university is that it has a special and distinctive role to play in society, a distinctive duty which is concerned not only with the numbers of trained professional men it may send into society, important as that is, but with the cultivation of independent minds leading to free inquiry and to the free discrimination of its results in society through teaching and publication.\textsuperscript{114}

De Bunsen argued that the state and the society should allow universities to perform their task of cultivating independent minds uninterrupted.

However, in his view, it would be inappropriate to give the university boundless freedom; university freedom had to operate within certain parameters. He espoused the view that for universities to perform their tasks well they needed “constant prodding from without and self-criticism from within.”\textsuperscript{115} This combination would deter the university from abusing its freedom. Thus, De Bunsen expected universities to be free to perform their tasks in society but also felt that they had to be subjected to scrutiny by other constituencies such as the state and the society. To this end, he sounded a warning:

Let us beware of hoisting the flag of university \textit{Uhuru} if it is a symbol of immunity from public criticism or pressures. University societies can easily go to sleep and become self-satisfied corporations.\textsuperscript{116}

This was by far a balanced view on the university and the state.

Pratt tackled the relationship between the state and the university, arguing that this relationship is shaped by a number of factors which include trust and respect held by members of each institution of each other. Pratt stated that the teaching staff at Makerere was well-positioned to comment on the functioning of different Ugandan government departments. He invoked Professor Edward Shil’s view that men respond both to the encouragement and to the criticism of people whose judgement they respect. According to this trajectory, politicians in government and senior civil servants are likely to give an audience to those they accept as intellectual equals – especially if they are in easy and frequent contact with them. Chapter 4 of this book demonstrates that the relationship between East African states and the Federal University was not constant. The sustenance of this relationship was determined by a confluence of factors, including the manner in which the students expressed their concerns on a variety of issues in which the state was involved, and the pace at which the administrative staff at the University’s central office or at its constituent colleges implemented the Africanisation process of the University.
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In their quest for an identity, African universities debated whether or not it was appropriate for them to subscribe to the Western notions of academic freedom and university autonomy or to modify these to fit the African context. De Bunsen argued that African nations were faced with situations of infinitely greater urgency in their political, social, and economic lives. To ensure common understanding, there had to be conscious efforts to knit the concerns of the university with those of the nation. The university “needs to appreciate the very real problems facing the governments” and there should be “appreciation by the public that only a free university can truly serve its need.”

De Bunsen alluded to the fact that Western notions of academic freedom and university autonomy could not be applied to Africa in their pure form. Africa’s political, social and economic circumstances ruled out the possibility of pure transplantation. While it was necessary for African universities to be granted freedom by the public and by the state, these universities had to consider the realities of the African continent and respond to them intuitively instead of adhering almost dogmatically to the general notions of academic freedom and university autonomy.

Wilbert Chagula who taught and held administrative positions at Makerere and at the University College, Dar es Salaam shared de Bunsen’s views. Drawing a distinction between theory and practice, Chagula stated *inter alia* that Universities and Colleges in most developing countries in general, and the University Colleges in East Africa, in particular, still had a predominance of expatriate academic staff some of whom might still hold views on university autonomy and academic freedom which were either strange or totally inapplicable to East Africa. Because of this, and since the governments of all developing countries look up to their universities and university colleges for guidance, advice and direction in the various matters relating to the intricate and multi-disciplinary problems of development, it is not surprising that in most African countries “there have been sharp clashes and misunderstanding between politicians, on the one hand, and the university academics, on the other, some of whose ideas on university autonomy and academic freedom are not in keeping with the stark realities, needs and aspirations of these rapidly developing countries.”

In his view, arguments about academic freedom and university autonomy had to consider different social, economic and political situations obtaining in each continent and in each country. In a separate article Chagula analysed the relationship between the university and the government in East Africa. He maintained that University Colleges in East Africa received close scrutiny from the politicians, both from the angle of what they spent and how they spent the money each year balanced against the value of what they produced for the public and against the urgent needs of other development projects or social programmes for finance. Chagula then concluded: “... the traditional western concepts of academic freedom and university autonomy cannot take root in and are totally unsuitable to East Africa.”119 His submission was in line with

the political mood in the 1960s. In his view, if it was wrong for the national universities to emulate European institutions, it was equally wrong to apply Western concepts to East Africa in their pure form which disregarded the local context. These were the views of the men on the spot.

The academy

There is vast literature on higher education in Africa emanating from African and foreign scholars over the past four to five decades. Defining the role of the university has been one of the major preoccupations of the academics. Another focus has been on the challenges faced by African universities in their quest for an identity; this entails the call for the Africanisation of these universities. In this section I will briefly look at what academics have been saying on these issues as background information to the case study of East Africa which is the main focus of this book.

The role of the university

The first role of the university discussed by the academy is encapsulated in Robert Hutchins’ definition of a university. He writes:

> The best definition of a university that I have been able to think of is that it is a center of independent thought. It may be a good many other things as well; but, if it is not this, it has failed.120

According to Hutchins, the university should serve as a center of critical independent inquiry. In other words, the university should be nonpartisan in its everyday operation so that it can remain a credible educational institution of academic excellence serving the entire society.

The academy regards the production and transmission of knowledge as some of the key roles of the university. Ogot argues that traditionally, universities, whether in Africa or anywhere in the world, have three main functions:

(i) they transmit knowledge and values from generation to generation through effective teaching;

(ii) they discover new knowledge through research; and

(iii) they serve their societies by participating in various forms of extension programmes.121

None of these roles are easy to perform.

---


The university as an institution must also serve as a cultural repository. Seymour Lipset (1964) argues that the tasks of the universities in the underdeveloped countries are not fundamentally different from what they are in developed societies. In his view, universities everywhere have a responsibility to transmit the cultural heritage – the history, the scientific knowledge, the literature – of their society. Lipset, however, concedes that universities cannot afford to confine themselves to transmitting the cultures of their immediate society. Instead, they must also transmit the cultural heritage of the world of which their society is part. Thus, Lipset’s submission is that the university has a dual role to play – one for its immediate society, and another for the world. According to Ogot, in its capacity as a cultural deposit, the university must constantly consolidate its relationship with the society whose cultures it is preserving and transmitting. Ogot reasons: “It therefore follows that the university as a social institution reflects, to a large extent, the social problems of the country in which it is established.”

Another role of the university is development. Various authors argue that this role demands more commitment from the university community. According to Ogot, for African universities to play a positive role in development they must recast themselves instead of reproducing archaic patterns that are not suitable to the needs of independence and the objectives of the contemporary world. Ogot further discusses the role of the university in development with a specific focus on poverty alleviation, stating:

Put in simplistic and crude terms, I would say that poverty is the problem. Development is the issue. And I believe that education in all its forms (including university education) is the solution.

In Ogot’s view, the development of the society in all spheres of life is the responsibility of the university, hence his submission that the university must be in constant contact with the society. In one of his articles Ogot sees the university as an instrument of a social order and argues that it can never be neutral just teaching facts while the society is overwhelmed with practical problems that retard its development efforts. Cowan, O’Connell and Scanlon support the view that the university is key to development. They argue that there is no other institution that can contribute to Africa’s social and economic development more than the university. These authors concur with one another that universities should play a profound role in solving societal problems, both immediate and distant while subscribing to conventional notions.

At times authors suggest tentative solutions without necessarily resolving the tensions or their potential. Lipset for example suggests that universities must develop their own systems of operation otherwise they will become parasitic on the university systems of other countries of the world and be unable to cope with the tasks of national development. According to Lipset’s trajectory, universities must first and foremost be inward looking if they are to be of any relevance to their societies. Ashby sounds a warning to universities that always resist change

and to those that are too flexible. He argues that universities have to strike a balance between an adaptation which is too pliable and an adherence to tradition which is too inflexible. To achieve this balance, Ashby suggests that universities need to initiate and control their adaptation to society, not to allow it to be imposed on them from outside. In his view, it is advisable for universities to take a defensive position against intrusion from outside.

The multi-faceted roles of the university discussed in this section show that the potential for tensions is ever present. As shown later in this book, the same happened when higher education was developed in East Africa. The choice between the immediate and the global community made the polarisation of the society an ineluctable corollary.

Academic freedom and university autonomy

African and Africanist scholars discuss these concepts at two levels. First, they juxtapose Africa and the West and argue that the latter must not impose decisions regarding academic matters on African institutions of higher learning. Second, they discuss these concepts by focusing on the relationship between the state and the university within Africa. Commenting on the first level, Mazrui states that if the purpose of academic freedom is in part to create favourable conditions for intellectual activity, that purpose is compromised by the heavy Euro-centrism of the academic culture itself. Thus, as long as the balance of power between Africa and Europe is uneven, academic freedom remains a myth. Mazrui further states that academic freedom is up against a dual tyranny:

(i) external tyranny – the Eurocentrism of academic culture – the degree to which the whole tradition of universities is so thoroughly saturated with European values, perspectives, and orientations; and

(ii) a domestic tyranny – the temptations of power facing those in authority, the political tyranny of governments’ insensitives to some of the needs of educational institutions.

This is a convincing analysis.

Some authors argue that the twin concepts of academic freedom and university autonomy “are among the most important issues concerning the existence, mission and role of the university throughout the world.” Yet, authors grapple with the meaning of these concepts. Ashby articulates inherent tensions in these concepts and espouses the view that “academic freedom and university autonomy are emotive expressions.” In his view, there is no universal meaning for these concepts. Consequently, the potential for tensions among different constituencies that use them is ever present.
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For Balsvik, in the academic world “there are strong conventions regarding these issues even when they are not spelled out in characters of constitutions or have not been defined in courts of law.” Academic freedom and university autonomy demonstrate centrifugal tendencies. It is imperative to look at how the academy tackles each concept.

**Academic freedom**

This concept is sometimes defined as: “the academic’s right to freedom of thought and expression.” Ajayi, Goma and Johnson argue that the academic must have freedom to think, do research, publish his findings and teach uninterrupted. Balsvik shares the same view, arguing that academic freedom is believed to be essential for teaching, learning, and research. Similar to these other authors, Ashby has the university teacher(s) as his main focus. He defines academic freedom as *de fecto* control of the following functions by the university’s academic staff:

1. the admission and examination of students;
2. the curricula for courses of study;
3. the appointment and tenure of office of academic staff; and
4. the allocation of income among the different categories of expenditure.

These authors concur with one another that academic freedom has a narrow focus: the academic or the university lecturer. They do not in any way extend this freedom to the university’s administrators or to the students.

Balsvik traces the history of academic freedom to nineteenth-century Germany where the term *Lehrfreiheit* meant the privilege of the teacher, and *Lernfreiheit*, the privilege of the student and researcher. The idea entailed in these concepts, he maintains, was that teachers and students ought to be free to teach and learn what and how they wish. But Balsvik concedes that the definition of academic freedom has become more complex since the German usage. He attributes this complexity to the broadening and multiple interpretations of the concept. Hyder attributes this complexity to the relative nature of the concept’s definition. He writes:

> After all, ‘academic freedom’ is a conditioned relativity rather than an absolute entity. It is for the university to condition the state and the public to accept its own concept of academic freedom.

These submissions put it beyond doubt that the usage of this concept is contentious.

---

For Hyder, the tension between the universal and the local usage of this concept is another locus of the problem. He cautions that parading the banner of academic freedom in its most obviously foreign form without even attempting to give it local frills, almost immediately damages the justifiable core of the concept. He adds: “emotional excitement over an uncritically examined issue of ‘academic freedom’ becomes a diversionary irrelevancy.”

Sometimes the literature on academic freedom and university autonomy is confusing. Not all scholars distinguish between the two concepts. Mazrui argues that the elements which add up to academic freedom include relative freedom for universities and similar institutions to determine for themselves what they are going to teach; who is going to do the teaching and to some extent, who is going to be taught. This involves autonomy to shape the curriculum and syllabus, relative freedom to recruit teachers, and some freedom to admit students by criteria chosen by universities. Then, he adds, there is freedom of scholars to decide research priorities and research methods, to publish their research findings, and to publicise their intellectual positions. Finally, there is general freedom of expression for teachers and students as a necessary intellectual infra-structure for mental development and intellectual creativity.

Mzrui blurs the meaning of academic freedom and university autonomy. A similar conception of academic freedom can be gauged from Crawford’s submission that once the government has provided large sums of money to the university, it becomes extremely difficult for the university to resist government control. Thus, the university’s inability to grant academic freedom to its staff and students is inevitable given lack of such freedom to the university. He writes: “It is axiomatic that a university must itself be free before it can grant much freedom to its staff and students.” Crawford’s conclusion is that political independence in Africa sounded death knells to academic freedom. Independent governments felt that it was safe for them to have complete control over all institutions if they were to consolidate their independence. Any institution that was outside their control was labelled ‘colonialist’ or ‘neo-colonialist’.

In this context, universities were not supposed to make decisions flouting those of the government. Instead, they had to willy-nilly join hands with the national government in implementing national plans. Post-colonial governments wanted to have a say on student admission, fees and adjustment of entry as well as examination standards. They were anxious to see more students being admitted to the university and more passing their examinations. Therefore, students’ financial insecurity as well as their complete dependence on the government inevitably but understandably jeopardised chances of promoting academic freedom at universities. To satisfy manpower requirements in their development plans, many governments direct students into particular courses and give scholarships on an obligatory bonding basis or requirement to undertake national service. In these matters it is difficult to market the idea of academic freedom to governments, especially if it interferes with their wishes.
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Crawford's analysis of academic freedom and the problems associated with its application is blurred with that of university autonomy, which other authors treat as a separate entity. This buttresses Ashby's observation that some authors see academic freedom and university autonomy as synonyms when this is not the case in real terms. But what does university autonomy entail?

**University autonomy**

According to Ajayi, Goma and Johnson, university autonomy can be defined as –

... the freedom and independence of a university, as an institution, to make its own internal decisions, whatever its decision-making processes are with regard to academic affairs, faculty and student affairs, business affairs, and external affairs.139

While academic freedom focuses on the academic staff, university autonomy has the institution as its focus. The literature on university autonomy shows that this concept is even more complex than academic freedom. Firstly, its universality is limited compared to that of academic freedom. According to Ashby, while academic freedom does not vary with latitude, race, politics, or creed, university autonomy does not always and everywhere assume the same pattern. Ashby argues that each and every nation needs to have some concordat between the state and the university to safeguard the autonomy of universities, and that in each nation the concordat is likely to be different from that obtaining elsewhere.140 Balsvik shares Ashby’s views and argues that university autonomy, or self-government, is much more ambiguous than academic freedom. This ambiguity, he holds, is caused by the fact that universities call for autonomy, yet most of them depend on the governments for their finances. In Balsvik’s view, an ideal situation would be for the universities to be autonomous in all respects – including financial independence.

Yet, authors such as Carr-Saunders allude to the fact that governments can continue financing universities and still respect the autonomy of those universities. He writes:

About the relations between the governments on the one hand and the universities on the other, three questions can be asked. Have the former given to the latter adequate financial support; have they, when making grants, imposed conditions which are not compatible with university autonomy; have they acted in other ways which infringe autonomy?141

He maintains that as long as the state respects the university’s autonomy there is no harm in funding it. Ajayi, Goma and Johnson sustain this view. They argue that autonomy protects the corporate rights of self-regulation, which the state confers upon the university as an institution in the law setting it up. In other words, autonomy does not prevent the university from seeking financial support from the state nor does it forbid the latter from providing such support. These authors neither deny nor acknowledge the possible negative repercussions of such support.

There are two sets of tensions revealed by the discussion in this section. First, there are multiple conceptions of academic freedom and university autonomy; sometimes these concepts are defined independently of each other, in other instances their meanings are obscured. Second, the extent to which each can be protected without experiencing any ambiguity is not guaranteed. Thus, there is always a potential for tensions between different parties that use these concepts. Ajayi concedes that the confrontation between the state and the university can be minimised if the university searches for and finds its identity but it cannot be prevented altogether. Therefore,

... there is always potential conflict between universities and political leaders. For the university is at once an ally of government in the production of skilled manpower and, at the same time, a critic of the status quo, in the search for a better society and the greater approximation to truth.142

East Africa experienced the same problem.

**Africanisation**

The surveys discussed earlier in this chapter show that the spirit of nationalism and independence inspired the call for the Africanisation of the institutions of higher learning. Some African scholars and politicians alike argued that these institutions, similar to national governments, had to reflect an African outlook in terms of students, curriculum, syllabus, teaching and research methods, as well as administrative staff and faculty.

Scholars have been thinking aloud on these issues. Oculi holds the view that the movement urging Africanisation had three aspects:

(i) recognition or awakening to the need to Africanise;

(ii) the rejection of both the context and content of a learning process which was constructed to serve the purposes of the colonial system – a process pervaded with the ideology of colonialism; and

(iii) the product of the other two.

Out of the consciousness which arose to reject what was there emerged a proposing mood. The rejection had to be replaced by African proposals aimed at serving the true African needs. Oculi describes the movement as assertive, rebellious, bold, optimistic and clinical.143 Authors identify three areas in which Africanisation was deemed necessary: (i) staffing; (ii) curriculum and syllabus; and (iii) teaching methods.

With regard to staffing, authors argue that it was necessary for African scholars to replace expatriate staff at the universities. The rationale for this submission was provided inter alia by Ki-Zerbo who argued that without saying that only Africans can teach what is African, there is no doubt that they are more likely to appreciate African society and character than their

expatriate counterparts. In Ki-Zerbo’s view Africanisation had to be implemented on pragmatic grounds and as a matter of necessity.

The literature on the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus reveals two sets of tensions:

(i) were African universities supposed to teach only those subjects that were taught in Western universities (e.g. Latin) or could they teach subjects like art, deemed relevant to Africa?

(ii) what would be the guiding principle for deciding on the content of those subjects?

Would there be room for African innovation or were Africans supposed to draw solely from the Western experience? Authors such as Ki-Zerbo and Ashby\textsuperscript{144} agree that the syllabus had to be Africanised, except in cases like mathematics.

Method is deemed a key factor by the academy. Various authors argue that even after the curriculum and the syllabus have been Africanised, if the method of teaching remains foreign, the whole process is doomed to failure. Ki-Zerbo invokes the saying that “the manner of giving is more important than what is given. Indeed, there can be no real Africanization of the curriculum without an effective adaptation of teaching methods.”\textsuperscript{145}

There are two parallel arguments from which tensions arise:

(iii) authors perceive the university as a societal treasure wherever it exists; since societies are different, universities must portray a local outlook in terms of staff and be innovative in terms of subject choices and content and with regard to teaching methods;

(iv) authors perceive the university as an international asset.

Its local and international dimensions have centrifugal tendencies, thus leading to tensions. Kwapong writes:

No true university, however deeply committed it may be to its national preoccupations and local concerns, can today afford to ignore what has been called the ‘international dimension’ or to remain in isolation.\textsuperscript{146}

East Africa could not deviate from this conventional practice.

The students

Students have been the agents of change in different parts of the world, including Africa. Some played a pivotal role in the struggle for political liberation and continued to influence post-colonial policies. Hanna writes:
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Student demonstrators in Lagos, Nigeria, were instrumental in forcing their country to give up plans for a defense pact with the United Kingdom. Rioting students in Dakar, Senegal, created a governmental crisis which was only weathered by the use of military force. Student protests in the Sudan contributed to the 1964 downfall of the government.147

To what extent did African students demonstrate this kind of activism in challenging developments that took place at the Asquith Colleges and, later, at independent African national universities? What did these institutions mean to the students of Africa?

Available literature from the 1960s shows that students were “disproportionately elite in background”,148 “members of an elite in gestation”,149 and “an incipient elite destined to rule over their countries within the not too distant future.”150 They had their own perceptions about African universities. Some of their perceptions were similar to and others were different from those of the African political leaders, the people on the spot, and the academy. Most students welcomed their newly established universities for a number of reasons: the buildings were impressive and the environment different from the one they were used to back home.151 Those who studied in these institutions enjoyed the conferment of presumptive elite status upon them. Barkan, in his survey conducted at Makerere between 14 November and 1 December 1966, discovered that at Makerere University College academic gowns were worn at all evening meals and special lectures, and each residential hall practiced the tradition of high table as in Britain. He concluded that life at the College was thus heavily patterned after the English model of higher education.152 Ike states that during the early years of University College, Ibadan students proudly referred to it as ‘the University of London situated at Ibadan for the sake of convenience’.153 Similar conceptions of universities can be traced throughout Africa.

The majority of the students held overseas tertiary institutions in high esteem and aspired to pursue their studies abroad than in their home institutions. Writing specifically on East Africa, Furley and Watson argue that it was inevitable for East Africans to aspire to travel abroad to pursue higher education at institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge where many of the British colonial officials obtained their degrees. They write: “Only by obtaining similar qualifications, it was thought, could the African stand up to the European socially and politically and compete for the same jobs.”154 When this primary goal could not be achieved, African students accepted the Asquith Colleges and expected them to assimilate Western practices: curricula, teaching
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methods and university life in general. This, they thought, would bring them on par with their European counterparts. 155

The literature covering the period from 1945 to the 1960s shows that African students had high expectations about their universities. Like their political leaders, they expected these institutions to meet social needs. The students deduced that if they were to replace colonial administrators and if they were to compete with expatriates for jobs, they needed qualifications that would make them competitive and were prepared to leave their countries if local institutions did not guarantee this goal. Thus, Nigerian medical students aspired to study abroad or have a local medical institution that would offer the same qualifications as the ones offered in Britain. But the students’ other reason for aspiring to study abroad was self-pride. In 1956, Busia recalled one of the popular songs which already refers to “‘been-tos’, ‘car-ful’, ‘frig-ful’, those who have been educated overseas and own cars and refrigerators, as being the most desirable husbands.”156 It follows from this citation that African students sometimes perceived universities as a means to elevate social status.

Two surveys conducted by Goldthorpe at Makerere College between 1951 and 1962, and another by Marvick at Fourah Bay College in 1960 are revealing. The East African case study concluded that: “some students saw Makerere as the way to material and social rewards.”157 Responses to the question why the students went to study at Makerere included the following: “I wanted to increase my knowledge and so get a better paid job.” To such students, Makerere was an answer to their material needs. An analysis of students who attended Makerere University College between 1958 and 1960, as shown in the table below, gives an idea as to what some of those ‘better jobs’ might be.

Table 1. Students at Makerere University College between 1958 and 1960.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
<th>Veterinary</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958-9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J.E. Goldthorpe (1965), An African Elite, Appendix 1, p. 89.

As the above table demonstrates, only the ‘medical’ category shows an upward trend; the rest show a downward spiral. According to Goldthorpe’s survey the medical profession attracted more students who believed that leaving Makerere with a medical qualification would provide them the material rewards it was deemed to be having. Yet, to the majority of the students, going to Makerere was only a stepping stone. Goldthorpe maintains that a great majority of the sample indicated that they hoped to travel abroad to further their studies after leaving Makerere. To these students Makerere was only a means to an end, not an end in itself.

Marvick’s survey at Fourah Bay College demonstrates how West African students perceived their college both as a means for self-elevation and as an instrument to enable them to make the
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expatriate staff dispensable. Students aspired to become: diplomats, administrators, medical doctors, scientists, entrepreneurs, lawyers and civil servants. But about two thirds of all students indicated that they wanted to become secondary school teachers. Accounting for this bias, Marvick argues that teachers and civil servants were bound by scholarships, in most cases the sponsor being the government.  

As this section has demonstrated, student’s perception of the University Colleges was guided by personal and national aspirations. Students’ aspiration to study abroad had the same rationale. They would elevate themselves and at the same time Africanise different professions when they returned home after finishing their studies.

A focus on East Africa

This section provides a critique of the literature on higher education in East Africa as a justification for the present study. It begins by reviewing the works of authors who discuss the development of higher education in East Africa but do not necessarily have East Africa as their primary focus. Further, it reviews the works that focus on East Africa but discuss higher education as a sub-theme. Moreover, it reviews those sources whose primary focus is higher education in East Africa. Lastly, the section identifies the lacuna in the academy and spells out what this book wants to accomplish.

Higher education in East Africa reached its climax with the establishment of the University of East Africa in 1963. While it lasted, the University of East Africa was “a hard-headed and realistic experiment in regional technical co-operation, as well as a dream in the tradition of Pan-East Africanism.” For the past five decades scholars have been thinking and writing about the development of education in East Africa yet none of these authors provides a comprehensive analysis of this process.

Ashby’s (1966) ambitious work locates the discussion on the development of higher education in East Africa into the wider context of the British policy on education since the end of World War I. Ashby discusses key documents through which the development of higher education in East Africa evolved. This is useful but there are two problems with Ashby’s work. Firstly, he covers a very large ground. This forces him to move swiftly and leave out detail. Secondly, his discussion ends with the passing of the 1962 University of East Africa Act by the East African Authority and does not cover 1963 when the University started its operation. It is also silent about the tensions surrounding the establishment and sustenance of the federal University.

Nwauwa (1996) discusses the development of higher education in the British colonies, including those in East Africa. One of the contributions of Nwauwa’s work is that it shows how disturbances in the West Indies impacted upon other colonies in the British Empire. The work provides the political context in which higher education developed in East Africa. But like Ashby,
Nwauwa is silent on territorial and inter-territorial tensions which dominated the development of higher education in East Africa.

Ajayi, Goma and Johnson’s (1996) work provides valuable information regarding the origins of Makerere College, Royal Technical College and the University College at Dar es Salaam. It also provides the political context in which the 1932 Zanzibar Conference and the Currie sub-committee should be understood. However, this source is too broad, both in terms of scope and time. It covers Anglophone and Francophone Africa, Belgian Congo, apartheid South Africa and Liberia and Ethiopia. It examines the historical background of universities in these countries from the colonial period and discusses the issues faced by these universities in the 1990s. This broad focus prevents the authors from providing a detailed discussion on any region, especially East Africa.

Within East Africa, scholars tap into different moments in the history of the Federal University in order to elucidate certain points in their works. Iliffe’s (1998) work is “a collective biography of East African doctors, covering many aspects of the experience since Africans first practiced modern medicine in the region during the 1870s.” The book focuses on the role played by East African doctors in the medical profession in East Africa. Iliffe makes reference to the University of East Africa but only begins the discussion in the 1950s when the Asquith Colleges were already in place. His contribution to our understanding of the development of higher education in East Africa is his discussion on the relationship between nationalism and education. But Iliffe does not have higher education as his principal focus. His work is less helpful to readers who do not have background knowledge on the subject.

The primary aim of Hunter’s (1963) work is –

... to examine the opportunities for education and training which are open to East Africans in their own country, with some indication of the gaps and deficiencies which might be filled by sending students overseas.

Hunter analyses education and training opportunities that were available in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika on the eve (in the case of Kenya) or immediately after independence. The main focus of Hunter’s work is on primary and secondary education. His only mention of higher education is when he says that three University Colleges – Makerere, the Royal College and the University College of Dar-es-Salaam – together made up the University of East Africa. This source is helpful in analysing the manpower needs in East Africa in the early 1960s but does little to help us understand the complex history of higher education in this region.

Macpherson (1964) traces the history of Makerere College from its infant stages up to the eve of the establishment of the Federal University of East Africa. Her work is important as a background source but is silent on the political factors. Secondly, Macpherson’s work is only a case study of Uganda and therefore does not discuss the development of the RTC and the University College, Dar es Salaam in any significant detail. The same critique goes for Goldthorpe’s (1965) work, as well as his dissertation on which the book is based. In both works Goldthorpe has

Makerere students as his primary focus and only makes reference to the University of East Africa in passing. He states that his book –

... represents an attempt to draw together the various studies which the writer carried out, while on the staff of Makerere College from 1951 to 1962, of former students and students then at the College.162

The terminal point of his study is 1962, before the University of East Africa was established.

Furley and Watson have a promising title for their work: A History of Education in East Africa (1978) but their book too, provides very little information on the University of East Africa. Out of sixteen chapters, only two (Chapters 14 and 15) are dedicated to the University. Even these two chapters provide scanty information on the University. Chapter 14 swiftly addresses the development of Colleges in different parts of Africa, including Makerere in Uganda. The earlier Commission Reports (the Currie, De la Warr and the Asquith Reports) are mentioned in passing. Chapter 15, which looks specifically at the University of East Africa, is condensed. The two authors write:

The conception of the University of East Africa, along with the East African Common Services Organisation, symbolised the potentialities of a federalised East Africa, and many people will argue that its early breakup was a severe blow to the hopes of closer federation in all other fields.163

This citation provides a tantalising glimpse of the political context in which the federal University was established but no detail about that context is provided. Also, the chapter makes quick references to the inequality that existed among the three constituent colleges but is quiet on the debates that took place in the national parliaments of the three countries, at the East Africa Legislative Assembly, and in the Senate and Council meetings regarding the meaning of inequality to the life of the University. This current book provides the context and content of these debates.

Southall’s (1974) seminal work and Svein-Erik’s (1972) master’s thesis both discuss the politics and the tensions surrounding the rise and fall of the University of East Africa. Southall argues that the University of East Africa was part of the regional integration project. His argument is that the idea of establishing the East African Federation and the University of East Africa was inspired in part by economic factors – the fact that East African economies were weak and this forced the region to pull its resources together. In Southall’s view, the Federal University was –

... a tool whereby the political ambitions which argued for a university institution in each territory could be reconciled with the economic capabilities of the region; and once the colleges had matured to a level consonant with independent status, and the East African economies could withstand the burden, the Federal University would be succeeded by three full universities.164

162 Goldthorpe, An African Elite, viii.
163 Furley & Watson, A History of Education in East Africa, 328.
Southall further argues that political and educational federalism were related but somehow different. The ultimate aim of political federation was permanent integration, which, if successful, would result into an eternal loss of sovereignty for each territory of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika. The act of federating the University on the other hand was not intended to be irrevocable. The University’s ultimate objective was to disintegrate once it had reached a sufficient state of maturity.\footnote{Ibid., 69.}

Southall’s work provides the economic and political context in which the Federal University of East Africa was established and discusses the role played by independence in the failure of regional integration in East Africa. But Southall only discusses isolated cases where tensions occurred between the different territories in the region. His work is silent on the tensions that occurred within each territory and those that emerged between the British government and its Governors in East Africa during the developmental stages of the University. Secondly, Southall does not focus solely on the Federal University of East Africa. His book is about regional integration in East Africa in its broad sense. The present book has higher education and the University of East Africa as its main focus. It shifts the goalpost by exploring tensions that occurred at different times and between different constituencies when East African higher education was developed.

Svein-Erik’s thesis is a study of the origins of the University of East Africa based on a summary of the key recommendations made in various reports from 1925 to 1962. He does not discuss the tensions surrounding the establishment of the University of East Africa. Even the political context he refers to is not developed in his thesis. Instead, he spends most of his time demonstrating how the six objectives of higher education\footnote{These objectives are: adaptation, standards, moral training, vocational training, elite recruitment, and expansion. For details see: Education Policy in British Tropical Africa: Memorandum Submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies (1925). Cmd. 2374.} identified by the first British policy document on education in Africa operated.

Thus, while Southall and Svein-Erik’s works illuminate our understanding of the history of higher education in East Africa, they provide no continuous narrative, and therefore no history of the University of East Africa, hence the need for this book.

Higher education has been one of Ogot’s concerns for many years. In one of his works (1999) he provides the skeleton of the University of East Africa by introducing three phases:

(i) the period from 1938 to 1964 when the concept of a unitary University of East Africa considered in the context of other types of inter-territorial co-operation was the colonial ideal;

(ii) the period from June 29, 1963 to June 30, 1970 which is the lifespan of the Federal University of East Africa that was owned and run by the three independent states in the region; and

(iii) the period from July 1, 1970 when the University ceased to exist and gave birth to three national universities that were established in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.
This periodisation identifies key moments in the history of the University. Yet Ogot does not discuss these phases, he only provides the dates as signposts. Readers who do not know the background are left guessing.

It is in this context, therefore, that the present book was conceived. Its aim is to provide a systematic and detailed analysis of the politics behind the development of higher education in East Africa – including the Federal University of East Africa. The book aims to present a step-by-step account of the events that led to the development of higher education in East Africa and shows how those events culminated in the eventual establishment of the regional university. Later, the book shows how the spirit of nationalism and national needs combined to bring the Federal University to its knees in 1970. Most importantly, the book argues and demonstrates how the university was linked to the whole project of regional integration in East Africa. It contends, for instance that there is a direct link between the disintegration of the university in 1977 and the dissolution of the East African Community (EAC) in 1977. This makes the present study relevant and necessary for two reasons:

(i) to present a consistent and chronological analysis of the development of higher education in East Africa from its infant stages to 1963 when the federal university was established; and

(ii) to discuss the various factors which culminated in the demise of this university in 1970.
PART II

THE RISE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EAST AFRICA
CHAPTER 2

The development of higher education in East Africa and the establishment of the Federal University

In writing a general history of a university, one invariably espies intriguing topics which cannot adequately be followed up in a work of that nature.

Howard Phillips, 1994

Introduction

The establishment of the University of East Africa (hereinafter referred to as the UEA or the University) was a very long drawn-out process. It was part of a broader colonial plan to develop higher education in this region. In the end, the British government in London, British Governors in East Africa, and East African politicians and academics all played their role in bringing the University into being. Developments in other parts of the British Empire also contributed significantly to this process as mentioned in Chapter 1.

The history of the UEA can be traced back to the early 1920s. The process began with the conference held at the Colonial Office in London in November 1923. On 24 November 1923 the Duke of Devonshire, Secretary of State in the Colonial Office, set up the Permanent Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies. The Committee was tasked: “To advise the Secretary of State on any matters of Native Education in the British Colonies and Protectorates in Tropical Africa which he may from time to time refer to them; and to assist him in advancing the progress of education in those Colonies and Protectorates.”

This Committee, chaired by W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, comprised strong and influential members.

Soon thereafter, the Advisory Committee was consulted about educational projects that were already underway or still being contemplated in a number of British colonies and dependencies.

---

1 Education Policy in British Tropical Africa. Memorandum Submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies, March 1925. Cmd. 2374, 2.

2 These were: The Right Reverend the Bishop of Liverpool (formerly known as Bishop of Edmundsbury); The Right Reverend Bishop M. Bidwell; Major A.J Church; Sir James Currie, Director of Education in the Sudan and Head of Gordon Memorial College in Khartoum; The right Honourable Sir Frederick (later Lord) D. Lugard, who had been in charge of education in Hong Kong and Nigeria; H.J. Oldham, the Secretary of the International Missionary Council; Sir Michael Sadler; President of the Calcuta University Commission of 1917-18; and C. Strachey. Hanns Vischer, who had been responsible for numerous educational developments in Northern Nigeria, served as full-time Secretary of the Advisory Committee.
One such request was to transform Makerere College from a technical trade school into a more advanced training college for East Africa. In West Africa, Sir Gordon Guggisberg, Governor of the Gold Coast, had drawn up an ambitious education plan for the Gold Coast in which he proposed the establishment of a model for all levels of education from kindergarten to university.\(^3\) The Committee approved some of the requests and embarked on its job. For eighteen months it examined educational activities in the Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories in East and West Africa, focusing on the Gold Coast (Ghana), southern Nigeria and Uganda. The Committee submitted its Report to the Secretary of State for the Colonies during the first quarter of 1925.

One of the conclusions drawn by the Ormsby-Gore Commission was the following: “the time is opportune for some public statement of principles and policy which would prove a useful guide to all those engaged directly or indirectly, in the advancement of native education in Africa.”\(^4\) The Commission briskly asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies to issue its memorandum as a Parliamentary Paper. The request was accepted and the memorandum was issued as Command Paper No. 2374 in March 1925. Although the Commission’s focus was not on East Africa per se, this memorandum laid a solid foundation for the development of higher education in East Africa. It changed the British government’s thinking about the state of education in its Empire and mandated territories.

In June 1932, the Directors of Education based in Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar attended a conference in Zanzibar to discuss educational matters in East Africa and the role to be played by Makerere College in the development of higher education. The Report of this conference stated that the Directors were thrilled by the idea that a course leading to Matriculation by means of the University of London’s School Examination would begin at Makerere in January 1933. They agreed that a syllabus had to be drawn up. Their view was that as soon as a sufficient number of students had reached the stage of entering for the intermediate Arts Examination of London University, the Secondary Schools should undertake the whole matriculation course, and matriculation should become the standard for entry to Makerere.\(^5\)

The Directors of Education from these four East African countries asked for advice from the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on whether it would be advisable for Makerere to adopt London Examinations so that its leavers could get wider recognition, or to set its own examinations. The Advisory Committee referred the matter to a Sub-Committee under the chairmanship of Sir James Currie.\(^6\) The Currie Committee studied the educational situation in East and West Africa. In its Report,\(^7\) it expressed concern that Britain had neglected higher education in her colonies, arguing that this was not good, both for the natives and for the British government. The Currie Report was “the first clarion call that Britain should take it as a

---

\(^3\) Pattison, *Special Relations*, 7-9. See also: Ashby & Anderson, *Universities*, 188.

\(^4\) *Education Policy in British Tropical Africa*. Cmd. 2374, 2.


\(^6\) Other members of the Currie Sub-Committee were: F.O. Mann; W.W. Vaughan; Miss Philippa C. Esdaile; W.H. McLean; A.G. Church; Hanns Vischer and A.I. Mayhew.
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duty to set up universities in Colonial Africa.”8 Eric Ashby refers to this Report as “an eloquent and urgent plea for the founding of universities in tropical Africa.”9 This view is premised on the fact that the report called for an immediate and publicly announced programme of university development. The Report was adopted by the British Colonial Office and was made available to the public on request. It was also distributed among the Governors in East and West Africa. For reasons discussed in the next chapter, the Governors delayed giving their opinions on the Report. The Ormsby-Gore Memorandum had called for a general educational policy; the Currie Report emphasised the need for the development of higher education in Africa. The actual process that led to the establishment of the UEA began in 1937 when the De la Warr Commission submitted its Report to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As soon as the recommendations contained in this Report had been accepted by the British government, the implementation process began in 1938 and reached the climax in 1963 when the University was finally instituted. Therefore, the history of the UEA can be divided into three distinct phases:

(i) the period from 1938 to 28 June 1963 when the concept of a unitary University of East Africa was largely a colonial ideal espoused by British authorities as part of the East African inter-territorial co-operation project that had been set in motion in 192610;
(ii) the period from 29 June 1963 to 30 June 1970 which is the lifespan of the University; and
(iii) the period from 1 July 1970 when the University was dissolved, giving birth to three national universities: the University of Nairobi in Kenya, Makerere University in Uganda and the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania.

The focus of this chapter is on the first phase. The second phase is discussed in Chapters 4 to 6. The discussion of the third phase is beyond the scope of this book.

The De La Warr Commission, 1936

Towards the end of 1936, W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, who became the new Secretary of State for the Colonies on 28 May 1936, appointed a Commission of enquiry and tasked it to look into the question of higher education in Britain’s East African dependencies. This Commission was under the Chairmanship of Earl De la Warr, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary and an ex-officio Chairperson of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies (ACEC). The De la Warr Commission (also known as the Commission on Higher Education in East Africa) was a high-powered Commission comprising 11 members – 10 men11 and one woman, Dr Philippa C. Esdaile. Three of its members (Mr Hanns Vischer, Dr Philippa Esdaile and Dr W. Maclean) had

8 Furley & Watson, A History of Education in East Africa, 299.
9 Ashby, African Universities and Western Traditions, 17.
10 In 1926, the first East African Governors’ Conference was held in Nairobi, Kenya following the recommendation made by the East Africa Commission in 1925. See: Report of the East Africa Commission (London: HMSO, 1925). Cmd. 2387. By the time the University was inaugurated, East African leaders had already embraced the idea of establishing a Federal University. They perceived such an institution as an instrument to accelerate regional integration.
11 Earl de la Warr (Chairman); Robert Bernays; B. Mouat Jones; Alexander Kerr; W.H. McLean; Z.K. Matthews; John Murray; Harold Nicolson; Hanns Vischer and F.J. Pedler (Secretary from the Colonial Office).
all served in the Currie Sub-Committee mentioned above. The Commission was guided by the following terms:

1. To examine and report upon the organisation and working of Makerere College and of the institutions or other agencies for advanced vocational training connected with it in relation to
   (a) the society which they were intended to serve, and
   (a) 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:
   (a) the effect of the development of the College upon the educational organisation of the territories concerned;
   (a) the general interest and needs of the communities from which students are, or may in future be drawn, and
   (a) the educational needs of women.\footnote{12}

During November and December 1936, the Commission held preliminary talks in London and started collecting evidence there from people who had personal experience of East Africa. At the end of December it left for Uganda in two groups. The first group arrived in Uganda on 11 January 1937, and the second group arrived two days later. The Commission’s headquarters were in Kampala, Uganda. It visited schools and institutions throughout the Uganda Protectorate. By the time it ended its job in Uganda it had listened to over sixty witnesses and deputations as part of evidence collection.

Even though the focus was Uganda, the Commission managed to visit Tanganyika and Kenya by using air services and by dividing itself into small parties. However, it still saw it fitting to consider Uganda in greater detail “since Makerere College the institution to examine which we were primarily appointed is in that Protectorate and the greater part of our information related to it.”\footnote{13} After all, the idea of appointing the Commission came from Sir Philip Mitchell, Uganda’s Governor, who requested an independent team to conduct “an educational stock taking and some rails laid down for the next few years.”\footnote{14} Kenya and Tanganyika were included on pragmatic grounds. The Commission realised that it would be impossible to make meaningful recommendations regarding the future of Makerere College without also examining the education system in the whole region. On 2 September 1937, the Commission presented its findings and recommendations to the Secretary of States for the Colonies after concluding its job.
In its introductory remarks, the Commission made a number of key observations, which, if adequately addressed, would have benefited Africans a great deal. For example, it maintained that one of the main difficulties which hampered co-operation between the African school and the African community was that much of the education of the African was in non-African hands. The Commission then concluded: “in these circumstances the qualities produced in the pupils, while welcome to their teachers, may not commend themselves to the people among whom the pupils have to live.”\textsuperscript{15} Another observation was that African theory of traditionalism and European theory of progress had to interact because the African child needed both theories for his own development.

In its comparative study, the Commission noted that Uganda was unique in the region because it had a school system that was entirely under the control of the missions. Other territories also had missions but the Government and the Native Administrations had co-operated to provide schools in these territories. Uganda’s education was generally in the hands of the missionaries but Makerere College was maintained by the Uganda Government. It was a school where boys\textsuperscript{16} from the junior secondary schools in all the territories came to complete their general education before pursuing their professional courses at different institutions. Some of these professional courses were: schoolmasters and engineering foremen – both offered at Makerere; Medical Assistants – offered at Mulago Hospital; Agriculturalists – offered at Bukalasa; and Veterinary Assistants – offered at Old Entebbe. By East African standards Uganda’s education system was the most advanced in the region and that is why it received much attention.

The Commission reiterated most of the points made in the Currie Sub-Committee Report but also made new proposals. One of the key recommendations was that there was a need for the establishment of a University College in East Africa. While noting the flimsy foundations of primary and secondary education upon which such an institution would have to be based, and realising the possible risks of too rapid advance and of top-heavy structure, “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.”\textsuperscript{17}

Several issues had to be first considered regarding the establishment of this envisioned University College: the site of the College, its size, its racial composition, its funding and its entire administration. Most importantly, what would be the nature of the relationship between the College and Makerere? The Commission recommended that secondary work should continue at Makerere and that the new College should focus specifically on post-secondary work. The proposed Higher College would have departments of Arts, Science, Agriculture, Medicine, Education, Veterinary Science and Engineering. With regards to the site, the Commission suggested that these courses should be taught at a new site located between Mulago and Kololo hills. The proposed College would first be known as the Higher College of East Africa and later become the University College of East Africa. It would first award Diplomas, and then affiliate to the University of London before becoming a fully-fledged University of East Africa. The Commission envisaged that the Government of Uganda and perhaps other governments

\textsuperscript{15} Report of the De la Warr Commission, 8.  
\textsuperscript{16} There was no secondary education for girls. That is why one of the terms of this Commission was specifically on this issue.  
\textsuperscript{17} Report of the De la Warr Commission, Chapter 30, 118-119.
would contribute to the College’s endowment fund, which was a prerequisite for the College’s establishment.

The tone of the De la Warr Commission Report suggests that at this time there was nothing cut in stone. The Commissioners were only looking at possibilities. For example, they suggested that in making the grants “the Protectorate Government, and any other Governments which may [emphasis mine] participate, should pledge themselves to contribute a fixed sum annually for at least five years … The heads of certain [emphasis mine] government departments should be afforded the opportunity of maintaining close contact with the work of the College.”

The Commission could not say with precision which governments would be willing to join hands with the Ugandan Government in footing the bill. The Commission was certain that the government(s) had to work jointly but it was still uncertain which departments would link the College to the government(s).

With regards to the College’s federation with other institutions, the Commission was somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, it argued that it was premature for the College to enter into any relationship with other Colleges. On the other hand it felt that it was necessary for the new College to have co-operation with the Kitchener School of Medicine at Khartoum. Most importantly, the Commission stated: “The Higher College must therefore develop an outlook which embraces not merely Buganda but Uganda, not merely Uganda but East Africa, and not merely East Africa but the wide lands beyond.”

The question is: how could a young College play all these multi-layered roles? In other words, how could it remain individualistic and yet be national, inter-territorial, and even continental at the same time? These questions eluded the Commissioners.

Overall, the De la Warr Commission felt that education in East Africa had to be based upon the needs of African communities. It also had to be closely related to their environment. As a result of this Commission, Higher Education in East Africa received more attention than ever before. Thus, the De la Warr Commission Report constituted a landmark not only in the history of the development of Makerere as a Higher College of East Africa, and later, as a University College, but also in providing the impetus for the foundation of University Colleges in other parts of Africa after World War II.

In November 1937, Mr Creech Jones asked Ormsby-Gore whether any steps were being contemplated to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Higher Education in East Africa. Ormsby-Gore responded by saying that the Report of the Commission would first have to be considered by the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies and by the Governments of the East African Dependencies and therefore could not make any definite

18 Ibid., 81-82.
19 Ibid., 83.
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announcement. He continued: “but I am hopeful that the Commission’s main recommendations will prove acceptable.”

As expected, not everyone hailed the Commission Report. Dr John Murray, one of its members, was not happy with some of its recommendations. He subsequently submitted a Minority Report. The thrust of Dr Murray’s criticism was that the Report was of a highly general and abstract character. In his view, it was a replica of British practice. He argued: “The scheme for the Higher College, for instance transcribes closely and faithfully the build of the new university institutions in England. The sections on College residence are based, similarly, on up-to-date English practice.” He argued that the Commission moved from a wrong premise that what worked in Britain would also work in East Africa, which was not the case in real terms.

There were also instances where Dr Murray took the Commission to task for its wrong interpretation of the local situation in East Africa. He tenaciously argued that such action made the Commission propose wrong and inapplicable solutions to East Africa’s problems. For example, Dr Murray argued that there was no lack of initiative or of agencies for education in Uganda as the Report claimed. He also recommended that the functional continuity of Makerere College had to be preserved through the transitional period. This recommendation was a deviation from the Commission’s proposal (Chapter 10) that Makerere should continue as a secondary school and pass its advanced functions to a new Higher College. The two views were diametrically opposed to each other.

But in spite of these criticisms, the De la Warr Commission Report was deemed an impressive document that brought hope and optimism about the future of higher education in East Africa. Sir Philip Mitchell who had requested the Commission was delighted by its Report and looked forward to the implementation of what he considered to be the Commission’s very promising and forward-looking recommendations. The Uganda Government shared Mitchell’s impressions. Once the Report had been published, the Uganda Government took immediate steps to prepare itself for the construction of the envisioned College. The country’s Director of Public Works was on leave at the time and his deputy visited a number of English Universities in Europe with the aim of studying the plans of their buildings. The Government Architect was sent to South Africa to consult the university authorities in the Union and to study the plans and layout of its various universities and colleges. When these two officials returned to Uganda, local discussions were held to debate and compare different plans. The plans that looked durable were chosen. Subsequently a Consultant Committee in England was asked to provide detailed professional advice on the College’s construction.

Governor Mitchell and the Ugandan Government were not the only ones who found the De la Warr Commission Report appealing. The ACEC suggested that the Report be implemented immediately. Naturally, not all the recommendations could be implemented simultaneously. Therefore a phased-in programme was suggested.

---

Menawhile, an inter-territorial conference convened to consider and to examine the practical steps necessary to implement the recommendations of the Commission with regard to the envisaged Higher College was held in Uganda. Delegates who attended this conference (Africans, Asians and Europeans) came from various countries including: Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, Central Africa and Sudan. To ease its job, the conference divided itself into three sub-committees, with each sub-committee focusing on specific aspects of the envisaged College:

(i) the name, site and building plans;
(ii) the financial arrangements; and
(iii) the status and organisation of the College.

The conference approved most of the recommendations made in the De la Warr Commission Report. It approved Makerere as the College’s site and further suggested that buildings around the site should be secured to ensure that the College’s future expansion would not be hampered. The conference endorsed the name of the College, ‘Makerere College’. Conference delegates agreed that secondary education would be carried out at the College until such time that students with matriculation standards were available. With all these plans in place, the implementation process began in earnest in 1938. Mr Barr, a Member of Parliament in Britain, asked Malcom MacDonald, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he could make any statement on the detailed proposals for the establishment of a Higher College for East Africa; whether the inter-territorial conference called by the Governor of Uganda resulted in any constructive proposals; and whether the Government of Kenya showed its sympathy with the proposed College by making a grant similar to the grants made by the Governments of Uganda and Tanganyika. MacDonald responded by expressing his joy that the proposals for the establishment of the higher college had reached an advanced stage. He answered the second part of the question affirmatively and added: “I am sending the hon. Member a copy of the report of the Conference.”

In November 1938, the first Makerere Ordinance was drafted to come into effect in 1939. In an attempt to show regional ownership, the Ugandan Government handed the College over to a Representative Council comprising members from all three East African territories. East African governments and the British government made their financial contributions to the endowment fund proposed by the De la Warr Commission. Britain contributed £100,000 after the three territorial governments had made their respective contributions. Uganda contributed £250,000; Tanganyika – £100,000; and Kenya – £50,000. A grant of £170,000 from the Uganda Government and an additional £7,550 from various local governments in Uganda, as well as a grant of £10,000 from the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation met Makerere’s immediate building needs. In November 1938, the Duke of Gloucester cut the first sod.

27 At first the Kenya Government was reluctant to approve this sum, arguing that it had not seen the site nor the building that would become Makerere College. Perhaps that is why it voted such a small contribution.
The impact of World War II

Britain’s declaration of war against Germany on 3 September 1939 disturbed the building process. Shipping in building materials became difficult. The girder to support the gallery in the main hall did not arrive and this delayed construction. The College’s library had to be occupied without steel shelves because they had not arrived yet. Furniture for the main building and the two chapels had to be made locally – a compromise solution and forced deviation from the original plan. One classroom was used as a mosque due to the shortage of the buildings. The men’s hostel had the site excavated but construction was postponed indefinitely. The money allocated by local governments for the building of the women’s hostel could not be used. The central building, whose construction began in 1938, was only completed in 1940, “work being continued upon it, despite the war, at the personal insistence of the Governor of Uganda, Sir Philip Mitchell.”28 Overall, construction work at Makerere was either suspended or, continued at a snail’s pace.

Teaching was not spared by the war. Teachers and members of the Education Department as well as lecturers from Makerere College were called up. Ronald Stuckey, lecturer for agricultural biology at the College, took over the organisation of air raid precautions in the College – at that stage the possibility of attack not being so remote as to warrant no precautions at all. Almost all members of staff had by this time joined the Uganda Volunteer Reserve and wore khaki uniforms. The students regretted this, since they had enjoyed the varying fashions of dress, particularly of the younger members.29 By 1940 Makerere College was feeling the effects of the war. The College’s Department of Engineering could not admit new students because it was difficult to get teaching staff, many of them already serving in the war under way.

The Kabaka of Buganda and the Mukama of Bunyoro were the first kings in Uganda to announce that they were ready to support the Allied forces, and urged their subjects to enlist in the Uganda Volunteer Reserve Force.30 By the time Britain passed an Ordinance making service in the army compulsory for all British subjects and British Protected persons between the ages of 18 and 45 years in 1940 many Ugandans had already enlisted. Thus, World War II resulted into constrictions of educational progress in East Africa, both in terms of the construction of Makerere College and with regard to teaching and learning. As long as the war was in progress, Makerere’s future remained in limbo.

Channon’s Memorandum and the Channon Report, 1940-1943

As the war continued, some British authorities started thinking about the future of the British Empire after the war. In 1940, Liverpool University’s Professor H.J. Channon, a member of the ACEC started preparing proposals for a network of colonial universities that would train the leadership required for self-rule by British colonies. Channon produced a memorandum31 in which he assessed the Advisory Committee’s thinking about higher education in the colonies. The memorandum argued that it was not enough for post-secondary education to aim...
at producing manpower for the current needs only; its view, higher education had to go beyond offering technical education. Colleges offering technical education had to establish a relationship with British universities (Makerere was to be linked with the University of Oxford, which would give advice regarding the curriculum and provide visiting lecturers).32

Mr (later Sir) Christopher W.M. Cox, the new Advisor to the Colonial Office on educational matters, put Channon’s Memorandum before the Advisory Committee for consideration. The Committee discussed Channon’s Memorandum at its 110th and 111th meetings. At the end of the latter meeting in April 1941, it expressed its appreciation of Channon’s Memorandum and agreed with his analysis of the character of the problems to be faced. The Committee strongly recommended 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.33

When Oliver Stanley became the new Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1942, he appointed Professor Channon as his advisor on higher education matters. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee appointed a Sub-Committee to advise it on how to implement his Memorandum. Channon became the chair.34 The main focus of the Sub-Committee was East Africa, West Africa and Malaya. For two years it conducted its investigation and then presented a Report to the Advisory Committee on 15 May 1943. The Report stressed the need for the University of London to assist in the development of higher education in the British colonies by sending staff, awarding degrees and drawing up the curriculum.35 It further recommended curricula adaptation to the local circumstances. The Advisory Committee accepted the Channon Report on 20 May 1943. Nine days later, the Secretary of State for the Colonies wrote to the Vice-Chancellors of British universities informing them that he was setting up a Commission of inquiry and asking for their co-operation. On 13 July 1943, the Secretary of State informed the House of Commons that he would be announcing the names of the members of the Commission in August.36 This marked the beginning of the next phase in the development of higher education in East Africa.

The Asquith Commission, 1943

On 13 August 1943, Stanley addressed the House of Commons thus: “I am accordingly setting up a Commission of Inquiry. I am glad to say that Sir Cyril Asquith – Mr Justice Asquith – has agreed to be its Chairman. He will bring to the task not only an honoured name and a great academic record, but the qualities of intellect and judgment which will be required.”37 Being mindful of the work at hand, Stanley appointed a powerful38 Commission of enquiry to make

32 Ibid., par. 25.
34 Other members were: Mr Christopher Cox; Sir Fred Clarke; Mr Eric R.J. Hussey; Dr Julian Huxley; Mr B. Mouat Jones; Professor W.M. Macmillan; and Miss Margery Perham.
35 The University of London was chosen because of its experience in running the external degree programme and in guiding University Colleges in Britain towards becoming fully-fledged universities.
36 Pattison, Special Relations, 17-22.
38 Sir James Irvine was the Vice-Chancellor of the University of St Andrews; Raymond Priestley was Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Birmingham; and Margery Perham was a Fellow of Nuffield College and a reader in Colonial Administration at the University of Oxford.
recommendations regarding the development of higher education in the colonies in the light of the Channon Report. Justice Cyril Asquith was the Chairman. The Commission was instructed:

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.

As the guidelines indicate, the scope of the Asquith Commission was wider than that of the De la Warr Commission. For example, unlike the previous Commission, which confined itself to East Africa, the latter commented on East and West Africa, and the West Indies. The Commission noted that conditions in (West) Africa were similar to those obtaining in the West Indies and stated inter alia that: “we felt that the considerations which had prompted the decision to direct a special enquiry in respect of West Africa, applied with equal force to the West Indies, or to be more accurate, to the Caribbean area.” General principles had to be applied widely, not in one area.

The Commission held its first meeting on 21 September 1943. It soon discovered that the terms under which it was asked to operate were very broad. It simplified them by setting its main objective as follows: “to formulate, as we were enjoined to do, principles applicable generally to the colonies; not to elaborate in detail higher educational programmes for particular colonies.” This objective made the Commission’s job a bit manageable but once it started collecting evidence it realised that some areas were larger than others therefore elaboration became inevitable.

Another way in which the Commission simplified its job was by appointing sub-committees. Both Professors Channon and Duff, already members of the Asquith Commission, also served in a separate commission focusing specifically on West Africa. The Commission on Higher Education in West Africa was under the Chairmanship of Colonel Walter Elliot. After considering that the West Indies needed Special attention, the Asquith Commission set up a separate Committee for the West Indies in January 1944. Sir James Irvine served as its Chairman.

39 The other members were: Sir Donald Cameron; Sir Alexander M. Carr Saunders; Prof. H.J.Channon; Sir Fred Clarke; James F. Duff; The Lord Haisley; Sir James C.Irvine; Sir Richard W. Livingstone; R. Marrs; Professor Lillian M. Penson; Miss Margery Perham; Sir Raymond E. Priestly; Professor J.A. Ryle; Sir Richard V. Southwell and J.A. Venn. Mr D.W. Malcom served as the Commission’s Secretary until May 1944, when he was replaced by Mr S. Robbinson.

40 Asquith Report, 3.

41 Ibid., 4.

42 Ibid., 5.

43 Its other members were: Arthur Creech-Jones, who later became the Secretary of State for the Colonies; Sir Geoffrey Evans, Acting Director of Kew Gardens, Dr Julian Huxley, a prominent scientist, Miss E.C. Martin, Vice-Principal of Westfield College in London; Professor B. Mouat Jones, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds, Dr Margaret Read, Acting Head of the Colonial Department at the University of London Institute of Education and Dr A.E. Trueman of the University of Glasgow. Three West Africans were included: K.A. Korsh from the Gold Coast, Reverend Ransome Kuti from Nigeria and Dr E.H. Taylor-Cummings from Sierra Leone.

44 Other members were Miss Perham and Dr Raymond Priestley. Two members from the West Indies were added: P.M. Sherlock, Secretary of the Institute of Jamaica; and H.W. Springer, a member of the House of Assembly in Barbados. W.D. Innis and J.A. Lukkhoo served in the Commission when it was in Trinidad and British Guiana respectively.
By the time the Asquith Commission completed its job in May 1945 it had met thirty-one times, interviewed students and education officers, and accepted written views from various individuals and organisations. It then submitted its Report to Stanley. The latter presented the Report to the House of Commons in June 1945. Subsequently, the Report was published as Command Paper No. 6647 in July 1945.

In its recommendations (Part I, Chapter III) the Asquith Commission proposed the establishment of Colleges in the colonies where they were non-existent and the upgrading of those that had already been put in place. The ultimate goal was to see these colleges become regional universities. Irvine’s Committee on the West Indies shared the same view and reported that after a careful consideration of the evidence put before it and after enquiry into the needs and conditions of the West Indies, the number of potential candidates for higher education and the absorptive capacity of the colonies, “we have come to a unanimous decision ...We recommend the establishment of a single University of the West Indies at the earliest possible date.”45

There were objections to this idea on the grounds that the economic status of the British West Indies would not support the expense. The Committee’s response was that since the colonies were British possessions, the Imperial Government was morally obliged to foot part of the bill. Another concern was that the islands were small and isolated and therefore students had to be sent out into the wider world so that they could broaden their intellectual horizons. The Committee did not totally object to this view but felt that students needed to undertake their first degrees in the West Indies and only go abroad for postgraduate education. On that note the Committee insisted that there was therefore a need for the development of higher education in the West Indies.

With regard to Makerere, the Asquith Commission indicated that it found the idea of promoting this institution to the status of being an inter-territorial university appealing and reasonable. Consequently, the Commissioners endorsed the earlier proposal made by the De la Warr Commission of 1937. The Asquith Commission also proposed that these Colleges be established earlier than the previous Commission had suggested. However, the Commission strongly believed that no rush was necessary for the premature granting of degrees by the Colleges. For these Colleges to be credible academic institutions they would first have to be linked to well-established British universities through the ‘Special Relationship’ programme.46 This relationship would continue until such time that the Colleges were mature enough to become self-reliant and independent universities.

After discussions, the University of London agreed to have a Special Relationship with any of these University Colleges, which would provide the features sought by the Asquith Commission. The University of London stated that it might be of assistance to colleges who might desire to seek association with the University if the Committee (of the Senate of the University appointed to administer these new arrangements) expressed its agreement with the general underlying assumptions as to the characteristics of a university contained in the Report of the Asquith Commission and in particular with the following points:

45 Report of the Irvine Committee, pars. 21 and 22. See also: Asquith Report, Part III, Chapter XXI, 94.
46 Roger Southall (1974) argues that the idea of ‘Special Relationship’ came as a result of persuasion by Carr-Saunders, one of the members of the Asquith Commission.
(a) 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;

(b) It should be ready to accept the responsibilities of intellectual leadership in the community it serves and should endeavour 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;

(c) 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;

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

(e) 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; and

(f) 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.  

The rationale behind linking Colleges in the colonies to the University of London was that university institutions in the colonies had to maintain high academic standards and be able to offer their students ‘education in the fullest sense’ and be confident enough to take their place as equal partners among the universities of the world. This view was based on the understanding that “an institution with the status of a university which does not command the respect of other universities brings no credit to the community which it serves.” The Commission stated that universities in the colonies had to maintain high quality if they were to do justice to their graduates.

According to the Asquith Commission, University Colleges would have to serve as centers of learning where research would be promoted. Since students attending these Colleges would come from different areas, the Commission recommended that they be wholly residential institutions paying particular attention to liberal Arts and Science; professional and vocational studies would be given less attention. No specific reasons were provided for this recommendation. However, there are two possible explanations: first, the Colleges were considered to be ‘young’ institutions, which therefore had to focus on basic skills; secondly, professional courses were deemed to be more expensive than basic courses in the Arts and Sciences.

For the whole process to work the University system had to be monitored and supervised. Thus, the Commission recommended the establishment of bodies such as the Inter-University Council.

---


for Higher Education Overseas (IUCHEO or simply IUC). It was established on 8 March 1946 in Burlington House, London.\textsuperscript{49} I.C.M. Maxwell argues that the reason for having big names in the IUC was to ensure that it could speak with authority on the policy and practice of university development and could give a balanced overview rather than a medley of specialist opinions. In effect the IUC was made up of one representative from each of the British universities, except the University of London which had two members. Colonial universities in Ceylon, Hong Kong, Malta and Palestine were also represented in this body.\textsuperscript{50}

The IUC was charged with two tasks:

(i) to co-operate with existing colonial universities; and
(ii) to foster the development of colonial colleges in their advance to university status.

Its main purpose was “to promote the foundation and expansion of universities in the British colonial territories as comprehensive institutions offering both liberal education and professional training.”\textsuperscript{51} It had to assess the Colleges and advise when a College was ready to be raised to university status after meeting certain requirements. The IUC was also responsible for the allocation of funds after getting advice from relevant committees. The processing of advertisements of posts available at different University Colleges and the recruitment of staff to fill those vacant positions also fell within the ambit of the IUC. The IUC Council did not want to accelerate the rate of expansion. Instead, it planned to foster a steady development.

A parallel body to the above was the University Grants Advisory Committee (UGAC) whose primary task was to advise the Secretary of State on financial matters, relating to the expenditure of British funds on higher education in the colonies. Its duty was “to estimate the needs of the universities and colleges for capital grants over a period and to communicate its views to the Secretary of State, to set aside for each institution a portion of such sum as he may allocate, and to advise him on the merits of each particular scheme submitted by an institution as one to be paid for, whole or in part, out of its allocation.”\textsuperscript{52} The IUC was represented by two nominated members in this Committee. The rest were directly appointed by the Secretary of State.

In October 1949, the Advisory Committee on Colleges of Arts, Science and Technology (ACCAST) was formed. It was instructed:

(i) to advise the Secretary of State and any other responsible authorities in the colonies on the development of the colonial colleges of Arts, Science and Technology and to advise on expenditure of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds allocated for this purpose; and
(ii) to maintain close liaison with the IUC in the Colonies and with the colonial University Grants Advisory Committee.

\textsuperscript{49} The IUC had big names such as: Alexander Carr-Saunders, Director of the London School of Economics; James Irvine, Vice-Chancellor at St Andrews University; Raymond Priestly, Vice-Chancellor at Melbourne then Birmingham; James Duff, Warden, Durham College; William Hamilton Fyfe, Vice-Chancellor, Aberdeen; Ivor Evans, Royal University, Malta; and Professors J.G. Writh and L.E.S. Eastham from Liverpool and Sheffield respectively.

\textsuperscript{50} Maxwell, \textit{Universities in Partnership}, 10-11.


\textsuperscript{52} Carr-Saunders, \textit{New Universities Overseas}, 46.
These measures gave a better shape to Britain’s policy on higher education in the colonies. Thus, the Asquith Report was “a tremendous stride forward.”

The defeat of the British Conservative Party by the Labour Party in 1945 did not disturb the implementation of the recommendations of the Asquith Report. The new administration, in which George Henry Hall was the new Secretary of State for the Colonies (with Arthur Creech Jones serving as Under-Secretary), put the university question high on its agenda. Therefore, the implementation process continued unabated. This process began in 1946 with the establishment of bodies like the IUC. From 21 July to 9 August 1946, a delegation of the IUC under Carr-Saunders visited Makerere College to make an assessment of its progress regarding higher education. Another delegation, under Sir William Hamilton-Fyer headed for West Africa to consider the provision of university education in that part of Africa. Carr-Saunders and his team concluded that Makerere College was ready to move to the next level.

In September 1947 the Registrar of the College wrote to the Makerere College Council informing it that the College intended to apply for the ‘Special Relationship’ with the University of London. The College Council approved the idea and Makerere sent its first application to the University of London asking for admission to the ‘Special Relationship’ programme. Soon thereafter preparations were made to raise Makerere College’s status into a University College as recommended and outlined in the Asquith Report, that is: an institution of higher education at a university level which is not empowered to grant degrees. In 1948, Dr William D. Lamont, Makerere College’s Principal, visited Britain and held discussions with members of the University Council and Senate Committee at the University of London. They agreed on many issues except that Art and Social Studies would not be acceptable for the award of degrees. The Makerere College Academic Board did not take kindly to this view. The Board asked Dr Lamont to write a letter to London’s Senate Committee asking for a full explanation. Once the Senate Committee had discussed the issue, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, the Chairman, responded to Lamont’s letter, stating inter alia that the department of Art was doing pioneer work in providing opportunity for the development of creative ability. The concern was not the value of the work which was being done, but simply as to the position of the subject in the general academic programme. He continued: “The suggestion was made to you while you were over here that it might be desirable to explore the possibilities of a treatment at Makerere similar to that obtaining elsewhere either in relation to a College Diploma, or in relation to a university diploma for which naturally the University would finally be responsible.

In deciding the fate of the Social Science course, London’s Senate Committee relied on information provided by members of the University who had visited Makerere College. According to their reports the teaching of this course at Makerere had not yet attained the required degree standards. The other proposals made by the London Senate to Makerere College were not affected by these decisions.

54 Except in the case where the new leadership attempted to replace the majority with the minority report.
55 Asquith Report, 12.
56 Minutes of the Special Committee of the Senate on Higher Education in the Colonies, 12 July 1948. Cited by Pattison, Special Relations, 55.
During the summer of 1949, another delegation of the IUC visited Makerere College to see how much progress had been made. Lamont met the delegation at Entebbe and told them that he had resigned as Principal.57 This, however, did not prevent the IUC delegation from conducting its work, nor is there any sign that Lamont refused to co-operate with it. Back in London, the IUC delegation reported that constitutional changes suggested by the University of London had been made, the staff had been strengthened and the library expanded. Moreover, a considerable amount of research was going on at Makerere. The IUC then proposed that Makerere be accepted to the ‘Special Relationship’ scheme. London University accepted the proposal and Makerere was admitted into the scheme in November 1949.

Meanwhile, the 1949 Makerere College Act passed by the East African Central Legislative Assembly officially made Makerere a University College.58 The Act stated that Makerere College would be “governed and administered with a view to providing in East Africa facilities for higher education, facilities for professional training, and facilities for research.”59 The same Act also established a sixteen-member Council with representatives from the EAHC, the IUC, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The position of Visitor (Chancellor) was to be taken by one of the Governors of the three East African territories. Thus, from 1949 Makerere became the University College of East Africa – a status that was later confirmed by the Makerere College Amendment Bill, 1961.60 Its physical location remained at Makerere against the wishes of the De la Warr Commission, which suggested a site between Mulago and Kololo. Governor Mitchell was pleased because he wanted the site to remain at Makerere.

Professor Bernard de Bunsen from the Department of Education at Makerere was appointed as the first Principal of the University College. He took over from Dr William D. Lamont who had been Principal of the College in its previous status since the departure of Mr G.C. Turner.61 A total of £1,250,000 was granted to the College by the Colonial Development and Welfare Act (CD & WA). Subsequently, courses approved by the University of London began in 1950 and the first examinations for BA and BSc degrees under the Asquith Scheme were held at the College in 1953. In the same year (1953) the College’s Medical Diploma was recognised as a qualification authorising its holder to practice medicine in East Africa.

57 According to Goldthorpe (1965), Lamont’s resignation came as a result of the difficulties he experienced in implementing the ‘Special Relationship’ programme. It is not clear though whether the difficulties Goldthorpe is talking about were the ones caused by the London Senate or if there were other problems experienced by Lamont at Makerere. Whatever the source of the problems was, Lamont resigned in 1949 and was succeeded by Mr (later, Sir) Bernard de Bunsen.


61 G.C. Turner became Makerere’s Principal when D.G. Tomblings left the College in 1938 to start another college in Fiji.
In 1952 Makerere University College had fifty-two members of staff all of whom were white. It was hoped that Africans would join as soon as they met the necessary requirements. These expatriates taught an all-black student population. In 1953 the College had about 400 male and 20 female students, all Africans. This situation changed gradually so that in 1957 the ‘White Paper on Higher Education in East Africa’ noted that Makerere College was inter-racial, serving the whole of East Africa. But even by this time no significant change had taken place yet: the College had a total of 44 Asians and only six white students. What was more conspicuous was the College’s inter-territorial outlook. The White Paper observed that its student body had a strong inter-territorial flavour and that this was ensured by a quota system which guaranteed at least 25% of the places to each of the three mainland territories.

Since this was a regional University College, each one of the three East African governments contributed a block grant to it. In exchange, the governments were assured of a quota of around 26 percent of student places – which amounted to 78% in all. Ten (10)% of the places were kept as a ‘free pool’. Students competed for these places regardless of which one of the three territories they came from. The remaining twenty-two percent became available for students who came from Zanzibar and any other countries. All places that remained unclaimed by the territory(ies) to which they had been allocated were added to the ‘free pool’. The distribution of the 558 registered students in 1955 is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanzibar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>528</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is fair to say that the De la Warr Commission was a pioneer for the development of higher education in East Africa. But as shown above, the Asquith Commission went a long way towards addressing higher education in the British colonies in general. It therefore out-classed the De la Warr Commission by covering a wider ground. The implementation of its recommendations was a giant stride towards the development of higher education in British colonies in Africa and the West Indies but more particularly towards the development of the University of East Africa. Meanwhile, other developments that would contribute to the establishment of the University of East Africa were taking place elsewhere. The next section discusses these developments.

\[62\]  But as discussed in Chapter 4, the so-called requirements – for example, possession of an MA or PhD degree – was just an excuse for shutting Africans out because even some of those who possessed these degrees were either not employed or were employed but not promoted to senior positions.

Other developments, 1947-1962

A number of developments took place between 1947 and 1962 that accelerated the process of establishing the University of East Africa. These are discussed in this section.

The Royal Technical College

One of the major developments that took place between the late 1940s and the mid-1950s was the establishment of the Royal Technical College [RTC] in Kenya. The history of this College goes back to 1947 when the idea of establishing an institution of higher learning was conceived by the colonial government in Kenya. During that year, the Kenyan Government drew up a plan for the establishment of a local Technical and Commercial Institute. By 1949 this plan had become an East African concept aimed at providing higher technical education for all the territories in the region. In 1949 a Commission under G.P. Willoughby (the Willoughby Commission) recommended that the Kenyan Government should establish such an institution. Initially the proposed college was meant mainly for the benefit of European and Asian students. That the College should be inclusive and inter-territorial was an after-thought.

Another sense in which the proposal was initially exclusive was with regard to its territorial particularism. The envisaged College was meant for Kenyans only. However, as plans got underway for the College’s construction, Dr F.J. Harlow, then Secretary of States’ Assistant Educational Advisor for Technical Education, was tasked to advise on the general proposals, and particularly on the possibility of this envisaged institution being made available to students from the entire East African region. It was after this development that the proposal was modified so that it became more encompassing. In his recommendation, Dr Harlow recommended that the College could serve two specific purposes: it would meet Kenya’s needs for all forms of technical education and, during the earlier stages of the development of technical education in East Africa generally, would provide higher level courses available to students from Tanganyika, Uganda and Zanzibar as well as Kenya. This recommendation had political significance because it promoted the idea of regionalism. With these modifications, East African governments accepted the proposal to establish a technical and commercial College in Kenya.

In February 1951 the Kenyan Government applied for financial assistance from the CD &WA to start building. It invited the governments of Uganda and Tanganyika to also lend a hand in the initial capital expenditure. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, James Griffths, responded to Kenya’s request by making a grant of £150 000 on the understanding that the College’s courses would be available on an inter-territorial basis and that this College “would be the apex of a broadly based system of instruction and education throughout East Africa.” On 7 September 1951, the Governor of Kenya granted a Charter to the Royal Technical College of East Africa (RTCEA). It was originally thought that this legislation would take the form of a Kenya Ordinance, “but as the conception of the functions to be performed by the College broadened it was considered that the College would be more suitably governed under High

---
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The development of higher education in East Africa and the establishment of the Federal University Commission legislation.” With this official permission and with funding from the three East African territories and Britain, the College was set to go. The stone-laying ceremony took place on 25 April 1952 and the construction began soon. Commenting on this historic moment (stone-laying ceremony) the East African Standard had the following to say:

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 will 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.

Indeed, this ceremony was one of the most important occasions in the history of East African education because it raised the region’s higher education system by laying emphasis on technical education. Sir Philip Mitchell in his address stated: “The institution of which we are laying the foundation stone today aspires to become in the near future the Royal College of Science and Technology for the whole of East Africa and I hope that the day will come when it will qualify for the grant of a Royal Charter and so achieve the equivalent of University status.”

At the beginning of 1952 the EAHC had agreed that institutions of higher education in East Africa had to be inter-territorial in character. Being one such institution, therefore, the RTC had to meet this requirement. As happened with Makerere, the RTC’s administration was put under a regional structure, except that this time it was the EAHC, not the Representative Council to which Makerere was handed over by the Ugandan government. Similar to Makerere, the RTC ceased to be directly linked to the Kenyan Government as soon as Dr Harlow’s recommendation had been accepted. By 1953 it was clear that there would be no impediment in the establishment of the RTC. In March 1953, the EAHC made the Royal Technical College of East Africa Order, 1953 with the approval of the Legislative Councils of each of the three territories. Major-General C. Bullard was appointed as the College’s first Principal. In April 1954 the East African Central Legislative Assembly passed an Act establishing the RTC. This Act repealed the Charter granted to the College in September 1951. The Gandhi Memorial Academy and the RTC merged to offer better service to the people of East Africa. The Gandhi Memorial Society provided £200 000 towards the cost of the College buildings.

The EAHC Act that set up the RTC in April 1954 authorised it to provide:

(i) facilities for higher technological training;
(ii) facilities for professional training;
(iii) facilities for research; and
(iv) facilities for vocational training, either in conjunction with any other training or separately therefrom, in engineering, science, laboratory technology, sanitary science, pharmacy, domestic science, industry, commerce, accountancy, economics, arts, art and artistic crafts, either directly or through the medium of connected schools or connected institutes.

---
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The Act discouraged duplication of facilities and encouraged consultation among different academic institutions in the region.

The RTC opened its doors to new students in 1956 at the edge of Nairobi city. It had six departments: Architecture, Arts, Commerce, Domestic Science, Engineering and Science. Princess Margaret formally opened the RTC on 24 October 1956. The College had 215 students (105 Africans, 100 Asians and 10 Europeans). Between 1956 and 1961 it provided technical and commercial education in the region. It also prepared students for examinations such as the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, and the Institute of Chartered Secretaries.\textsuperscript{72} At long last the idea of establishing a second college in East Africa had become a reality. There was still a long way to go before the UEA would come into being, but each step forward increased the hopes of establishing such an institution. One of those steps was the appointment in 1955 of a Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa.

**The First Working Party, 1955**

Once Makerere had become a University College, higher education in East Africa received more attention than had been the case before. In the autumn of 1954 the EAHC suggested the appointment of a Committee to review higher education in East Africa and assist in planning Makerere College’s further development. This suggestion was made following the visits to the region made by representatives of the IUC and the ACCAST. The proposed Committee would re-examine the existing blueprint for higher education in East Africa in light of previous recommendations. The Committee had to be independent and objective, consisting of persons not themselves directly involved in East African education.\textsuperscript{73}

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Allan T. Lennox-Boyd, asked the IUC and the ACCAST to appoint a Working Party. In July 1955 a Working Party under Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, then Director of the London School of Economics was appointed.\textsuperscript{74} The Working Party was guided by the following terms:

(i) To bring under review the existing provision for all post-secondary 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).

The Working Party left for East Africa in two groups. Keir and Harlow arrived in Nairobi on 16 July 1955. Carr-Saunders and Giffen joined them on 18 July. By the time the Party arrived plans had already been put in place to facilitate its work. Under the headline: ‘Review of East Africa


\textsuperscript{73} White Paper on Higher Education in East Africa (Entebbe: GP, 1958), 2.

\textsuperscript{74} Other members of this first Working Party were: Sir David Lindsay Keir, Master of Balliol College in Oxford; Dr F.J. Harlow, Assistant Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State on Technical Education; and Prof. E. Giffen, Professor of Civil and Mechanical Engineering at Queen Mary College, London University.
Education’, the *East African Standard* reported: “A comprehensive tour of advanced education institutions in Kenya has been arranged for the Working Party on higher education, led by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Chairman of the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies, which begins its inquiries in Nairobi on Monday. The Party was appointed by the Colonial Secretary after consultation with the East African territorial Governments.”

While conducting its investigation in Kenya, members of the Working Party held discussions with the Administrator of the EAHC, Kenya’s Ministers of Education, Land and Labour as well as Directors of Education and Deputy and Assistant Directors of Education. Between 19 and 26 July 1955, the Working Party visited different schools in Kenya and talked to school principals and other education authorities including Mr G.P. Willoughby, Chairman of RTC Governing Council. They also held discussions with representatives of the Association of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in East Africa. The Party interviewed ex-students of Mombasa Institute of Muslim Education and also talked to some of the institution’s officials such as the principal and the bursar.

On 27 and 28 July 1955, the Working Party was in Zanzibar where it interviewed the Director of Education and other education officers before visiting local schools. It also held discussions with Directors of different institutions such as medicine, agriculture and finance. The Party then interviewed two members of the Legislative Council, the Principal of the Muslim Academy and representatives of the Indian Community. From 29 July to 8 August 1955 it was in Tanganyika where it met principals, headmasters, directors of education and government officials from different ministries.

From 10 to 17 August 1955 the Working Party was in Uganda where it interviewed the Governor of Uganda, Sir Andrew Cohen, and held discussions with directors of different government departments, principals, representatives of parents’ associations, representatives of the Uganda Chamber of Commerce, Indian Merchants Chamber and Uganda African Chamber of Commerce, the President and Secretary of the Progressive Party and members of the Uganda National Congress. Having spent a total of four-and-a-half weeks traversing East Africa, the Working Party left Entebbe (Uganda) on 17 August 1955 and returned to London.

In its Report, which was submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in January 1956, the Working Party recommended that drastic steps be taken to accelerate the pace towards the establishment of the Federal University. It observed: “Makerere is the only institution of university status yet established in East Africa; judged by academic standards it is fully entitled to rank alongside the other university institutions of the British Commonwealth, and it is a possession of which East Africa has every reason to be proud.” The RTC may have had a regional outlook but it did not match Makerere’s status. To be sure, the Working Party was not in East Africa to judge one college against the other; its task was to find ways in which higher education could be developed in the region as a whole. It is for this latter reason that it steadfastly upheld the belief that the provision of university education in East Africa had to continue to be the concern of all three territories acting as a unit. This proposal was premised on the understanding that time was not ripe yet for each of the three East African territories to

---


support its own university institution independently. Therefore, until that time arrived it would be folly to cripple the development of Makerere College by the diversion of funds, now needed to build up that college, to the foundation of new institutions for which financial support would be inadequate.77

In a nutshell, the First Working Party put its weight behind Makerere’s case. All three East African governments accepted the Working Party’s recommendation that higher education in East Africa needed immediate reorganisation. With these views in mind, the governments considered that all recognised institutions of University College status in East Africa had to be closely associated. This association might be put on formal basis and “the desirability of carrying out further University College development within the scope of a single University of East Africa, of which all present and future colleges territorially situated would be constituent units, should be considered.”78

While being optimistic about the University, the three East African governments conceded that it would be some time before such a university could become a reality. But the process had to continue. The Working Party concurred that University Colleges had to be established both in Kenya and in Tanganyika on the understanding that they would be complementary to, not competitive with the already existing ones. The colleges would be inter-territorial and would be the subject of consultation between the Governments with regard to both their scope and timing.

To set educational inter-territoriality in motion, the three Governments recommended to the Governing Councils of Makerere and the RTC that they had to establish an Academic Liaison Committee on which representatives of both academic boards would sit. The Committee would meet alternately at these two institutions and the Principal of the hosting college would chair the meeting.

One of the impediments to speeding up the process of establishing the University was the very fact that East Africa was not a single territory but three, or four if we include Zanzibar. In its Report, the Working Party expressed its concern about this fact and stated that this situation made it difficult to decide where and when to plan a second University College once the development of Makerere had been completed. But from the above discussion it is clear that Kenya was already far ahead of Tanganyika thus making her an obvious successor to Makerere. But the details on how to proceed to the next stage were left to Dr John F. Lockwood’s Working Party. It was hoped that the recommendations of this Second Working Party would help tighten the lose ends and accelerate the process.

**The Second Working Party, 1958**

As seen above, the East African governments were very much impressed by the Report of the First Working Party. In their joint White Paper, the governments conceded that no one would repudiate the fact that the need for higher education in East Africa was on the increase. It was for this reason therefore that they approved the 1955 Working Party’s recommendation on promoting regional integration in higher education. But before implementing any resolutions

77 Ibid., 24.
The development of higher education in East Africa and the establishment of the Federal University outlined in the White Paper, the governments needed an independent opinion. They therefore asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies\textsuperscript{79} to appoint a Working Party to examine the proposals set out in the White Paper. In July 1958 a six-member Working Party under Dr John F. Lockwood, Master of Birkbeck College and Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, was appointed.\textsuperscript{80}

The Second Working Party was guided by the following three terms:

(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.

Lockwood’s Working Party conducted its business between July and August 1958. Before it arrived in East Africa, members of the public prepared several memoranda to be considered by the Working Party. More than fifty such memoranda were submitted. Writing to the Permanent Secretary for Local Government, Health and Town Planning at the beginning of July 1958, the Permanent Secretary for Education in Kenya informed his colleague that the Working Party would be visiting Nairobi during the week beginning on 17 July. He stated that it would help the Party if it could be given the opportunity to meet the heads of Departments particularly interested in the employment of men trained at the Royal Technical College and at Makerere College, the Director of Establishments and the Labour Commissioner concerned with the placing, in Government posts and commercial employment of students who had completed their higher education.\textsuperscript{81}

The Working Party arrived in East Africa in separate groups. Dr Lockwood and the Secretary arrived in Nairobi on 4 July. On 6 and 7 July they held discussions with the Acting Minister and the Acting Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Labour and Lands in Kenya. They also held discussions with the Chairman of Council and the Acting Principal of the RTC. The Working Party left for Uganda on 7 July. On 8 July Professors Giffen and Ingold and Mr Alexander arrived in Uganda where they interviewed the Governor and the Acting Chief Secretary. Between 9 and 16 July the Working Party held discussions with different institutions and individuals in Uganda. These included: education officials (Ministers, Directors and Principals), Councils of Ministers from the Kabaka’s Government, members of the Advisory Council on African, Asian,

\textsuperscript{79} The Secretary of State for the Colonies was still Allan T. Lennox-Boyd. He took over from Oliver Lyttelton, who resigned on November 25, 1954, and remained in this position until 1959. He was succeeded by Iain Macleod.

\textsuperscript{80} Other members of the Party were: Dame Lillian Penson, Professor of Modern History, Bedford College, University of London; Professor C.T. Ingold, Professor of Botany, Birkbeck College, University of London; Mr D.H. Alexander, Principal of Municipal College of Technology, Belfast; Sir David Lindsay Keir and Professor E. Giffen, both of whom were members of the First Working Party.

\textsuperscript{81} Permanent Secretary for Education in Kenya to Permanent Secretary for Local Government, Health and Town Planning (ED.52/9/4. IV), 1 July 1958. KNA. BY/27/2.
European and Goan Education, as well as Secretary and representative members of the Uganda National Congress.

From 17 to 24 July the Working Party was in Kenya. Sir David Keir joined it on 18 July. While in Kenya, the Working Party met former students of Makerere College and RTC. It also met education officials and representatives from different Ministries, the Permanent Secretaries as well as the Administrator of the EAHC. From 25 to 26 July it visited Zanzibar and held discussions with education officers and directors of different Ministries. The Working Party met representatives of teachers, parents’ Associations, the African Association, Arab Association, Comorian Association, Indian National Association, Muslim Association and Shirazi Association. It also had a meeting with graduates from Makerere College and overseas universities.

Between 28 July and 3 August the Working Party visited Tanganyika. It first interviewed the Governor and the Chief Secretary before holding discussions with different Ministries and representatives from different associations and organisations such as the Unofficial Members’ Organization of the Legislative Council. The Working Party also had a meeting with Makerere College graduates and concluded its visits by travelling back to Kenya; it was in Kenya from 4 to 7 August. The Working Party left East Africa in three groups. Penson left on 7 August; Lockwood, Giffen, Ingold, Alexander and the Secretary left the following day. Sir David Keir was the last to leave on 9 August.

The Working Party submitted its Report to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on 26 November 1958. In paragraph 83, the Working Party maintained that it had no doubt whatsoever that within a period of ten to fifteen years the idea of associating several colleges in the framework of a single university would become a reality and that such a university would best serve the interests of East African Higher Education. The rationale behind this recommendation is contained in paragraph 89, which states, inter alia that:

> All the colleges should be interterritorial wherever they are located. The principle of interterritoriality is fundamental to our recommendations. It is not only that the financial support needed from Governments should be obtained from all the Governments – important as that is. There are other reasons for our emphasis. Unless the colleges are interterritorial, there is bound to be needless and expensive duplication.82

The Working Party recommended that the RTC be upgraded to a University College status providing courses of training in technology as well as courses leading to university degrees. The reasoning behind this idea was to combine technological and professional training in one institution. Students who completed their studies in such a college would secure employment in administrative, educational, commercial and industrial institutions throughout East Africa. It was envisaged that the close association between professional and academic training would equip them for these jobs. Members of the Working Party were convinced that this was an excellent idea, hence their recommendation: “We, therefore, recommend that by measure of reconstruction and by the addition of appropriate facilities the Royal Technical College should be transformed into the second interterritorial University College in East Africa, and we strongly urge that immediate steps be taken to effect this transformation.”83

---

83 Ibid., par. 28.
Similar to Makerere, the RTC had to join the ‘Special Relationship’ programme with the University of London. Such a change had to be effected expeditiously to ensure that the development of higher education in the region became a reality. Members of the Working Party were mindful of problems such as the training of the academic staff, strengthening of the administration, physical expansion and rearrangement of the space available in the existing buildings. However, they still felt that remodeling the college was a necessity since the results would far exceed the problems to be experienced.

Arguments in favour of the establishment of a University College in Tanganyika left the Working Party convinced about the merits of this idea. Their Report urged that the necessary preparatory measures be undertaken so that such a college could be opened in 1965/66, “or as soon thereafter as possible.” Each of the colleges had to maintain inter-territoriality. This recommendation was premised on two reasons:

(i) financial support needed by each college came from all three governments, and therefore paying for an inter-territorial institution and local institutions offering the same facilities would over-stretch the governments unnecessarily;

(ii) unless the colleges were inter-territorial, there would be unnecessary and costly duplication of facilities.

According to Lockwood’s Working Party, the UEA had to be established not later than 1966. The three colleges, and any other college which might be founded thereafter, would then become constituent colleges of the envisaged UEA. For these plans to be carried out, the Working Party (paragraph 89) advised that no additional institutions offering facilities already offered by the colleges had to be contemplated since that would delay the implementation process. The East African Standard concluded as follows: “In general, the recommendations may be described as bold, imaginative and practical, for they clear away much that has tended to clog progress and development, and point to great potentialities.”

The implementation of the recommendations of Lockwood’s Working Party began as soon as the three governments and the EAHC had accepted the Report. Late in 1960 the East Africa Legislative Assembly drafted the Royal College, Nairobi Bill, 1960, which was read for the first time on 30 November and for the second time on 3 December 1960. Reading the motion regarding this Bill, The Administrator, Mr David maintained: “I feel Sir, that the relatively brief life of the Royal Technical College Act is symbolic of the pace of educational development in East Africa. This is one field in which we can never be satisfied; one field in which we must ever be striving after higher aims and greater achievements.” He continued to state that higher education was not the responsibility of the EAHC and the policies were decided jointly by the East African governments. In conclusion, he reasoned: “It is, however, because of the accepted East African basis of higher education that this Assembly has been charged with the duty of legislating for the two colleges which at present exist in this field.”

84 Ibid., 13. See also: East African Standard, 26 February 1959.
Bill made provision for the transformation of the RTC into a University College and repealed the 1954 Royal Technical College Act. On 25 June 1961 the EAHC Act upgraded the RTC into the status of a University College. Its name was subsequently changed to ‘Royal College, Nairobi’ (RCN). Thus from 1961 Royal College, Nairobi officially became the second constituent college of the envisaged UEA.

Similar to Makerere, the new College prepared students for the University of London examinations. In 1962 the faculty of Veterinary Science was transferred from Makerere to RCN. In 1963 the College of Social Studies, Kikuyu, formed part of the RCN. In 1964 the name of the College was changed again to become ‘University College, Nairobi’ (UCN). It remained that way until the eventual collapse of the Federal University of East Africa.

The idea of inter-territoriality was retained in the aims of the College, which were:

(i) To provide facilities for University Education, including technological and professional education, and for research either directly or through the medium of connected schools or connected institutes.

(ii) To assist in the preservation, transmission and increase of knowledge, and in the stimulation of the intellectual life and cultural development in East Africa.

(iii) To preserve academic freedom and, in particular, the right of a college of the University of East Africa to determine who may teach, what may be taught, how it may be taught and who may be admitted to study.88

These aims were similar to those of Makerere as they were stated in the 1960-61 Calendar: “It is hereby declared that Makerere College shall be governed and administered, in accordance with provisions of this Act, with a view towards providing in East Africa facilities for University education and for research either directly or through the medium of connected schools and connected institutes.”89 Both institutions were conscious of their responsibility to promote regional integration through higher education.

As the RTC was going through its metamorphosis, other developments in Higher Education were also taking place in Tanganyika. When Makerere became a University College it did not offer courses in Law and Engineering. The RTC filled one gap by offering the latter. There was still a need for a regional institution to offer Law. It was partly90 due to this reason that the University College, Dar es Salaam was established. The Working Party once contemplated recommending that a University College to be established in Tanganyika could offer Geology, in view of the impressive organisation of the Geological Survey in Dodoma. But this idea had to be abandoned because a good nucleus of Geology department was already in existence at the Royal Technical College, and it seemed, therefore most reasonable to develop and expand that nucleus so that it could teach for the BSc General Degree and also make its specific contribution to geological research in East Africa. Also, the importance of Geology in the training of civil

88 University of East Africa. The Nairobi Royal College, Calendar for 1963-64, 70-72.
89 Makerere College. The University College of East Africa, Calendar for 1960-61, 146. See also: Makerere College. The University College of East Africa, Calendar for 1958-59, 75.
90 I say ‘partly’ because even if Law courses were offered in one or both of the already existing institutions, a need would still exist for Tanganyika to have a University College.
The development of higher education in East Africa and the establishment of the Federal University engineers rendered peculiarly appropriate the location of the department in the college providing for degrees and higher professional qualifications in engineering.91

According to the recommendations of the 1958 Working Party, the estimated date for the establishment of a College in Tanganyika was 1965/1966, or as soon thereafter as possible. But for reasons discussed in Chapter 6, the college came into being on 25 October 1961. It was opened in a borrowed four-storey building leased by Julius Nyerere’s Tanganyika African National Union (TANU). The first intake of Law students was 14. The establishment of a University College in Tanganyika completed one of many phases leading to the establishment of the University of East Africa.

The final touches

The recommendations made by the two Working Parties provided answers to most of the questions that needed to be addressed before the University was established. But there were still a few outstanding issues. Between 1960 and 1963 concerted efforts were made to accelerate the process. This section discusses how those final touches were made, by paying particular attention to the Quinquennial Report, the Nicol Report and the Provisional Council of the UEA.

The Quinquennial Report, 1960

In 1960, the three East African Governors appointed the Quinquennial Advisory Committee (QAC) and tasked it to study the Lockwood Report and advise them on the financial and other implications of the recommendations made in the Report. The motivating factor behind this decision was to ensure that no mistake was made in terms of which political decisions would ignore the financial realities of the region. Therefore, specifically, the Committee was tasked: “to consider the proposals for, and the estimated cost of Higher Education in East Africa in the five years from 1961 to 1966.”92 Its terms of reference were stated as follows: to advise the East African governments generally in the light of:

(i) the Report of the 1958 Working Party on Higher Education;
(ii) the needs of the Colleges concerned; and
(iii) the finance likely to be available.

The Chairman of the Committee was E.B. David.93

The QAC assembled at Entebbe on 9 July 1960 and drew up its detailed itinerary that would enable it to execute its duties accordingly and make appropriate and practical recommendations to be considered by the East African leadership. It held preliminary meetings with the Principal of Makerere College and flew to Nairobi on 10 July. From 11 to 14 July it studied the development proposals and estimates submitted by the RTC. It also held discussions with the Chairman of

91 Report of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa, July/August 1958, 14, par. 64.
92 Report of the Quinquennial Advisory Committee, 1960, 1, par. 1.
93 Other members were: Yusuf K. Lule, W. Wenban-Smith, W.A.C. Mathieson, E.W. Russel, J.E. Richardson, R. Milnes Walker and C.R. Morris.
the Governing Council, the Principal-Designate, the acting Principal and Heads of Departments. It then flew to Dar es Salaam on 15 July where it discussed proposals for the establishment of a new University College there. The Committee met with the Minister of Finance and with representatives of the Elected Members’ Organization. On 19 July it flew back to Nairobi and visited the Makerere Veterinary Faculty at Kabete. The Committee then returned to Uganda on 21 July where it examined the proposals made by Makerere College and held discussions with the Principal, Heads of Departments and Administrative staff before holding an informal meeting with the Minister of Health. The Committee finished its job in East Africa on 28 July 1960.

In its Report (paragraph 6), the QAC concluded that there were very strong educational reasons for the establishment of a central university in East Africa. Its members unanimously agreed that there would be an inter-territorial college in each of the three countries. Each college would offer courses in the basic studies in Arts and Science. With regard to professional courses, the Committee advised that these would have to be divided between the colleges. This recommendation was inspired by the need to maintain inter-territoriality and the need to save money.

Concerning the establishment of the UEA, the Committee maintained that such an institution would not come into full academic activity and authority until such time that was agreed upon by various stakeholders. The date would have to be determined in relation to the rhythm of the academic work of the colleges, considered both internally and in relation to the University of London to which they were affiliated. The colleges could continue their relations with the University of London until the envisaged UEA was established. The Committee suggested that a University College in Tanganyika be established earlier than the date suggested in the Lockwood Report. It recommended that the college’s Principal be appointed in the 1961/1962 academic year. The Committee also endorsed the 1958 Working Party’s recommendation that a college in Tanganyika had to offer Law courses.

The Governor of Tanganyika was upbeat about the prospect of having a University College in his territory. He addressed the Legislative Council as follows: “In the sphere of higher education it is this Government’s wish that very 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.” The Minister of Education expressed the same feeling. Presenting the University College, Dar es Salaam (Provisional Council) Bill, 1961, he reminded the House about the recommendations made by the QAC: “Among these recommendations were a number of particularly close interest to this country, for the Committee advised that immediate steps should be taken towards the establishment of a University College of Tanganyika which would join with Makerere College and the Royal College, Nairobi, in a University of East Africa.”

On finance, the Committee recommended that grants be given to the colleges and the Central Office of the envisaged Federal University. The following table shows how these grants would be distributed.

The development of higher education in East Africa and the establishment of the Federal University

Table 3. The Distribution of Grants at the University of East Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amount (in Sterling Pounds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makerere College</td>
<td>£4 304 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College</td>
<td>£1 921 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika College</td>
<td>£255 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Africa</td>
<td>£30 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6 510 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Quinquennial Advisory Committee recommended that a Provisional or Development Council for the University be established as soon as possible so that it would start putting in place the necessary administrative structures and guiding rules. This recommendation was in line with the 1958 Working Party’s proposal that before the date for the establishment of the University was set, the terms of the constitution of the University would first have to be laid down. Once all the rules had been put in place then the date for the opening of the University would be decided. Students admitted to any of the Colleges after that date would subsequently work for the degrees of the University of East Africa. However, students who were already in the process of finishing their degrees for the University of London would be allowed to finish them – subject to the approval of their respective colleges. By this time there was no doubt that the University would indeed become a reality but other steps had to follow.

The Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, 1961

The establishment of the Provisional Council (PC) of the University of East Africa marked an important phase in the history of higher education in that region. The draft enactment for the Provisional Council stated: “It is hereby declared that there shall be established on the appointed day a University of East Africa, of which Makerere, the Royal College and the University College, Dar es Salaam shall be members, and for the furtherance of this purpose there shall now be established a body to be known as the Provisional Council of the University.”

The PC of the University was then established in June 1961 under the Chairmanship of Sir Donald MacGillivray. It was a product of an agreement reached by the three East African governments and their colleges.

The principal task of the PC was to establish the University. This task involved:

(i) consultation with the University Colleges and with the authorities of the proposed college in Tanganyika so as to co-ordinate the colleges’ development plans;

(ii) consultation with governments on matters affecting higher education in East Africa; and

(iii) the preparation of a draft charter and statutes for the University of East Africa.

(iv) The functions of the Provisional Council were summarised as follows:

---

97 Draft Enactment for Provisional Council of the University of East Africa. UON Archives. UEA University Council. PUEA/1A/78.

98 Council Memorandum, 61/5A (Makerere Memorandum c/600 – 61/27). Provisional Council of the University of East Africa. UON Archives. UEA University Council. PUEA/1A/78, 23.
(a) The preparation of a draft charter and statutes for the University;

(b) The making of regulations for entrance to the University for courses of study, for the duration and number of University terms, for the award of degrees, certificates and diplomas of the University and for the revocation of such awards, such regulations to be in force for the first year after the establishment of the University or until such later date as they were amended or revoked by the authorities of the University;

(c) The co-ordination of the development plans of the colleges and the establishment of common standards and principles in the structure of courses of study and examinations;

(d) The approval of the establishment of new Departments or Chairs;

(ii) Advising the East African governments and the Government of Zanzibar on matters affecting University policy; and

(iii) The making of provisions with regard to the relationship with the University of other institutions of higher education and of research institutions.99

The PC held its first meeting at the Royal College, Nairobi on 21 and 22 June 1961. Sir Donald MacGillivray, in his opening address, remarked that the first meeting was a very exciting occasion because it was “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.”100 He looked forward to a challenging but necessary task lying ahead of the Council and prayed that God would guide the deliberations so that the Council could create an instrument that would truly serve the people of East Africa. The Chairman used this opportunity to assure his colleagues that the University they were about to establish had the backing of a wider community from beyond the boundaries of East Africa. He pointed out that the Conference on Education in East Africa which was held at Princeton, New Jersey in the United States in December 1960, had noted with pleasure the decision to establish the UEA.101 The Conference stated that East Africa’s three University Colleges would be strengthened academically by their integration into a common University of East Africa.102 The conference urged that immediate steps be taken to ensure that this idea was put into practice.

The Council had to demonstrate the inter-territoriality of the UEA. To this end, it was agreed that the Provisional Council would not have any specific meeting place of its own. Instead, there would be a rotation of meetings between Nairobi, Dar-es-Salaam and Kampala. However, the Council’s Headquarters were opened in Uganda since the Uganda Government had made office space available immediately and promised to have other buildings ready within a year. After the meeting, a press statement was prepared and arrangements made for simultaneous release in Nairobi, Kampala, Dar es Salaam and London on 23 June 1961.103 These developments showed

99 Minutes of the Meeting of the Promotional Committee at Makerere College on 1st March 1961. UON Archives, UEA University Council. PUEA/1A/60, 3.
100 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, Royal College, Nairobi, 21st and 22nd June 1961, UON Archives, PUEA/IA/52.
101 The conference was sponsored by the Africa Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education, a committee that served as a link between Africa and America.
102 Supplementary Notes to: The Press Release. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/57.
103 Ibid., Minute No. 9/61 and Minute No. 29/61.
the level of caution exercised by the Provisional Council. Another press statement released in March 1962 referred to the Chairman’s announcement that the Provisional Council had been enlarged by the addition of three co-opted members: Mr L.G. Sagini from Kenya, Chief A.S. Fundikira from Tanganyika and Dr M.J. Aliker from Uganda. These additions reflected the Council’s desire to make itself more representative of public opinion in the region.104

Once the Provisional Council went into full gear with the deliberations an agreement was reached that it would address the most urgent issues such as drafting the University Charter and Statutes. Other issues would be addressed by the University Council to be appointed as soon as the University had been constituted. In its 5th meeting, held at the University College, Dar es Salaam on 27 June 1962, the PC approved of the suggestion that the EACLA should be requested to pass the Act establishing the University such that it left the function of statute-making to the University Council. For the time being, the University would operate under the Statutes made by the Provisional Council. The Provisional Council recommended that the transitional period be limited to a maximum of six months in order to ensure that the Statute was made soon after the University Council had been put in place.105 It was hoped that by that time the University Council would have had sufficient time to make its own Statute. The PC executed its duties diligently. By the end of March 1962 it was almost certain that the proposed University would come into being in 1963. One letter summarised the situation thus:

It is now a widely accepted proposition that the orderly and successful development of higher education in East Africa depends upon three closely related factors. These are the provision of effective local institutions, with modern facilities and equipment, the recruitment, in Africa and abroad, of well qualified academic staff, and a programme of overseas scholarships in those areas where opportunities in East Africa are for the time being lacking.106

By this time the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa had already publicly recognised the great assistance given to education in East Africa, and to higher education in particular, by the programmes of scholarship. It was only concerned that a programme of overseas scholarships had not been designed to supplement and strengthen the basic and essential responsibility. The Provisional Council drew attention to the enduring results that could be purchased at relatively small cost by financial aid given to its recruitment needs.

The contents of this letter, more especially the point about bringing in expatriate staff to level the ground for the not-yet-ready African staff, was to become the source of confrontation once the University had been established. When the Provisional Council was appointed, different committees were set up to address specific issues and report to the Council. The rationale behind setting up these ad hoc committees was to ease the Provisional Council’s job while at the same time making sure that the Provisional council remained in charge of the entire process of setting up the UEA. Dr Davidson Nicol, the Principal of the University College of Sierra Leone chaired one of the committees.

105 Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, University College, Dar es Salaam, 27 June 1962. UON Archives, PUEA/IA/54 Vol. 2.
The Nicol Committee Report, 1962

After the P.C. had been instituted, one of its many tasks was to try to understand the manpower needs in the East African region. Such information would assist the Council in making informed decisions about the role the University could play in regional development. The Provisional Council asked Guy Hunter to conduct a manpower study for East Africa. With the assistance of Professor Frederick Harbison, Hunter carried his study in 1962 and subsequently wrote a Report titled ‘High-Level Manpower in East Africa: A Preliminary Assessment’. Although the Report was never published, Hunter included its data in a book he published the following year, whose immediate purpose was to examine educational and training opportunities open to East Africans in their region and to highlight deficiencies which might be filled by sending students abroad. Hunter’s study called for massive educational expansion to satisfy the requirements of the East African region’s ambitious development plans.

During the second half of 1962, the Provisional Council appointed a Committee and tasked it: “To review the needs and priorities of higher education in the three East African University Colleges, in view of new circumstances which have arisen since the Report of the Quinquennial Advisory Committee, of the intention to establish a University College of East Africa, of such findings of any East African manpower survey that may be available and of the desirability that each college should be able as soon as possible to play its full part in the university structure; and to recommend accordingly.” This Committee of five members was a very powerful Committee comprising renowned scholars from Britain, Canada, America and West Africa. Three of its five members had just returned from the UNESCO Conference on the Development of Higher Education in Africa that was held in Tananarive in September 1962. The Committee’s Chairman, Dr Davidon Nicol, served as Chairman of the above Conference on: ‘The Choice and Adaptation of the Higher Education Curriculum’. Another member of the Committee, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders from the IUC, had been one of the consultants of the Tananarive Conference and also submitted a background paper on ‘Staffing of Higher Education in Africa’. Alan Pifer from the Carnegie Corporation had been one of the consultants of the Tananarive Conference, which he also attended. The other two members of the Committee were H.J. Seddon and N.A.M. Mackenzie.

Nicol’s Committee arrived in East Africa in September 1962 and only had three weeks within which to collect evidence. This meant that it had to move fast. Within that short time, the Committee managed to visit all three East African territories. But firstly it visited Hunter to get more insight about his survey. The Committee stated afterwards: “we found the manpower survey useful in several respects and we are grateful to Mr Hunter and Professor Harbison for their work.” It conducted interviews with College, University and Government officials in East Africa and subsequently reported to the Provisional Council in January 1963.

The Report of Nicol’s Committee resulted in the establishment of the University Development Plan (UDP) to guide the administrators of the UEA for the first triennial period ending in 1967. The Committee concluded that a total cut of £150 000 had to be made from Makerere’s grant for 1963-1966 and be redistributed as follows: £60 000 would go to the Royal College, Nairobi; £50 000 to Dar es Salaam and £40 000 to the Faculty of Veterinary Science. Before
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the Committee’s arrival, a total sum of £85 000 for the extension of Makerere’s Northcote Hall had been frozen by the College’s authorities after realising that the number of students it had expected to come to the college would decline drastically as some of them joined the new colleges in Kenya and Tanganyika. The Committee recommended that £40 000 from this fund be transferred to Dar es Salaam. Mitchell Hall (already under construction) had to be left as it was so that whatever remained of the £250 000 allotted for it could be given to Dar es Salaam.

One of the key recommendations of the Nicol Report was ‘parity’ or ‘equity’. The objective was: “to bring the colleges as quickly as possible to a rough degree of parity. By Parity we mean equality in teaching facilities in number of student places in basic faculties of Arts, Science and Education common to all colleges, and in the spread of intellectual quality.” There was a conscious decision to bring Dar es Salaam (and to a certain extent the Royal College) on par with Makerere – already at an advanced stage of development. Some scholars believe that Crawford Pratt, Principal of the University College, Dar es Salaam, pushed the objective of parity on behalf of his college.²

Unsurprisingly, this proposed idea of ‘parity’ or ‘equity’ between the colleges did not go down well with Ugandan academics and politicians. Mr F.X.B. Mugenyi, a politician in Uganda, later recalled in Uganda’s National Assembly: “I could not imagine, Sir, a time when Makerere University should mark time until the Dar es Salaam University or Nairobi reached the same status.” Naturally, Dar es Salaam was thrilled with the Committee’s recommendations since it would be the main beneficiary. In fact, even before Nicol’s Committee arrived, Dar es Salaam had asked Makerere to transfer to her the funds referred to above but Makerere’s Council refused and resolved that the University College, Dar es Salaam, had to be informed that the Council viewed with great sympathy its problems in financing a capital development programme. The Council, however, was not in a position to assess the needs and resources of the other East African University Colleges against its own pressing capital requirements and considered that such an assessment could only be justly made by an independent advisory body. Thus, the Council felt unable to enter bilateral negotiations on this subject.⁴

Nicol’s Committee served as that independent body. Kenya was not adversely affected by its recommendations and therefore decided on a diplomatic silence. Overall, Nicol’s Committee “was the embodiment of a first attempt to centralise the allocation of resources.” The Report of this Committee marked the last phase in the process of establishing the UEA. Five months later, the University was inaugurated.

The establishment of the University of East Africa, 1962-1963

In 1962 the Governors-General of Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda – with the advice and consent of the East African Central Legislative Assembly – enacted the University of East Africa Act. This Act officially set up the UEA with three constituent colleges based in Kenya, Uganda and
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Tanganyika. Part II 3(1) and 4(1) of the Act stated there would be established, upon a day to be appointed by the Authority by notice in the Gazette, a university to be known as the University of East Africa. It stated that the University “shall comprise the constituent colleges thereof and such other colleges as may, from time to time, be recognized as constituent colleges in accordance with the provisions of this section.”

The objects and functions of the UEA were stated as follows:

(i) to assist in the preservation, transmission and increase of knowledge and in the stimulation of the intellectual life and cultural development of East Africa, to preserve academic freedom and, in particular, the right of a university, or university college, to determine who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught and who may be admitted to study therein;

(ii) to assume responsibility for university education within East Africa, to co-operate with governments or other appropriate bodies in the planned development of higher education and, in particular to examine and approve proposals for new faculties, new departments, new degree courses, or new subjects of study submitted to it by the constituent colleges; and

(iii) to conduct examinations for, and to grant, degrees, diplomas, certificates and other awards of the university.

It was agreed that President Nyerere should become the first Chancellor of the University. Sir Bernard de Bunsen was appointed Vice-Chancellor while Sir Donald MacGillivray and Dr Lindsay M. Young became Council Chairman and Registrar respectively. Accepting his position, President Nyerere wrote: “I would like to say how pleased I am to receive the honour of being made first Chancellor of the University of East Africa. I am very anxious that our University should become renowned for the quality of its graduates and for its services, through them and the staff, to the development of the whole area.”

The establishment of the UEA was an event many constituencies had been eagerly waiting for. When the day of its inauguration eventually came on 28 June 1963, it was greeted with excitement. In Nairobi, the *Daily Nation* had an eight-page supplement exclusively on the University. It reported: “Three solemn ceremonies will today bring to Nairobi’s Royal College the traditional pomp of learning as the University of East Africa is officially inaugurated, its Chancellor installed and a whole bevy of new buildings at the College opened.” The reporter predicted that the University would produce graduates whose degrees would hold their own against overseas universities. Individuals, institutions, and different companies all had good wishes for the University. One company based in Kenya wrote: “To the University on its inauguration and to Dr Julius Nyerere the first Chancellor, sincere congratulations from UNITED AUTO TOOLS LTD, Suppliers of Aircraft … Marine Automobile and Engineering Tools.”
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The inauguration ceremony took place in the Taifa (kiSwahili for ‘nation’) or Gloucester Hall at Royal College, Nairobi. It was preceded by the first meeting of the Senate, held in the Council Chamber of the University College. Sir Bernard de Bunsen, led the procession to the Hall and constituted the congregation. He officially installed President Nyerere as Chancellor of the University and he was in turn officially installed by him as Vice-Chancellor. It had been previously agreed that the Vice-Chancellorship would be a rotating position among the three colleges so as to maintain the inter-territoriality of the UEA. Therefore, these incumbents knew that they would later hand over to their counterparts in the the other territories. At long last, the British and East African dream of having a regional University in East Africa became a reality!

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to trace the development of higher education in East Africa and to show how the Federal University of East Africa came into being. A few conclusions can be drawn at this juncture. The first conclusion is that agency in the history of the UEA cannot be attributed to any single constituency; local and global actors played their respective roles in bringing the University into existence. Nor can the establishment of this institution be attributed to any single causal factor. Endogenous and exogenous should be credited for this success. The British government had espoused the idea of establishing the University as part of its general education policy for its Empire. British Governors in East Africa asked successive Secretaries of State to set up Commissions, Committees, and Working Parties that would help them develop higher education in the region. East African politicians, too, through the East African Authority, the East African legislative Assembly, etc. embraced and promoted the idea of a Federal University.

The second conclusion is that the process of establishing the University of East Africa did not unfold smoothly for two reasons. First, global events such as the outbreak of World War II reduced the pace in which the process of establishing the University was advancing. Second, there were tensions between different constituencies. The University of London worked on the assumption that University Colleges established in the colonies had to assimilate London’s practices. However, East Africans did not share this view. London University’s epistemology of homogenising institutions of higher learning, already entrenched in Britain, was not welcome in East Africa. Another locus of these tensions was between the would-be constituent colleges of the UEA. Sometimes each college put its own needs before those of the region. This became another germ for tensions. These issues will be further explored in Chapters 5 and 6. The present chapter has also alluded to the fact that the establishment of the University of East Africa was politically inspired. Political debates took place both in Britain and in East Africa. The next chapter develops this submission by demonstrating the role played by politics in the establishment of the Federal University Universi of East Africa in 1963 and links it to the overall euphoria of political independence.
CHAPTER 3

Politics and the Federal University of East Africa

… however strong the desire to divorce education from politics, it cannot be done; for as the Greeks so clearly appreciated, education and politics are inextricably interwoven.

B. de Jouvenel, cited by W.K. Chagula, 1968

Introduction

The establishment of the inter-territorial University of East Africa in 1963 was politically motivated. In a way, this is not surprising because “inter-territorial organizations are political in their inception, termination, and basic arrangements even if the conflict factor is minimized in their daily operations.” Therefore, the UEA, conceived of and also established as an inter-territorial educational institution, could not be insulated from politics. Between 1919 and 1930, East African students persistently agitated for higher education and demonstrated their zest and preparedness to travel abroad to obtain it. This gradually became unsettling to the British colonial governments in East Africa and to the British Colonial Office in London. Both constituencies were concerned about the possible long-term political consequencies of these travels. Officials from both British institutions resolved to develop higher education in East Africa mainly for two reasons:

(i) to pacify East African youths who were thirsty for higher education and

(ii) to ‘protect’ these youths from exposure to political influence to which they were likely to fall prey if they travelled abroad in pursuit of their education.

During the 1930s and 1940s, the British Colonial Office planned the establishment of a regional university in East Africa as part of the broader British imperial policy on higher education in the colonies. In both instances, the political factor loomed large and became discernible in each stage.

The purpose of this chapter is basically to demonstrate how a combination of political factors contributed to the establishment of the UEA. It argues that British imperial policies on higher education in the colonies were largely influenced by political factors. The thrust of the argument in this chapter is that the tensions that occurred between different constituencies in Britain
and in East Africa regarding the establishment of the University had political derivations. This submission is buttressed by undertaking two investigations:

(i) analysing the statements articulated by different constituencies in Britain and in East Africa from the moment the idea of establishing an East African University was conceived to the time when this institution was inaugurated in 1963; and

(ii) analysing the different reports discussed in Chapter 2. This analysis will achieve two objectives:

(a) it will help us understand the rationale for establishing the University in the first place and

(a) it will place the history of the UEA in the wider context of British imperial policy on higher education in the colonies.

The present chapter is chronologically divided into five sections. The first section analyses the political thinking in Britain and in East Africa in the early 1920s regarding lack of education for East African youths and its impact on British government opinion. This section explores the tensions that occurred between British Governors in East Africa and various East African constituencies regarding access to higher education. Moreover, it discusses in detail the tensions which occurred at the British Colonial Office in London regarding the mode of operation that had to be followed in responding to East African demands for higher education. Lastly, the section also demonstrates how these different tensions paved the way for the establishment of the UEA.

The second section discusses the political tensions which occurred between the British government and its Governors and Directors of Education based in East Africa regarding British imperial policy on East African higher education. These tensions are discussed with specific reference to the Currie Report. Included in the analysis are the politics behind the delay in implementing the recommendations of the Currie Report, and the broader political context in which the famous De la Warr Commission referred to in Chapter 2 of this book was appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Section three of this chapter addresses the political thinking in Britain during the course of World War II and shows how politics influenced the decisions made by the British government and its appointees regarding higher education in the British colonies in general and in East Africa in particular during this time. The fourth section analyses political tensions between different constituencies in East Africa and in Britain between 1945 and 1960 while the last section discusses these tensions between 1961 and 1963 when East African territories achieved their political independence from Britain.

**Politics and East African education in the 1920s**

The end of World War I in 1918 left the British government and its officials totally convinced about the need to develop African education. This necessity presented itself in three ways. First, a postmortem of the war by the British government revealed that Africans could have been more useful during the war had they been offered the kind of education that would teach
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them certain skills. Second, as soon as the war ended, British Governors working in East Africa realised that there was a chronic shortage of artisans to rebuild the infrastructure destroyed during the war. Third, the socio-economic and political climate in Britain during the post-war period was not stable at all. During the course of the war colonial subjects had been urged by the British government to travel to Britain so that they could lend a hand in the war effort. This did not last long, partly because of the race riots that broke out in Britain in 1919. These riots resulted in the repatriation of a number of colonial subjects from Britain to the colonies. Although students from the Caribbean and Africa were exempted from such measures, “they could not be insulated from the prevailing racist climate in Britain. The potential repercussions in the colonies of the exposure of members of the educated West Indian and African elite to racism on the streets of Britain were all too obvious.”

Under these prevailing circumstances the British government resolved to educate East Africans locally. In that context, politics became a determining factor in the formulation of British imperial policy on education post-World War I.

From the 1920s onwards, British policy was governed by the assumption that political independence was a foreseeable endpoint at some remote future time. For that reason, colonial subjects had to be prepared for the time when they would be expected to run their own affairs independent of their colonial masters. This British thinking paved the way for the development of higher education in East Africa.

Similarly, Africans in general stressed the need for higher education because they believed that this level of education would enhance and, later, consolidate their political independence. In East Africa, this thirst for education contributed, however little, to the need for the establishment of the Federal University. Thus, both the British government and its appointees on the one hand and African constituencies on the other shared the same view that there was a need for higher education in East Africa. The locus of the tensions that subsequently emerged between these constituencies was over the manner in which such education could be acquired without causing further political instability in the region. It is here that political wrangling ensued and took centre stage.

There was considerable pressure exerted mainly by chiefs and African political groups on the colonial government to establish schools of full secondary status with the hope – in the cases of Budo in Uganda and the Alliance High School in Kenya – that these schools might in future develop into fully-fledged universities and thus quench East Africa’s thirst for higher education.

In the meantime, East Africans were determined to acquire higher education wherever it was available. Molonket Olokoriyaa ole Sempel, a Keekonyokie Maasai, sold his cattle in 1908 and left for North Carolina with his missionary friends who had been working for the Africa Inland Mission (AIM) in East Africa. This meant that those East Africans who had the means to leave the region could do so at any time – be it for religious or educational reasons.

The general practice was that parents who had the money, especially East African chiefs, sent their children abroad to pursue their education. These students include inter alia, Peter (who later went by the name Mbiyu) Koinange, the son of Chief Koinange. Mbiyu Koinange did his
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undergraduate work at Hampton and Ohio Wesleyan University and then proceeded to the Universities of Columbia and Cambridge for his postgraduate studies before returning to Kenya where he held several ministerial portfolios. Some students from poor families secured overseas scholarships and travelled to any country where the scholarships were obtainable. Some of these East African students travelled to Tuskegee, Alabama in the Southern United States of America.

The Tuskegee Institute was popularised in Africa by Marcus Garvey’s publication called the *Negro World*. This newspaper found its way to Uganda and, later, to Kenya.5 Through the *Negro World* “Garvey’s voice reverberated inside Africa itself.”6 The arrival of this illustrious newspaper in East Africa was, according to one of the witnesses, a new ‘sensational development’.7 The *Negro World* had a ‘beautiful’ portrayal of outstanding African Americans and therefore played a pivotal role in advertising ‘Negro Colleges’. Consequently more Ugandans developed an interest in African American education and aspired to travel to America to further their education. In 1921, Joswa Kamulegeya, Secretary of the Young Baganda Association (YBA), secured a place for his younger Brother, Danieri Kato through Robert Moton, President of Tuskegee Institute with whom he had been corresponding for about two years. Another Ugandan student was Hosea Nyabongo, nephew of the Omukama of Toro, who entered Tuskegee at the beginning of 1922.8

In the early 1920s, the interest expressed by the young East Africans in American education made both the British government and the colonial governments apprehensive about the possible political repercussions of these travels abroad. In the case of Uganda, the colonial government, concerned about the prospects of political agitation among the youths, was forced to think about approving a school in a country where young Africans from Uganda were not likely to be imbued with the spirit of disaffection or disloyalty.9 The appointees of the British government working in different departments resolved to control the movement of the young East Africans to ensure that they were not exposed to ‘dangerous’ ideas while studying abroad. Furley and Watson summarise the disapproval of overseas education by East African colonial governments. They argue that these authorities much preferred to deal with Africans who had received a home-grown education, and thought that a foreign product might prove to have evolved too suddenly in a different world, becoming impatient with the conditions he found on his return to East Africa after completing the studies abroad. They recall that America, Britain and West Africa were all frowned because in all places the East African student “might encounter politicians and political movements considerably more militant than any in his own country, and he might realise that educational standards in his own country were very low by comparison.”10 India and South Africa were thought less politically dangerous. There was, therefore, less opposition
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to students going there. But the very fact that there was such a movement prompted the first official admission that there ought to be a higher college in East Africa.

One revelation made by this citation is that the British government was in a dilemma. On the one hand it needed educated East Africans whom it could use to develop the region, yet East Africa lacked educational facilities to produce such people. On the other hand the British government could not tolerate to see these young East Africans travelling abroad in pursuit of higher education fearing that they might be vulnerable to political influence while they were there. This was a conundrum and there was no easy solution that British authorities could come up with.

It is clear, therefore, that none of the constituencies enumerated above could in any way divorce education from politics. The two were intertwined and interdependent. In the next few pages I will analyse these political tensions with a view to demonstrating how they each contributed to the establishment of the University of East Africa.

**East African agitation for higher education**

Soon after the end of World War I, East Africans used different forums to articulate their views regarding the benefits which were deemed to accrue from higher education. The YBA, which was formed in Uganda in 1919, became the mouthpiece of the young Baganda on political and educational matters. In 1919, it invited Reverend C.F. Andrews, a British clergyman who was visiting Uganda, to address it. The meeting took place at Assembly Hall in Kampala. Joswa Kamulegeya, the Association’s Secretary, introduced the YBA to Reverend Andrews and stated *inter alia*: “Now, Sir, Uganda is a country which is growing amongst the civilized people and races and is in very bad need of high education to enable her people to meet the modern affairs.”

Kamulegeya asked Reverend Andrews to help the YBA in any way possible so that it could make higher education easily or better accessible to the youths of Uganda. In his view, Britain’s conspicuous reluctance to develop higher education in Uganda had a political motivation – the fear that once these young Baganda obtained their education they would probably use it to challenge British policies on education, politics and general administration. Kamulegeya continued:

> Now, Sir, we are proud to say that we are true friends to the British Government, far better than any other colony, because the famous King Mutesa invited them and preferred the protection of British Government to any other Government but on the other hand Government [British] do not trust us as they should.

In his view, lack of higher educational facilities in Uganda was a deliberate British imperial policy which had to be challenged and discouraged at all cost.
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Two years later, the YBA wrote to its friends, the Negro Farmers’ Conference in Tuskegee Alabama, explaining why it believed that the need for education in Uganda was so urgent. The letter 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 …”13 These young Baganda understood that education was indeed a sine-qua-non to their political and economic freedom and that without it they would remain perpetual minors under British domination.

It was this belief that inspired the YBA to submit a memorandum to the colonial government authorities in the Uganda Protectorate in 1921 requesting, *inter alia*, that the government should establish a department of education; introduce secularised education; and provide scholarships for Africans who wanted to go and study abroad.14 The views espoused in the memorandum echoed the three objects of the Association, which were stated as follows:

(i) To improve Uganda in every possible way;
(ii) To give a helping hand to deserved Muganda who may be in distress; and
(iii) To see the best way to enable us to get and maintain our education.15

This African initiative had a long-lasting effect on the overall development of higher education in East Africa and thus made a significant contribution to the establishment of the Federal University of East Africa.

**Responses by the Colonial and the British Governments**

Sir Robert Coryndon, Uganda’s Governor between 1918 and 1922, was highly impressed by the memorandum from the YBA and resolved to improve the existing educational facilities in Uganda. He envisaged prospects for some form of technical and vocational education for Africans. However, his reaction was not a gesture of altruism; the rationale behind his resolution to develop local educational facilities in Uganda was mainly “to curb the growing Baganda hunger for advanced [secondary] education in Ceylon, South Africa, the Sudan and Tuskegee College in America.”16 Governor Coryndon feared that if these young Baganda travelled abroad they would be exposed to political agitation and, later, cause him problems when they returned home after completing their studies. In his correspondence with Winston Churchill, Colonial Secretary, the Governor stated that he regarded with special anxiety “a desire, which has become more marked of late, on the part of several chiefs of different tribes, to send their sons to America, and notably to the great institution of Tuskegee for education.”17 His greatest fear
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was that these young men\textsuperscript{18} would fall prey to Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA).\textsuperscript{19} Governor Coryndon confided in his letter to the Colonial Secretary, that he was not comfortable about the migration of East African students to schools like the Tuskegee Institute because leaders of Negro political aspirations in the Southern states of America might seize the opportunity to influence and actually educate the sons of the African chiefs politically – something that would affect East Africa negatively.

But Coryndon was not alone in expressing these fears. A District Commissioner in Lango, Uganda, for example, espoused the same view. He warned British education officers in Uganda against sending the native abroad for further education as follows:

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

The colonial government in Uganda was in a predicament. On the one hand it was determined to see the young East Africans from Uganda acquire higher education so that they could be of better service in their Protectorate. On the other hand it was mindful of the possible political implication of allowing young East Africans to travel abroad to pursue higher education, fearing that the students’ political agitation could cause anarchy in the region at a later stage. Consequently, Governor Coryndon gave a negative response to the requests for overseas scholarships made by the YBA. He subsequently consulted the British Colonial Office to obtain its consent to refuse all passports for Ugandans who wished to travel to Tuskegee. Churchill accepted Coryndon’s request and the ban began. The fear of the British Government was that if these youths were allowed to travel abroad for their education, they “might fall into the wrong company – critics of the colonial system – or, at least, be exposed to certain streams of thought which, although allowed expression at home, would be dangerous if they fell into the ears of colonial subjects.”\textsuperscript{21}

But Governor Coryndon and Churchill’s decision to prevent Ugandan students from travelling abroad to pursue their education was only a short-term solution; it did not resolve the tensions between East Africans and the colonial governments. Confining students to East Africa without providing the necessary educational facilities needed caused political agitation between East African youths and representative bodies such as the YBA. The British Colonial Office then recommended that East African students should be allowed to travel abroad to further their education but must be restricted to study in Britain and should be placed under the Colonial Students Scheme to ensure that they were kept under control than would be the case when they travelled to Tuskegee.

This proposal shifted the locus of the tensions from East Africa to the British Colonial Office. Mr Cecil Bottomley at the Colonial Office strongly supported this idea, arguing that it would provide the students with the kind of education they needed to develop their colonies while

\textsuperscript{18} At this time girls’ education received very little attention. The majority of East African students who travelled abroad were males.
\textsuperscript{19} For details about Garveyism, Pan-Africanism and UNIA, see: Martin, \textit{Race First}.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}
insulating them from political contamination to which they were likely to be exposed in other countries. Mr H.J. Read, another Colonial Office official, was not impressed by this proposal. Instead, he proposed the establishment of a Higher Education College in East Africa for all the British dependencies in that region. This proposed college, he argued, would serve two purposes. First, it would provide the necessary educational facilities in East Africa. Second, and most importantly, it would insulate young East Africans from the possible political influence in other countries. Churchill directed that the Ugandan natives who were eager to travel to Alabama should be restricted to Britain and that the numbers should be kept to the minimum. The rationale behind Churchill’s directive was to ensure that East Africa would not have more trained students than it could employ, because that might lead to political disturbances caused by frustrated graduates. Therefore, Churchill’s directive only provided a temporal solution to Uganda’s endemic educational problems. Also, Churchill, unlike Read, did not consider East Africa as a region but only focused particularly on Uganda. Therefore even if the Ugandan problem was resolved the potential for tensions in East Africa would have remained intact for a very long time.

Mr Ezechiel, Director of the Colonial Scholars who was responsible for the supervision of private students in Britain, implemented Churchill’s directive by bringing Ugandans under his control. This development set Churchill’s plan in motion. When the students arrived in Britain, the political factor played itself out once again. Mr Ezechiel discouraged them from taking courses in law or general arts so as to avoid politicisation. Instead, he urged the students to do medicine and engineering, in part because these skills were desperately needed in Uganda, but mainly because these courses had no potential for political influence to the students. Liberal education “could result in frustration for such Africans, who would then begin to question the colonial set-up. African education would have to be compatible with the security of British rule in Uganda.”

Geoffrey Archer, Uganda’s Governor between 1922 and 1925 and William Gower, who became Uganda’s Governor between 1925 and 1932, worked towards the development of educational facilities in Uganda. Governor Archer invited Eric Hussey, an education officer who was involved in educational development in Sudan, to advise him on the development of educational facilities in Uganda. Hussey suggested that the technical school at Makerere should be transformed into a central training college for East Africa. According to Hussey, the envisioned training college would produce the urgently needed manpower in East Africa while at the same time containing the young East Africans. In 1925, Hussey became Uganda’s first Director of Education and had to implement the proposals he had made the previous year in a different capacity.

Thus, the British government temporarily succeeded in preventing East Africans from being politicised at overseas institutions such as Tuskegee Institute. Therefore the British government, the colonial government in Uganda under Governor Coryndon, and East Africans themselves all played their various roles in bringing about the inter-territorial higher education college at Makerere. Kenneth King writes: “In its own way, however, this African enthusiasm for education in the American South was one of the reasons that led the Uganda Government to establish a
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form of higher education locally, in the new Makerere College." This is an irrefutable analysis of the context.

One of the British authorities with a keen interest in the tensions that occurred between East Africans and the colonial government in Uganda regarding Tuskegee’s role in the development of higher education in East Africa was E.L. Scott. He conceded that preventing East Africans from going to Tuskegee was not a long-term solution to the problem. Scott articulated his views on higher education in his memorandum as follows: “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 time by providing an advanced course of study locally.”

It is clear from the above that from the early 1920s there were tensions between different constituencies in Britain and in East Africa regarding the development of higher education. The first locus of the tensions was on whether or not it was right to provide higher education for young East Africans. One view was that there was a need to educate East Africans for their own benefit and that of the colonial governments. An opposing view was that it was dangerous to educate young East Africans because they would become radicals afterwards. Another locus of the tensions was on whether this education could be obtained anywhere or from meticulously selected countries overseas, or locally. There were proponents of each view. The idea of establishing an East African college emanated from this political context. A closer reading of the second Phelps-Stokes Commission Report of 1925 leads to the conclusion that tensions regarding East African education were inevitable because there were many constituencies, each of which had its own expectations from and held its own assumptions about the East African natives. In 1925, Thomas Jesse Jones, the editor of the Phelps-Stokes Report, summarised these diverse positions as follows:

The attitude of the missionaries has been determined by their desire to impart their religious ideas to the Native people and to win them to a Christian way of life. The government officials have naturally thought of the colonial administration and have felt the necessity for clerical help and such skilled workers as are needed for the surveying of roads and other means of transportation. Settlers and traders have been concerned for the various needs of their special occupations. The traders have joined the Government in a demand for clerks. The settlers’ demand has been primarily for laborers to till the soil and to carry on the varied activities of the farms.

There was an acknowledgement of the fact that these diversities of view were further intensified by the attitude taken toward the native people. Some recognised the principle of trusteeship and desire to assist the Natives to realise their full capacities as human beings. However, others thought of them as economic assets to be exploited for the satisfaction of the party in control. In all the Colonies visited the first responsibility of the Commission was to eliminate aims that were evidently antagonistic to the best interests of the Natives and of the Colony and to harmonise those aims that were deemed natural, reasonable and desirable in the development of Africa and Africans.

---
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In a nutshell, the rationale behind the British Government’s development of higher education in East Africa and, later, in other colonies in the British Empire, was threefold:

(i) to pacify radical indigenous youths who showed thirst for knowledge;
(ii) to confine these youths to their respective colonies so that they could not be exposed to political agitation abroad; and
(iii) to preserve its own image in global politics by proving to the world that it was responsive to the needs of its colonial subjects.

Political tensions in East Africa during the 1930s

The 1930s constitute a significant signpost in the history of higher education in Africa in general and in East Africa in particular. There is a general view that by this time “perceptive observers began to see that future constitutional development in Africa depended more on the educated elite than on the hitherto favoured traditional rulers. Consequently, the demand for higher education began to be listened to with better understanding.”29 From this time, there was an unprecedented drive by the British Government to formulate a consistent policy with regard to university education for Africans. There was the first attempt by the British Government to use the “sacred” taxpayers’ money to fund a scheme of higher education in Africa.30 The question then becomes: Why was there such a change of mind?

Some answers to this question could be gleaned from the preceding section. One of the main reasons for this change of mind by the British government was that Britain’s colonial policies were being criticised both domestically and internationally. Gradually, this became unsettling to the Colonial Office in London and to British imperial thought in general. The British Government had two difficult options: to overhaul its higher education policies in the colonies or to remain unresponsive to the criticisms. The British government realised that the latter option would be to its own peril if it aspired to remain a dominant figure in the international scene. Thus, under these circumstances the British colonial policy on higher education had to be overhauled so as to bring it in harmony with Britain’s broad and long-term imperial objectives.

Yet, British constituencies in London and in East Africa had divergent opinions on the mode of operation and the pace at which the development of East African higher education could be carried out. The British Prime Ministers, the Secretaries of State for the Colonies, and the British Members of Parliament perceived themselves as the sole custodians of the East African territories. Overseas appointees of the British government, especially the Governors and Directors of Education, worked on the assumption that they were closer to the reality on the ground and therefore understood the educational needs in East Africa better than their counterparts in London. Naturally, they felt that they were better qualified to decide both the future of East African higher education and the pace at which that future should be nurtured. Inevitably, this disjunction between the centre and the periphery meant that the development of higher education in East Africa would continue to be characterised by latent tensions.

The following sub-section demonstrates how political factors influenced the recommendations of the Currie Sub-Committee Report and discusses the tensions that occurred between the British government and its East African Governors and Directors of Education regarding the development of higher education in that region.

The political influence on the Currie Report

The Currie Report was initiated by the Conference of the Directors of Education from Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar. It was held in Zanzibar in June 1932. The conference had been convened to discuss the state of education in East Africa. At the end of the Conference the Directors were uncertain about whether Makerere should adopt London examinations or continue to set its own locally. They approached the Advisory Committee for advice and the latter responded by appointing the Currie Sub-Committee, which subsequently produced the Currie Report in December 1933.

The recommendations of the Currie Report regarding the development of higher education in Anglophone Africa were largely politically motivated. The report had its eyes focused on the future; it anticipated the political repercussions of the failure by the British government to address the educational needs of its African communities and extrapolated how this would tarnish Britain’s image in the global scene. Paragraph IV of the Report captures this point elegantly. It points out that there was a grave danger 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. It noted that there appeared no prospect that the prevailing vehement demand for higher education would slacken off. It then concluded that if that demand was not adequately met by a natural development in Africa itself under the wise control, which only British Government and experience could afford, it would “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.”

The citation puts it beyond doubt that Britain’s global political image was at stake. To save it, the Currie Report thus recommended that the only right policy for the British government was to decide on a scheme of developing selected institutions in Africa up to a real University standard. The Currie Report recommended that the envisaged African University Colleges had to all proceed through the same stages by which University Colleges in England (e.g. Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, and Reading) had gained university status. It recommended that as the African students already had a close relationship with London University, and considered its degrees as ‘the hall-mark they require’, it would be prudent to approach the University of London to establish if it would be willing to guide African University colleges.

The Currie Sub-Committee was always mindful of the political implications of its recommendations. Its consciousness is encapsulated in paragraph VI. Among other things, it stated that the Sub-Committee regarded the announcement as of the highest importance to avoid any action that might excite African suspicion. It felt that it had to be made clear at the outset that

---

the adoption of the proposed scheme did not involve the Government putting any hindrance whatsoever in the way of any Africans who might still be determined to proceed to Europe for University training. However, there was no doubt (in such a case) that the Government might reasonably decline to grant any financial assistance. The Sub-Committee insisted that it had to be emphasised that nothing in the scheme was meant to discourage postgraduate students from proceeding overseas. On the contrary the proposals would envisage a steady increase in the number of such students directed upon Europe from the new African Universities, but at a riper age, and with a previous training better calculated to enable them to take advantage of European facilities than was the case at the time. The most important point was that “largely increased and improved facilities at infinitely lower cost would be made available to young Africans in their home country.” 32 Most importantly, it would be necessary to clear the native mind of any suspicion that the African Universities were a sham, designed merely to sidetrack native ambitions. The Sub-Committee buttressed this by citing a Government declaration that the degrees and diplomas granted by such Universities would rank equally with those of extra-African Universities in respect of Government. Such declaration would be implemented in administrative practice.

The Currie Report stressed the need to involve local African communities when planning these University Colleges. The rationale for making this recommendation was to ensure that the new African institutions of higher education did not in any way arouse political agitation among the local African communities by being unresponsive to their immediate needs. Further, the Report recommended that there was a need for the co-ordination of effort between different territories to ensure that the few resources available in the region were consolidated and used to provide education same in quality to that obtaining at Western universities. The Report stated: “It is encouraging in this connexion that, in East Africa, Kenya and Tanganyika are looking definitely to Makerere to meet the need in higher education of the whole East African area.”33

The overall vision of the Currie Sub-Committee can be gauged from one of its concluding paragraphs which stated: “We believe that the passion of the African for higher education, properly guided, may prove a boon to the economic, social and cultural development of the country, and an advantage, support and ornament to British rule. Neglected it must create social and political confusion.”34

It is clear from these recommendations that the members of the Currie Sub-Committee were mindful of the politics that characterised the 1930s and thus ensured that the political mood of the time was reflected in their recommendations. Ajayi, Goma and Johnson provide the broad political context and the emerging tensions. They argue that a major consideration with the Sub-Committee was the political implications of the new interest in studying in America which the return of Aggrey and the doctrines of Marcus Garvey and the Pan-African movement had generated not among would-be African pastors and missionaries, but among young radical nationalists like Nnamdi Azikiwe, Kwame Nkrumah and others. They opine that some members of the Advisory Committee may have begun to question the wisdom of basing British imperial policies so firmly on ideas generated in the United States. At any rate, the Committee “seemed to have begun to distance itself from orthodox Phelps-Stokes ideas and to move towards

32 Ibid., par. VI.
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accepting the necessity for an African educated elite. However, unlike the French, they preferred to have such an elite trained in African institutions where they could be better influenced than at British or American universities.35

According to Furley and Watson, James Currie was an imaginative, farsighted man with much sympathy for African aspirations, and “a more down-to-earth awareness that political demands should be met wherever possible, otherwise trouble would follow.”36 These authors base their submission on the fact that the Sub-Committee under Currie’s guidance preempted political tensions between Africans and the British government and anticipated the main phases through which universities in Anglophone Africa would pass before gaining an independent status. However, despite this alertness the Currie Report received mixed reactions from many quarters – both individuals and institutions with vested interest in the administration of British possessions in Africa and their parts of the world, as well as the development of higher education in East Africa.

**Political tensions caused by the Currie Report**

The British Colonial Office adopted the Currie Report in 1933. The Report was never published, but was made available to the public on request. It was circulated to all British Governors in both East and West Africa for comments. Soon thereafter, tensions emerged between the British government and its Governors and Directors of Education in East and West Africa. As the British government found the Currie Report impressive and forward-looking, the Governors and Directors of Education did not think that it deserved urgent attention since, in their view, there was no educational crisis in Africa and therefore no urgent pressure to address the question. These tensions stalled the process.

East African Governors received the Currie Report from the Colonial Office early in 1934 but showed no enthusiasm in pursuing its recommendations. However, persistent reminders from the Colonial Office forced the Governors to come forward with their reactions to the Report. East African Governors subsequently referred the Report to their Ministers of Education for consideration. Education authorities in East Africa met in Nairobi in January 1935 to consider the Report and disagreed with its conclusion that the demand for higher education in East Africa was ‘vehement’. In May 1935, educational officials from West Africa convened a special meeting in Lagos to examine the Report. But like their East African counterparts, they did not feel that the demand for higher education was urgent. This delay was indicative of local official opinion. It was “a symptom of the indifference of white administrators on the spot.”37

Why were the British local administrators in Africa so reluctant to accept and implement the recommendations of the Currie Report? Furley and Watson address this question by arguing that despite his political consciousness, Currie “had not reckoned with one issue which his proposal was bound to raise: the political one, that a rise in the number of African graduates would be a major contribution to political evolution and the demand for self-rule – a prospect which most colonial administrators of the time were unwilling to promote.”38 This submission

underscores the importance of analysing the role played by politics in the development of higher education in East Africa.

The Currie Report aroused political tensions at both ends of the power equation. As mentioned earlier, the British Colonial Office developed higher education in order to insulate East Africans from possible political agitation which might disturb the political equilibrium in the region. On their part, East African Directors of Education feared that its implementation would produce radical graduates who would challenge the colonial governments on the ground. These adversarial views sustained existing tensions.

In September 1935, H. Jowitt, then Director of Education in Uganda, left for Britain on leave. While he was there the ACEC invited him to meet with the Currie Sub-Committee to explain the source of the negative attitude of East African Directors of Education to the idea of establishing a University in East Africa. Mr Jowitt informed the Sub-Committee that East African Directors of Education were neither apathetic nor totally averse to the idea. They were particularly concerned about a possible vicious circle that could result – with Makerere waiting on the development of secondary schools, and the secondary schools waiting on expansion at Makerere. Whether Jowitt articulated the views of his colleagues, or represented Uganda’s position on the matter, or was simply expressing his own personal opinion remains a moot point.

The meeting between Jowitt and the Sub-Committee nevertheless recommended the appointment of a small influential Commission that would be sent to Uganda to study the existing educational situation, and advise the Colonial Office back in London on the prospect of developing Makerere College into a University College for the whole of East Africa. The British Colonial Office approved this recommendation. Governor Philip Mitchell39, alone among his colleagues, warmly accepted the recommendation that Makerere College should be developed into a regional University College. He embraced in principle the idea of appointing a Commission to visit Uganda. However, the final decision to appoint the Commission had to wait for the next meeting of the Directors of Education in East Africa scheduled for May 1936. After that meeting, W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed the De la Warr Commission towards the end of 1936, which was discussed in Chapter 2.

Kagenda Atwoki in the early 1970s described Governor Mitchell as “the most instrumental colonial governor in the formulation of the policies on which Makerere was launched into university activities.”40 To what extent were Governor Mitchell’s efforts to establish an East African institution of higher learning influenced by politics? Why did he differ with his two counterparts from Kenya and Tanganyika? What were his motives for developing Makerere? Some answers to these questions can be gleaned from Governor Mitchell’s address to the Higher College Conference held at Makerere in May 1938. He espoused the view that no civilisation in the world had arisen, nor could our civilisation be established and take root in these countries upon any other foundation than an aristocracy of culture which must be very small in numbers. He continued: “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.”41

39 Philip Mitchell became the Governor of Uganda towards the end of 1935.
41 Philip Mitchell, Address to the Higher College Conference, Makerere, Kampala, Uganda, May 1938.
For Mitchell, Britain stood to gain from the establishment of a University College in East Africa because he believed that in addition to providing educational facilities for East Africans, the institution would serve as a centre for the promotion of British culture and civilisation. So, one of Governor Mitchell’s aims was to sustain British influence in East Africa; the political developments in Uganda created a conducive atmosphere in which he could fulfil his aims. One scholar noted: “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 of the indirect rule system. Primarily the Baganda chiefs desired 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.”

It is clear from the above discussion that the recommendations of the Currie Report were politically motivated. Secondly, the divergent views held by different British officials about the recommendations of the Currie Report were also inspired by political factors. Two views ran parallel to each other. First was the view that higher educational facilities had to be made available to East Africans so as to prevent them from travelling abroad and be exposed to political agitation. Second was the view that it was dangerous to educate young East Africans, at home or abroad, because once they obtained their education they might challenge British administration and thus tarnish Britain’s global image. These tensions meant that political wrangling would characterise the development of higher education in East Africa.

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 had a dual impact on higher education in East Africa. As discussed in Chapter 2, on the one hand it significantly slowed down the pace of the construction work that had just begun at Makerere College. On the other hand, however, the war ushered in a new phase in the history of African higher education by inspiring the British government to develop educational policies that accelerated the pace of establishing the Federal University.

**Political developments during World War II, 1939-1945**

The declaration of war on Germany by Britain on 3 September 1939 marked the beginning of a new phase in British imperial policy on higher education in Anglophone Africa. As Edward Shils aptly puts it: “The coming of the war of 1939 to 1945 changed much in the world; it had its effects on universities too.” The political factor played a significant role in influencing British imperial policy on education during this time. The Colonial Development and Welfare Act (CD &WA) of 1940 placed more emphasis on education and provided funds for research on subjects such as Agriculture and Science. Different constituencies in Britain interpreted this move in political terms. The Fabian Colonial Bureau and other critics of the Empire argued that this ‘generous’ CD &WA was similar to a bribe to the colonial peoples whose support was desperately needed by the British government in its war effort. The CD &WA “served as a good weapon of defence against those particularly Americans, who insisted that Britain was running a ‘slummy’ empire by ignoring measures that would advance the prosperity and social welfare

---
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of the colonial subjects.” The British government had to prove to the world at large that its Empire was intact and also progressive. As the war continued the British government considered its political and economic position in the post-war era and started planning for peace. In June 1941, Lord Moyne, Chief Secretary, intimated that it was the desire of His Majesty’s Government that Colonial Governments should on the one hand prepare for rapid action after the war and on the other hand do all they could to improve standards even during the war. He referred to his mention of the desirability of laying plans to make rapid progress possible after the war. In conclusion, he reiterated: “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.”

When the war ended, Ugandan authorities seriously turned to the needs of technical education. They were inspired by the fact that hundreds of Ugandan men had been demobilised, and the colonial government was compelled to find them employment. Also, with the end of the war, there was demand for expansion in public works and social services. Uganda needed people with medical and commercial training. The development of technical training thus became necessary.

The purpose of this section is simply to demonstrate how political factors became the driving force behind policy decisions that were made by the British government and its appointees in East Africa during the course of World War II. It demonstrates the political influences behind the Channon Memorandum of 1940, the Channon Report of 1943, and the Asquith Commission Report of 1945. Furthermore, it analyses the debates that took place in the British parliament (in the House of Commons and the House of Lords) during this time.

**The Channon Memorandum and tensions between British constituencies**

The Channon Memorandum was not sanctioned by the Colonial Office in London and therefore did not have terms of reference. It was an individual effort by Liverpool University’s Professor Channon, a Member of the Colonial Office Advisory Committee, to ruminate about British thought regarding colonial education. The primary aim of this Memorandum is encapsulated in its sub-title: ‘Some Observations on the Development of Higher Education in the Colonies’. The Memorandum was inspired by Channon’s visit to Malaya, University of Hong Kong and University College, Colombo; his attendance at the meetings of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies and his reading of various reports on education in the British colonies. Channon stated his aim thus:

> 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 [emphasis mine].

The role played by the Channon Memorandum in the appointment of the Channon Sub-Committee and the Asquith Commission, and its impact on the recommendations made by
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the two bodies was discussed in Chapter 2. The purpose of this section is simply to analyse the
Channon Memorandum by discussing the tensions it identified between British constituencies
regarding the development of higher education in the colonies and by demonstrating that
although Channon argued that the purpose of the Memorandum was to clear his own mind it
eventually became a blueprint for the development of higher education in the British colonies
after World War II.

Channon argued that there were tensions between British constituencies regarding the
development of higher education in the colonies and identified two parallel positions: one
conceding that the development of higher education in the colonies was inevitable; another
postulating 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 because the graduates might challenge
colonial policies. Channon summarised these tensions by stating that the attitude of mind often
found in government and commercial circles regarding university development in the Colonies
appeared to be somewhat reluctant recognition that universities must ultimately be created.
He noted that this was usually combined with a hope that the day of achievement might be
postponed for as long as possible. “There is, in fact,” he continued, “a genuine fear of the
political and economic consequences of the production of a highly educated class among the
native populations, and in this connection the example of India is usually and understandably
quoted.”

According to Channon, the fears expressed by certain interested parties about the possible
ill-effects of the anticipated mass production of university students were understandable but
groundless. He argued that they were based on wrong assumptions and that those who spread
such fears failed to realise that the difficulties in the past had arisen because the fundamental
principles underlying the conception of university education had not been carefully thought
through by British imperial thinkers. Channon suggested that a university should desist from
being a mass production vocational machine through which are passed, regardless of their
future livelihoods, students of different mental calibre but of great capacity for memorising
facts. Instead, it had to be “a place where carefully chosen young people of adequate mental
attainments are fitted to take their places in the different professions, but at the same time are
given the outlook necessary for them to play their part as citizens in the much wider sense.”

Channon sustained this view in paragraph 7, arguing:

If we are to develop universities in the colonies, their vital objective at this stage must not be
the production of large numbers of men and women with no more than a highly specialised
technical knowledge; it should be the production of smaller numbers who, while they must
be adequately prepared for their future professional livelihoods, must go further and be
prepared for wider service.

Channon suggested that British universities should guide University Colleges towards achieving
an independent status; that they should second staff to the University Colleges for up to three
years and; that such staff should conduct research on special subjects (which he did not specify)
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until there were sufficient funds to allow for research in other subjects. Channon concluded his Memorandum as follows:

My concern is that we should take a broader view of the problems of Higher Education in the Colonies and direct our policy accordingly. We should endeavour to control future events rather than wait until the pressure of events makes it necessary to take action.51

As mentioned above, Channon began his Memorandum by stating that it had been inspired by his own curiosity. But his recommendations were geared towards formulating a clear policy on higher education in British colonies everywhere. He suggested the phases colonial colleges had to go through before attaining full university status. Furthermore, Channon considered the possible political effects of British policy on higher education (or lack thereof) on the image of the British government hence his reiteration of Churchill and Governor Mitchell’s view that few colonial subjects should be given access to higher education. Therefore, the political factor played a profound role in shaping Channon’s thoughts.

The significance of the Channon Memorandum to British imperial policy on higher education was twofold. Firstly, it revealed the intrinsic tensions between different British constituencies and identified the source(s) of those tensions. Secondly, it made recommendations on the way forward, thus initiating a process that would lead to the establishment of University Colleges in the British Empire after World War II. The Channon Memorandum led to the appointment of the Channon Sub-Committee and, later, the Asquith Commission, both of which retained Channon’s basic recommendations.

**Politics and the Channon Report**

The political context in which the development of higher education in East Africa was planned during the course of World War II is elegantly articulated in the Channon Report of May 1943. Channon’s Report was concerned particularly with the development to full university status of educational institutions in East Africa, West Africa and Malaya. This focus bolsters the relevance of the present section in our analysis. The preemptive nature of the Channon Report can be gauged from paragraph 6, which states, inter alia that during the war the British Government had emphasised that the guiding principle of its colonial policy was that the Colonies would become increasingly self-governing as the degree of their development made the carrying out of the policy possible. According to this trajectory, these public pronouncements of policy would lead the colonial peoples rightly to expect that active help in their own development would come from Great Britain after the war. There was no doubt that there would be a spontaneous and vigorous impulse for self-development among the colonial peoples in the immediate post-war period. Preparations had to be made to satisfy this impulse. Long-term plans had to be made so that the course of future events might as far as possible be pre-determined. Unless such plans were so prepared, it was felt that “pressure of events will later compel action to be taken, and action taken under pressure lacks the ordered sequence necessary to success.”52

---

In making their recommendations on post-war education policy in the British colonies the Members of Channon’s Sub-Committee\textsuperscript{53} were particularly influenced by the possible political advantages of such recommendations and expressed their views, emphasising that there was no doubt whatsoever that the immediate post-war period would provide a unique opportunity for a vivid demonstration of the seriousness of their intentions towards development of the Colonies. The feeling was that it was an opportunity which it would be both shortsighted and dangerous to lose, for the particular combination of circumstances would not recur. Wisely taken, it would not only bring inspiration to the Colonies themselves, “but the results would be of great political value within the Empire as a whole, and might even provide a pattern to other countries.”\textsuperscript{54}

Channon’s Sub-Committee had no doubt whatsoever that planning universities like the University of East Africa would need more money. However, it felt that there would be a greater return in the end. The Sub-Committee endorsed the point made in Channon’s Memorandum regarding the need to avoid political agitation among colonial students. Paragraph 30 of the Channon Report stated that it was essential to educate the governments in the colonies, academic staff teaching in colonial universities, and the general public about the aims and objectives of a university in the colonies, ‘for there is much misconception on this subject’. The Sub-Committee envisaged tensions that would arise between the British government, which did not want colonial universities to produce large numbers of graduates, and national governments that would expect such institutions to produce sufficient numbers of graduates needed to develop the new nation states. It was for this reason that the Sub-Committee felt there was an urgent need to state in explicit terms the goals of the British government regarding colonial universities.

Another site of possible tensions envisaged by the Channon Sub-Committee was between the students in the colonies and their governments whereby the governments would want to retain their students at the University Colleges while the students on the other hand aspired to travel abroad to pursue their education. The Sub-Committee considered the possible political impact of sending students abroad at an early stage and recommended that having considered the broad aspects of a possible Imperial machinery, it turned to discuss the question of study in British Universities by students from the Colonies. In its view, all experience showed that the sending of students from the Colonies to Great Britain for undergraduate study was often unfortunate in its effects, for on their return to their home country their outlook might have been changed far too radically; inevitably the graduates compared what they saw in Great Britain with what they found at home, and whereas before leaving their country they were satisfied, they subsequently found only discontent.\textsuperscript{55}

The Channon Sub-Committee recommended that postgraduate students should be encouraged to travel abroad to further their education. The assumption guiding this recommendation was that such students would be older and more mature and therefore less likely to fall prey to ‘disillusionment and worldly temptation’ than undergraduates. In the Sub-Committee’s view, it might be desirable to award scholarships to students who had spent at least a year as junior members of staff in their home institutions because this would enable them to emerge from
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their student outlook and respond to new situations obtaining abroad like adults. Channon’s Sub-Committee conceded that politics was indeed the motivating factor in its recommendations when it stated:

> Throughout this Report, we have emphasized our opinion that it is vital both from the educational and political point of view that the home Universities should now undertake to give active help in the development of Universities in the Colonies.\(^{56}\)

The Sub-Committee reiterated the relationship between politics and education in the last few lines of the concluding paragraph, stating:

> We ourselves are incapable of doing more than to provide a sketch of the problem as a whole; its solution must lie in more expert hands, and its political and educational importance with their wide implications are such that we consider an authoritative enquiry to be essential.\(^{57}\)

The tone of the Channon Report suggests that the authors were mindful of the political climate under which they were working. In making their recommendations they anticipated political tensions that would occur soon after the war. Overall, the Channon Report demonstrated that higher education could not be divorced from politics and that educational policies had to reflect the political climate of the time.

An analysis of British parliamentary debates reveals that British politicians discussed political issues like self-government concurrently with higher education because they believed that the two were interlinked. These politicians espoused the view that institutions of higher education were indispensable in the consolidation of political institutions. Oliver Stanley, Secretary of State for the Colonies, argued in 1943 that if the goal of the British government regarding self-rule was to be achieved at all colonial universities and colleges would have to play an immense part in that process. He stated that universities would meet the enormously increased need for trained professionals, which the increased social and economic services would necessitate. They would have to provide agriculturalists, engineers, doctors, teachers, veterinary surgeons and specialist technicians that would be in demand once self-rule had been achieved. Stanley continued to say that the problem was to encourage the constructive growth of these Colonial universities and colleges and to accelerate their wise development. He deemed it clear that in that task the British had to look to their home universities for guidance and help. Those universities had already done a great deal for the Colonies. They had already done a great deal of indirect service by training the men and women who had since gone out to the Colonies in various capacities. He concluded: “I believe that much as they have done in the past, they can do a great deal more in future.”\(^{58}\)

Creech Jones argued that there was a relationship between politics and education and inferred that if Britain were to compete with other world powers like Russia, she had to develop education at all levels in the Empire. Creech Jones lamented:

\(^{56}\) *Ibid.*, par. 98.  
\(^{57}\) *Ibid.*, par. 103.  
When one meets Africans, what do they say? – ‘The Russians have abolished illiteracy in their country. What are you doing about it inside the British Empire?’ It is difficult for us to answer that question. Therefore I ask that there should be a great drive for the provision of educational facilities for the colonial peoples.59

This self-introspection augured well for the development of higher education in East Africa.

Yet, as the need for the establishment of regional universities gained momentum the potential for tensions between British and other constituencies also increased. The British government sustained the perception that it was the sole custodian of the British colonies and assumed that planning the future of these colonies was its prerogative. John Dugdale, a British MP, asked Prime Minister Winston Churchill about the policy of the British government regarding the colonies. Churchill responded by saying that –

His Majesty’s Government are convinced that the administration of the British Colonies must continue to be the sole responsibility of Great Britain. The policy of His Majesty’s Government is to plan for the fullest possible political, economic and social development of the Colonies within the British Empire …60

This approach to overall colonial administration further increased the potential for tensions between the British government and its Governors as had happened with the Currie Report during the 1930s. Concerns about these tensions can be gleaned from the parliamentary debates in Britain. For example, Sir H. Morris-Jones asked George Hall, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, what change there had been in recent years in the relationship between the Governors and officials in the colonies and the Home Department; and to what extent this had resulted in depriving such colonial servants of the power of adaptability, resource and initiative. Hall responded by stating that it was difficult to generalise in a matter of this kind. He argued that the trend in recent years was for the Secretary of State to formulate broad lines of policy in close consultation with Colonial Governors, and to provide them with all possible assistance and guidance, but to leave the local application of policy to the Colonial Governments. So far from the qualities referred to in the second part of the Question being impaired, there was every opportunity for their exercise. “Of course”, he intimated, “war imports new conditions and it is necessary for instructions to be issued to Colonial Governments, as to other authorities, on many matters formerly left to their discretion which have now become of military or other war-time importance.”61

Sometimes there was lack of trust between British Members of Parliament and the colonial Governors. Mr Sorenson, one of the MPs in the House of Commons, asked Stanley to explain to the House: upon what qualification Governors were appointed to His Majesty’s colonies; how many they were; and did they all have previous experience of the colonies in which they were now serving as Governors? When Stanley told Sorenson that the answer to his questions would be long and therefore would have to be circulated in the Official Report, Sorenson continued:

---

“Can the right hon. and gallant Gentleman state in that reply how many of these Governors either belong to the Labour party or have opinions similar to the Labour party?” Questions like these provide a tantalising glimpse on the nature of the relationship between different constituencies in British political circles. They also explain in part the ‘schism’ between the British government and its East African Governors regarding the Currie Report.

Another locus of the tensions regarding the establishment of colonial universities was between the British Colonial Office and the University of London, although these tensions were ephemeral. In March 1943, Stanley endorsed the recommendation made in the Channon Sub-Committee Report regarding the setting up of a general Commission on higher education in the colonies. One month later, the University of London became somewhat apprehensive when it was rumoured that the Asquith Commission was being appointed and yet the University of London had no substantial information to that effect. The University was concerned that its traditional role in the colonies, through its external degree programmes which had become its source of pride, might be disregarded by the Colonial Office in the new venture. Harold Claufton, Principal of the University of London, wrote to Alexander Carr-Saunders of the University of London, School of Economics and confessed that he was “rather perturbed about our relationship with the Colonial Office.” His fear was that “matters may be maturing too fast in other directions whilst we are being left in the cold.”

According to Nwauwa, this suspicion was not unfounded; it derived from two sources. First, the University of London and the University of Oxford were rivals. Nwauwa argues that the aim of the derisory Oxford-Makerere links in 1940 had been to challenge London’s dominance in colonial education. Therefore, the rumour about the appointment of the Asquith Commission made Claufton suspicious that the Colonial Office might have approached the University of Oxford clandestinely and asked it to assist in planning colonial education. Second, Channon from the University of Liverpool had built himself a name in the early 1940s and thus became popular in the Colonial Office and the Advisory Committee of Education in the Colonies. Channon had deeply criticized the London external degree system. Thus, Claufton’s fear was that Channon might use his influence to sideline the University of London.

This apprehension was only allayed when Stanley wrote to all British universities asking them to assist the government in implementing its policy of extending university facilities to the colonies. The University of London was delighted to co-operate. Professor Frank Horton, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, assured Stanley that ‘this University, itself the pioneer through its External side in extending facilities for higher education throughout the Colonial Empire, would not be backward in its interest in any agreed schemes planned in the cause of higher education in the colonies and for the wise development of Colonial universities’. So, intermittent political tensions between different British constituencies characterised the early 1940s.

63 See: Nwauwa, Imperialism, Academe and Nationalism, 136.
64 Frank Horton to Oliver Stanley, 1 June 1943. Cited by Nwauwa, Imperialism, Academe and Nationalism, 139.
Politics and the Asquith Report

The British government redefined its relationship with the Empire during the course of World War II. Oliver Stanley reminded the British parliament that the central purpose of the colonial administration had been stated as being the doctrine of trusteeship. He then argued that the word ‘trustee’ was rather too static in its connotation and suggested:

... we should prefer to combine with the status of trustee the position also of partner ... But we are pledged to guide Colonial people along the road to self-government within the framework of the British Empire. We are pledged to build up their social and economic institutions, and we are pledged to develop their natural resources.65

The Asquith Commission was set up within this context. Consequently, its Report did not divorce politics from higher education.

The Asquith Commission worked on the assumption that University Colleges in the colonies would perform both political and educational functions. The Commission’s chapter on the place of universities and University Colleges in the development of higher education urged the early creation of universities in the colonial Empire. It stated that the main consideration in making such a decision was that His majesty’s Government had entered upon a programme of social economic development for the Colonies which was not merely the outcome of a desire to fulfil the moral obligations of the British as trustees of the welfare of Colonial peoples, but was also designed to lead to the exercise of self-government by them. In the stage preparatory to self government universities had an important part to play; they might be said to be indispensable. To them the British had to look for the production of men and women with the standard of public service and capacity for leadership which self-rule required. It was the university which could offer the best means of counteracting the influence of racial differences and sectional rivalries which impeded the formation of political institutions on national basis. The Commission concluded:

In short, we look on the establishment of universities as an inescapable corollary of any policy which aims at the achievement of Colonial self-government. We believe that there can be no more welcome proof of the sincerity of this policy than the provision at an early date of facilities for university education in the Colonies themselves.66

This recommendation leads to two conclusions. The first conclusion is that the main aim of the universities envisioned by the Asquith Commission would be to produce leaders that would assist the British government in implementing self-rule in the colonies. The focus of these universities would be a selected group of people who would be groomed for specific tasks, not the masses. Thus, the Asquith Commission, similar to Churchill in the early 1920s and Governor Mitchell in the mid-1930s, was elitist in its approach to higher education and mindful of the possible political implications of developing higher education in the colonies haphazardly. The second conclusion is that the proposed universities would pay particular attention to basic disciplines such as the humanities and the sciences – the underlying assumption being that these disciplines would be urgently needed by the new nation states to consolidate their self-rule.

66 Asquith Report, Chapter III, par. 2
The recommendations of the Asquith Commission captured the political mood of the 1940s and echoed the British colonial policy which blurred politics and higher education. One government source stated that the general policy of the United Kingdom towards its dependencies was primarily to assist them to attain self-government within the Commonwealth, furthering social and economic development to keep pace with political advance. It maintained that the colonial university was an essential feature of British colonial policy, because it was an essential condition of and preparation for the self-governing institutions which were the object of that policy.67 There was a realisation by the British government that its mode of operation regarding African education before the war had created problems and that this had to change. Captain Gammas, an MP in the House of Commons, reminded the House:

We have transplanted our own educational system into a tropical setting, and on the whole it has not been a great success. One of the worst things we ever did was to introduce the Cambridge local examinations as a sort of standard of gentility. We made the African a dissatisfied African without making him a satisfied anything.68

Gammas agitated for an overhaul of the British imperial policy on education to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past.

Three conclusions can be drawn in this section. First, the British government resolved to develop higher education in its colonies as soon as World War II had ended but started drawing up plans for that development during the course of the war. Second, arguments for and against the development of higher education in Africa ran parallel to one other and created fertile ground for tensions to arise between various British constituencies. Third, the nature of the relationship between the British government and the colonial Governors was unstable hence the divergent views on policy issues. Overall, our discussion has demonstrated that the political factor was the driving force behind the recommendations made in all the reports discussed above. This serves as justification why it is impossible to discuss the development of higher education in east Africa without also discussing the role played by politics in that process.

**Politics and the Asquith Colleges in East Africa, 1945-1960**

The end of World War II ushered in a new political dispensation in East Africa. By 1945 concrete plans for higher education in the British colonies had already been drafted and at the end of the war the British government found an opportunity to implement them. Yet the British government, now under the Labour Party, sustained the view that the Colonial Office, not the Governors, would be responsible for the development of British Dependencies. Creech Jones issued Colonial Paper No. 191 of 1945 outlining the British government’s vision about the future of East Africa. Creech Jones, while recognising the work done by the Governors’ Conference in

---

67 British Central Office of Information, Reference Division, *Education in the United Kingdom Dependencies* (London: HMSO, 1955), 1 and 38. This document discusses the broad aims of the British government regarding the development of its dependencies and identifies the role to be played by colonial universities in that process.

East Africa, insisted that the Governors could not take decisions independently regarding the East African Dependencies.69

In July 1946, Creech-Jones traversed East Africa to familiarise himself with the region. He also visited Makerere College, the nerve center for higher education in East Africa. He believed that a class of well-educated Africans would prove beneficial to Britain and therefore “courted the African elite”70 and strongly favoured the continued expansion of this class through the provision of institutions for higher education such as Makerere and, later, the University of East Africa. George Hall, Secretary of State for the Colonies, told the British parliament that it was pleasing to note that in the ten years programmes of development being submitted, education occupied an important place. Hall maintained:

Great stress is laid on every phase, whether it be primary or secondary, technical or adult, mass education or higher education. Every part is considered important to every other part as a basis of social and economic progress. Following upon the three valuable reports presented last year, higher education in the Colonies has progressed along several lines ...71

Ajayi, Goma and Johnson’s exploration of the development of higher education in Africa after World War II led them to the following conclusion:

Thus, the colonial University Colleges were established partly in response to African demand, especially in West and Southern Africa, partly in response to the demand of European officials and settlers, especially in central and Eastern Africa, but generally in pursuit of laid down colonial policies and objectives.72

The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies conceded the political motive behind the development of higher education in Africa, arguing that it was more dangerous to British imperial prestige, politically and socially, to deny Africans access to university education than to satisfy that urge.73

The period between 1945 and 1960 was dominated by politics all over Africa. World War II had brought home lack of technical skills amongst the African population, resulting into the establishment by the Kenya government of a Development Committee that would look into the foundation of a Technical and Commercial Institute to be based in Nairobi. This was followed by the appointment in 1947 of the Willoughby Committee discussed in Chapter 2. In 1948, the EAHC was established and tensions arose on whether or not the development of Makerere into a regional university would be the responsibility of the EAHC. Sir Philip Mitchell, now Chairman of the EAHC, addressed the Central Legislative Assembly as follows: “Although Makerere College does not come under the jurisdiction of the High Commission, this Assembly is empowered to pass legislation relating to the College.”74

69 Pressure from Kenya’s settlers forced the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies to change the tone of his Paper. Creech Jones subsequently issued Colonial Paper No. 210 with a few modifications.
73 Nwauwa, Imperialism, Academe and Nationalism, 68.
The Willoughby Committee presented its Report in 1949, the year in which Makerere was accepted into the ‘Special Relationship’ programme with the University of London. The recommendation by the Willoughby Committee that the Technical Institute in Kenya should develop to a University ended Makerere’s monopoly in offering higher education and also caused political tensions between Kenya and Uganda and between the Kenya government and the British Colonial Office. Southall recalls that there was ambition in Kenya for an institution of University status, despite the fact that official Colonial Office policy was that Makerere should develop into a unitary inter-territorial university. Makerere had never been held in the same respect by settler opinion as by either the African community or by the Uganda Administration, for its avowed intention of providing a liberal education was held in some vague manner to be subversive of colonial order. Perhaps “this explains the readiness with which the scheme for a Royal Technical College was greeted by settler opinion …”75

The mode of operation adopted by the Colonial government in Kenya contradicted with the educational policy for East Africa drawn up by the Colonial Office. While the Colonial Office put its weight behind the development of Makerere as an inter-territorial College, the Colonial government in Kenya resolved to establish another institution, arguing that –

... it should be left to each territory to start any institution that it liked on its own and that, at a later date, if it was considered that the time had come to propose it for adaptation as an East African institute, that could be done …76

The tensions regarding Makerere and the RTC provide the political context in which the First Working Party of 1955 was appointed. The uncontrolled developments at the RTC “were rapidly making nonsense of the concept of a unitary University of East Africa,”77 and the Working Party had to clear this confusion. The First Working Party considered the vision of the Colonial government about higher education in the colonies and recommended as follows:

At the outset of this part of the discussion we wish to emphasize with all the strength at our command that the provision of university education in East Africa should continue to be the concern of the three territories acting together.78

However, it is of particular interest to note that the First Working Party did not dismiss the proposal to develop the RTC. The three main recommendations of the Working Party were that:

(i) a new University College should be established in Nairobi;
(ii) university planning should be at the inter-territorial level so as to avoid unnecessary duplication between new institutions and Makerere; and
(iii) the University College to be founded in Tanganyika should be delayed until the completion of the development of Makerere.

75 Southall, *Federalism and Higher Education in East Africa*, 30.
Ogot recalls: “The second important factor, which influenced the deliberations of the Commission, was political. There was what it called ‘a growing territorial consciousness and consequential ambitions’, one which was to possess a university institution.” In a nutshell, the appointment of the First Working Party was inspired by political factors and its recommendations were influenced by post-World War II politics.

Failure by the First Working Party to spell out the manner in which inter-territorial co-operation would be effected necessitated the appointment of the Second Working Party of 1958. The Report of the Second Working Party endorsed the recommendation that Kenya and Tanganyika should establish their own University Colleges because such institutions were deemed to be symbols of territorial consciousness. The Second Working Party commenting on Kenya argued that the only practical method of combining the full promotion of technological and professional studies with the due honouring of the pledge given to the Gandhi Memorial Academy Society and with the initiation of a university college was to adopt the bold plan of transforming the Royal Technical College into a college which would provide “not only courses of training in technological and other professional subjects to the highest professional standards but also courses leading to university degrees.”

Members of this Working Party considered the political context in which they were operating and interpreted their task to be that of constructing a model of growth that would reconcile political demands with economic rationality. They were mindful of the fact that the three East African Colleges would be at different stages of development when the University of East Africa came into being and proposed that the University would exist in the colonies, which would be empowered to take key decisions.

The political significance of the Asquith colleges in East Africa became more pronounced in the late-1950s. The East African Standard newspaper, commenting on the Report of the Second Working Party stated:

> The report stresses that the inter-racial and inter-territorial character of the colleges are indispensable elements. Although there has perhaps been some initial disinclination to accept these prerequisites, there is now general agreement that they offer advantages which should be evident to East Africa in the efforts to narrow divisions and shape common purposes.

The reaction of Makerere College Council to the recommendations of the Second Working Party demonstrated the relationship between politics and the development of higher education in the region. The Council regarded the creation of a Federal University as the best way to ensure the maintenance of inter-territoriality. Yet, the Council also anticipated tensions and stated that it desired to put on record its opinion that the timing of these developments, particularly the creation of the East African University and the remodeling of the Royal Technical College into a second university college, had to be judged in relation to the supply of students of suitable quality, to the availability of funds, and to Makerere College’s emergence from its Special

79 Ogot, My Footprints on the Sands of Time, 127.
81 Ogot, My Footprints on the Sands of Time, 128.
82 East African Standard (Kenya), 26 February 1959.
Relation with the University of London. If this timing was not carefully weighed, damage might be done to the cause of Higher Education, and success already achieved might be imperiled.83

In 1960, Makerere College Council found it hard to divorce education from politics. The Council noted in one of its meetings that “the most satisfactory form of legislation appeared to be in the form of an Order in Council made by Her Majesty the Queen and applicable to all three Territories.”84 Politically, East Africa was still under British rule at this time; therefore the Council felt that it was appropriate for the Queen to have an authoritative voice in the region’s political and educational affairs. However, not all East Africans shared this view. The spirit of nationalism and the independence euphoria of the 1950s and 1960s made tensions inevitable on such issues.

Some of these tensions occurred at the East Africa Central Legislative Assembly during the debate regarding the naming of the College in Kenya. Laurence Oguda, one of the Members of the Kenya Legislature was not happy with the name ‘Royal College, Nairobi’ and then suggested that the name should be changed to ‘Nairobi College’. Some white Members of the House felt that this suggestion was politically motivated. Bruce Mackenzie, one of the white Members of the Legislature, opined –

... that most members of this Assembly will realize what a very great honour Her Majesty has given us by allowing the College to be called the Royal College, and will agree with me that the hon. Member’s reference to this was entirely uncalled for and was extremely ungracious. 85

He expressed his hope that the hon. Member would think this matter over and realise that his suggestion was, to say the least, ungracious.

The Central Legislative Assembly of East Africa tried its utmost to ensure that the envisioned Federal University did not in any way become a political battlefield. Mr David, the Administrator, expressed the view that a University is a free and independent corporation able to follow the paths of truth and learning in the widest context without being subject to pressure or control from Church, State or any other authority. In its internal organisation it presents the fellowship of scholars working on a democratic basis and not an authoritarian basis from the top down. His view was that the faculty boards present matters to the academic boards and the academic boards to the council or senate. The picture, then, was one of academic autonomy enabling the college authorities to decide on purely academic ground what may be taught in the college, how it may be taught, who may teach, and who may study. Provided this academic freedom is maintained and preserved in the future University of East Africa, David looked forward to the day when the University of East Africa would take its place by the side of the older foundations as a revered and respected home of learning and truth and knowledge.86 In spite of this

84 Makerere College. The University College of East Africa. The 60th Meeting of the College Council, 24 August 1960, 6. UON Archives. UEA Makerere University College, PUEA/12/12.
precaution, the remainder of this chapter and the next ones show that the Federal University was a political and racial battlefield throughout its history.

This section has shown that the end of World War II marked a new epoch in the history of higher education in East Africa by setting in motion the process of implementing the recommendations made by different committees and commissions during the course of World War II. Secondly, this section has shown that there was a very thin line between politics and education. The achievement of political independence by Tanganyika in 1961 gave the political factor an urge. The last section of this chapter explores the political tensions that occurred in East Africa between 1961 and 1963 thus presenting the political context in which the regional University was instituted.

**Independence and political tensions, 1961-1963**

The line between politics and education in Africa became thinner in the early 1960s due to the spirit of nationalism and independence that swept through the continent. Many African politicians and African scholars expected political and educational institutions to reciprocate each other; East Africa was no exception. Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika looked to their educational institutions to assist them in developing the region. The prospects of having a Federal University increased hope that East Africa would develop even quicker as a result of anticipated joint effort by the three East African territories. These assumptions plunged the University deep into politics before it was even formally constituted. The meeting of the Academic Board of Makerere College conceded that politics played a cardinal role in the establishment of the UEA when it argued that the Provisional Council of the University was recommended partly for political reasons: to establish a University that would transcend the frontiers of the three East African countries and inculcate the spirit of Pan-East Africanism.

By 1961 there was already mounting pressure to promote inter-territoriality in East Africa through economic, political and educational institutions. A memorandum sent to the Provisional Council of the University by Stratmore College, in Kenya, stated that the College was under some pressure to receive students from the other territories of East Africa, mainly because this was the viewpoint of some of the other entities that had contributed towards capital costs. The Board of Trustees felt that inter-territoriality would benefit the College. In view of all the foregoing, the Board of Trustees and the Academic Board of the College felt that Stratmore had to be closely associated with the new University of East Africa. Through this memorandum, the Board of Trustees wished to place before the Provisional Council a request for it to consider the possibility of Stratmore College being affiliated to the future University as a ‘Junior College’.

---

87 The discussion in this section is confined to the exploration of the nature of the relationship between East African constituencies and the Colonial government following the achievement of political independence by the East African territories. The role played by independence and nationalism in the demise of the University of East Africa (inter-territorial tensions) is discussed in Chapter 6.

88 Makerere College. The University College of East Africa. Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Academic Board, 11 February 1959. UON Archives, UEA Makerere University College, PUEA/12/8.

89 Memorandum to The Provisional Council of the University of East Africa from Stratmore College, Kenya, 15 October 1961. UON Archives. UEA. University Council. PUEA/1A/60, 2. In a subsequent meeting, The Provisional Council of the University of East Africa decided that the request could not be entertained until the University was established. When the University of East Africa was finally constituted in 1963, this request was never pursued. Only the Royal Technical College from Kenya formed part of the Federal University of East Africa.
The achievement of political independence by the East African territories between 1961 and 1963 led to increased tensions between East African leaders and the British government or its Governors in East Africa. The British government had been in charge of East African administration until 1960. East African constituencies vowed to take charge of their own affairs and this caused tensions between East African constituencies and the British government and/or its appointees.

When the Provisional Council of the UEA was formed in June 1961, political wrangling continued unabated. The Provisional Council had to acquire legal personality before it could begin its operation. Two proposals were made:

(i) Order-in-Council;

(ii) The formation of a company Limited by Guarantee or by incorporation of Trustees. Mr J.S. Fulton, an expatriate nominated to the Promotional Committee by the Chairman of the IUC, suggested the second option. His suggestion was based on the fact that a company Limited had been used with success to acquire legal personality by the London School of Economics, by the University College of North Staff, and by the University College of Sussex.90

Fulton’s proposal was accepted. However, instead of the company being registered in East Africa, which was one of the available options, it was registered in the United Kingdom and enabled to operate throughout East Africa.91

This caused tensions between different interested parties, some arguing that it was unjustifiable for Britain to continue deciding the educational and political future of East Africa even after independence. These concerns were considered by the Draft Committee charged with the task of drawing a Charter of the University. The Draft Committee came to the conclusion that an Act of the Central Legislative Assembly of East Africa would be more acceptable to East Africa than would be a Royal Charter. In addition, it was felt that there would be advantages in having the University’s basic legislation discussed in, and receiving the endorsement of, a legislature in East Africa. The view was that this “should help to foster the impression that the University was an indigenous institution.”92

To East Africans, political, economic, and educational freedom was deemed inseparable. President Kenyatta argued that there was no point in winning freedom from the shackles of colonialism only to find oneself in an economic and political bondage of a subtle kind.93 Kenyatta expressed the views of the multitudes of East Africans who steadfastly believed that time was ripe for their region to determine its economic, educational, and political future independent of Britain. The role played by political factors in the establishment of the UEA can be gauged

90 Minutes of the Promotional Committee, Makerere College, 1 March 1961, 2. UON Archives, UEA University Council. PUEA/1A/60.

91 Minutes of the Meeting of the Promotional Committee at Makerere College, 1 March 1961. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/60. See also: The Companies Ordinance, 1958. Company Limited by Guarantee and having a Share Capital. Articles of Association of the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, 1961. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/57.

92 Memorandum by Lindsay Young to all Members of the Provisional Council, 14 March 1962. Annexure D. Prov. Co. Agenda/29. 3. 62. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/53.

from one of the documents of The Provisional Council of the University of East Africa, which states that the University of East Africa was, perhaps, a unique experiment, in the sense that, from birth or early infancy, it would exist in three independent countries, each with perfectly understandable and justifiable national aspirations, but nevertheless resolved, in the sphere of higher education, to enjoy the fruits of mutual association. The view was that the University “comes into being at a time of great change in East African life, when the normal impulse might well be towards the choice of an East African as the first Chancellor of the University.”

The Provisional Council noted that other people might conceivably think differently. It argued that they might rightly adjudge an East African candidate possessed of the criteria enunciated in the paper. Yet, their desire to ensure that national aspirations and loyalties were transcended in the office of Chancellor of the new University might lead them to look beyond the borders of East Africa, while bearing in mind the desirability of the first Chancellor being able to appear in person at the inauguration of the University, and, perhaps, at least once more during his term of office, to preside over congregations for the conferring of university degrees.

The political factor played an instrumental role in the appointment of officers at the East African Colleges. A meeting of The Provisional Council of the University held in Nairobi in April 1963 noted that the Makerere Legislation would name the Governor-General of Uganda as the Visitor and the Dar es Salaam legislation, the President of Tanganyika. Existing Royal College Legislation left the choice of Visitor to the East African Common Services Organization (EACSO). The meeting noted that The Royal College Council might be asked to move in the direction of the Head of State as Visitor. It is of particular interest to note that politicians, not scholars, were considered for these positions. The appointment of President Nyerere by EACSO as the first Chancellor of the UEA was inspired by the political mood of the early 1960s. President Nyerere was perceived as an epitome of African freedom in East Africa, following his guidance of Tanganyika towards independence in 1961. The Daily Nation newspaper in Kenya was quick to notice this significant appointment and opined: “It is fitting that today the architect of the first nation to become independent in East Africa should be the Chancellor of East Africa’s first University.”

There was general consensus between different constituencies in East Africa about the need to create a good relationship between institutions of higher education and political institutions. The East African Common Services Authority (EACSA) decided in December 1962 that the EACSO would assume a measure of responsibility for higher education in East Africa. EACSO’s responsibility began in the fiscal year commencing on 1 July 1963 when it provided £410 000 for the central University organisation and the three Constituent Colleges although the details regarding the nature of the relationship between the University, EACSO and the three East African governments had not yet been clearly defined.

A.L. Adu, Secretary General of EACSO wrote to the Permanent Secretaries of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika, stating that preliminary reactions from all three Governments to his letter No.
5/29/3 of the 8th January, 1963, would appear to favour the proposal that relations between the University of East Africa and its Constituent Colleges and the Governments should be regulated through EACSO. In anticipation of agreement on this proposal, the Finance Ministerial Committee of EACSO had proposed the inclusion in the Estimates for 1963-64 of provision for the inter-territorial component of the grant to the University of East Africa organisation itself.97

Among the proposals made in the letter were the following:

(i) the need to amend the constitution of the EACSO by an addition of a clause to the first schedule in the following terms: ‘services for the co-ordination of relations between the University of East Africa, its constituent colleges and the contracting Governments, including such services for the administration of finance relating to such University and constituent colleges as may be agreed between the Authority and the contracting Governments’;

(ii) the East African Common Services Authority should assume responsibility for relations between the University of East Africa (and its Colleges) and the Governments, including responsibility for financial development, and negotiations on the grant contributions to be made by EACSO and the Governments. By the end of May 1963, the idea of an inter-territorial University had gained popularity. When the University was finally constituted it was perceived not only as an educational institution but also as a political institution. As discussed in Chapter 6, it was the latter reason that led to its demise in 1970.

Conclusion

Two broad conclusions could be drawn in this chapter. First, the establishment of the UEA was inspired by politics. Second, the developmental stages of this University were characterised by numerous tensions. East Africans – students, politicians and the Young Baganda Association; British colonial governments in East Africa; and the British government in London all played their part in bringing the University into existence. The chronological analysis of the statements and documents in which the history of the UEA is contained reveals that political factors took a vanguard position from the 1920s to the first half of 1963. By the end of May 1963, it was already evident that the much-anticipated University would become the battlefield between different interested parties.

The present chapter has placed the history of the University of East Africa in the broader context of British imperialism by demonstrating that the establishment of the University was part of the British imperial policy on higher education after World War II. While it cannot be repudiated that changes in the colonial education, particularly after 1948, were to a large extent responses to political and economic changes that were taking place in the colonies in general, it is clear from the above discussion that the rationale behind the British government’s decision to develop higher education in East Africa before and after World War II was mainly politically motivated. The British government used higher education to insulate the students from potential political influence that might later tarnish its international image.

97 A.L. Adu to Permanent Secretaries of Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika (Ref. 5/29/3), 8 April 1963. UON Archives. UEA University Council. PUEA/1A/2.
Now, the fact that different constituencies played their role in the establishment of the UEA raises the following question: Who were the custodians of the University of East Africa? Whose interest was the university going to serve or give first priority? These and other questions are explored in the next chapter which focuses on the UEA's ownership once it had been established.
The University Colleges which comprise this University cannot be islands filled with people who live in a world of their own, looking on with academic objectivity or indifference at the activities of those outside … We must, and do, demand that this University take an active part in the social revolution we are engineering.

President Nyerere, 1963.

Introduction

The question posed in this chapter is difficult to answer precisely because the African University Colleges that were established in the mid-1940s were a replica of metropolitan universities. When African universities were established in the 1960s they, too, portrayed a European outlook. Idrian Resnick argued that Universities in Africa are part of the development syndrome: every country wants one, most countries have one, and all governments are more or less puzzled as to just what they have once the university is in operation. In his view, “this is because most universities in Africa are very foreign to the way of life in the country; they do not fit in, they are not African.”

The University of East Africa had many identities and, therefore, many claimants. Some regarded the University as an agent of academic imperialism and thus part of neo-colonialism; others perceived it as a mere repository of Western ideas; for some it was a guarantor of academic standards of the work done at the regional colleges in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika while others regarded the University as an integral part of the East African Federation movement and an instrument for promoting a pan-East African consciousness. Each view considered at least one of the many identities of the Federal University, hence the view that the UEA “was, perhaps, all of these things at the same time, and this was possibly why it was an object of such controversy.”

Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 have shown that British and East African constituencies played their different roles in bringing about this regional University. Once established, the UEA displayed both local and global features. Its physical location was in East Africa and the student population was predominantly black and East African yet the administrative and academic staff were almost entirely European. Also, the curriculum and the teaching and research methods

2 For different perceptions about the University of East Africa see: Southall, Federalism and Higher Education in East Africa, pp. ix-x.
3 Ibid., p. x.
were all foreign. Moreover, the University was funded by the East African national governments and by the British government. Each of these sponsors aspired to have an authoritative voice in the affairs of the University thus making it a site for conflicting interests. Some British politicians espoused the view that it was their right to comment on any institution funded, in part or in full, by the British Government. For example, when Frank Bowles (British MP) asked Members of the House of Commons not to talk about higher education at the University College in Salisbury (present-day Zimbabwe), James Griffiths, another MP, responded by asking Mr Bowles to bear in mind that the university in Rhodesia was being helped financially by the British Parliament. He argued that since they were contributors towards it under the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund, reference to that university was, therefore, in order because Britain was responsible towards it.4

Therefore, the fact that the University of East Africa was funded in part by the British government left some British politicians convinced that it was their right to have a say in the affairs of the University. East African constituencies on the other hand held the view that they were the sole custodians of this University because it was sited on the African soil and populated by African students. Also, the University came into being soon after, or just before (in the case of Kenya), the three East African territories achieved their political independence from Britain. Presidents Nyerere, Obote and Kenyatta worked on the assumption that political freedom meant that they could now run their institutions independently of Britain. In their view, the three national governments in East Africa, not the British government, had to work with the administrators and faculty at the University of East Africa to decide how the University could collaborate with the three governments in the development of the East African region.

Tensions regarding ownership of the UEA are enshrined in the founding documents of the University. One of them states that the fact that the Provisional Council had chosen to ask the Central Legislative Assembly to enact the legislation which would call the University of East Africa into legal being, rather than to seek the device of a Royal Charter for its foundation, was itself indicative of the Council’s desire to ensure that from its inception, the University would be accepted as an indigenous East African institution. On the other hand, its founders did not believe that the University of East Africa could, or should, stand outside of the international academic community from which its three constituent colleges were such obvious inheritors. The document concluded:

> The draft constitution of the new University inevitably bears resemblances to the constitutions of Universities in other countries with which, for the supply of academic teachers and the provision of degrees for its students, East Africa has had such strong links in the past.5

The first paragraph in this citation leads to the conclusion that the Provisional Council of the UEA was aware of the possible tensions regarding its ownership. Yet, the last line of the first paragraph and the whole of the second paragraph allude to the fact that the University could not be solely East African but had to reflect its international character. This dual identity of the University, one local and the other global was the germ for the tensions between different

---


constituencies. As far as East African politicians, scholars, students as well as the general public were concerned the University was an East African asset that had to reflect an African character not only in terms of the student population and its physical location but also in terms of its staff, curriculum, syllabus, teaching methods, research topics and the manner in which the University organised its cultural and academic activities. All these perceptions were articulated and demonstrated by East African constituencies at different moments. Wilbert Chagula, then Vice-Principal of the University College, Dar es Salaam stated in his public address during the Graduation Ceremony held in Dar es Salaam on August 21, 1964 that attendance of the Tanganyika Police Band, the Band Dancers of the National Union of Tanganyika Workers (NUTA) as well as the contribution of indigenous dances such as ‘Mganda’ and ‘Gombe Sugu’ by the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) all went to provide “the warm and African atmosphere that was essential to the success of such an important function as this.”

This was by all means an historic event conducted at an African University College where all twelve African graduates of the University College, Dar es Salaam had come to receive their degrees in person, in front of a predominantly African audience. The organisers felt that giving the ceremony an African flavour would remind the congregation that Africans were the custodians of the University. But this claim did not go unchallenged as shown below.

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that the University of East Africa had many identities and therefore many claimants and that this led to tensions between different constituencies, both in East Africa and in Britain. The key questions addressed in this chapter are the following: How did British constituencies perceive the University of East Africa? How did African perceptions about the University differ from those of their British counterparts? What did each party do to demonstrate its ownership? Which tensions occurred between East African constituencies as they made relentless efforts to find an identity for this University?

The present chapter is organised into four sections, each of which tackles an aspect of the overhaul theme of the chapter. The first section discusses the UEA as an international asset like any other university; the second section discusses the University as a regional asset, while the third section discusses it as confirmation of *uhuru* [freedom]. The emphasis of this section is on Africanisation; it demonstrates how East African constituencies proposed to reorganise the University so that it reflected the political mood of the 1960s. The last part of the chapter explores the relationship between the University and the East African society to check if the society owned the university.

**The University of East Africa as an international asset**

We agree with the Report of the Needs and Priorities Committee that our University cannot afford to be a withdrawn, esoteric, institution. We should wish to be firmly planted in the African world and not only the East African countries which we particularly serve.


---

6 *News From the Hill*, Number Five of a Bulletin Designed to Keep the East African Public Informed About the Progress of the university College, Dar es Salaam, 3. KNA KA/2/17.
Any university is a multi-faced institution. It has a local and a global identity. The above epigraph captures the predicament in which the planners of the future of the University of East Africa found themselves as they finalised the preparations for the establishment of this institution. On the one hand they had to think of the University they were setting up as being primarily an East African asset. On the other hand they had to perceive it as an international asset belonging to the entire African continent but sited in East Africa. The Draft University Development Plan for the first triennium of the University stated among other things that:

The University of East Africa, a federal university transcending three international boundaries, is an experiment in international co-operation. The awareness of an underlying unity and the urge to give it effective expression, are important and encouraging features of contemporary Africa.7

The eighth meeting of the University Council noted with gratification the assurances of the East African governments that “they are committed to the support of local institutions and to the maintenance of the constituent colleges of the University of East Africa as inter-territorial and international institutions.”8 The perception of the University as an East African asset meant that East Africans would determine its operation and outlook. Conversely, the perception of the University as an international asset meant that it would be guided by international rules and assumptions about the university as an educational institution anywhere. These potentially conflicting perceptions created a fertile ground for tensions. David Court asks: “If ‘university’ has a universal meaning, where should modification begin?”9

The UEA was an international institution in three senses:

(i) it dismantled the artificial boundaries that divided Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika;
(ii) its African outlook transcend East African borders by reflecting the aspirations of different people within the African continent; and
(iii) the University was international in the global sense, an epitome of a university as perceived by the international community.

The international character of the UEA was portrayed from the very first day when it was inaugurated. The Daily Nation newspaper reported the following day: “The grandeur of the ceremony was no less dignified and no less traditional than are such occasions at the old-established universities of Britain, Europe and the United States.”10 The multi-faced nature of the University was demonstrated by the fact that while the students were predominantly African its architecture bore no resemblance to any of the local structures; the medium of instruction was English, not Luganda, or any of the indigenous East African languages – not even kiSwahili which is the lingua franca of the region. Also, the administrative staff and the

8 Extracts from the 8th Meeting of the University Council, UON Archives, UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/17.
 facult was predominantly British; and the University’s culture – reflected, *inter alia*, through sports, music, and dress – was different from indigenous cultures.

The editor of President Nyerere’s writings and speeches introduced the chapter on the inauguration of the Federal University thus: “The University of East Africa is both federal and international consisting of the University Colleges of Makerere (Uganda), Nairobi, and Dar es Salaam.”¹¹ Shaper stressed the fact that the Federal University was an international asset, arguing that although heart disease was a problem in Uganda,

> Work in this field is not just of importance to Kampala or even to East Africa, it might be important in a more international sense providing basic information on such vital problems as high blood pressure, rheumatic heart disease and atherosclerosis and its complications.¹²

These are some of the ideas groups and individuals had about the Federal University of East Africa that was being constituted in the midst of glamour and fanfair.

Some East African scholars acquiesced in the fact that the University could not afford to ignore its identity as an international asset. Washington Okumu and Thomas Odhiambo were among such scholars. While arguing that East Africans should not be told by foreigners how to run the University, the two authors conceded that they were aware of the fact that the white man, the blue man, and the black man everywhere was going to look at the university and judge East Africans; they were not merely going to see how East Africans ran and controlled the university, but what products could be turned out. They argued: “unless the stuff we give our student in East Africa is the stuff that can be matched by the stuff in other places, our university will have no place in the community of nations.”¹³ They argued that this University, like universities elsewhere, had to advance the frontiers of knowledge through teaching and research.

Chapter 1 demonstrated through various examples and pronouncements that the development of higher education in Africa followed a similar pattern by and large; that University Colleges in Anglophone Africa first had a ‘Special Relationship’ with the University of London before assuming an independent status and offering their own degrees. Similarly, the UEA was, to a very large extent, the brainchild of the University of London like its predecessors. In theory at least, British politicians and British scholars acknowledged the independence of this University. In practice, they conceived of and treated it as an international asset obliged to maintain the revered international standards and subscribe to internationally accepted notions of a university. Arnold Anderson states that East Africa, along with most of the third world countries across the globe and the racial divide,

> … has inherited conventional specifications of training for each high-level occupation, specifications which are cherished but seldom questioned. Unwitting acceptance of these (often extravagantly expensive) standards combines with the understandable determination of the University to adhere to a world standard.”¹⁴

The UEA was placed between the rock and a hard place. On the one hand, it could not simply adhere to international notions of a university least it be labelled ‘an ivory tower’. On the other hand, it could not be solely an East African institution because its academic standards would suddenly be put under scrutiny. This international identity of the University portrayed it as a foreign institution, thus setting the scene for tensions. Ashby’s broad study of African universities in the 1960s led him to a number of conclusions, including the fact that if African universities were to retain their quality they would have to rely on support from expatriate teachers for a long time to come. This meant that the indigenous self-sustaining intellectual community which Edward Shils regarded as indispensable for a viable national system of higher education was not likely to appear in African countries for many years. So long as large numbers of university professors working in Africa look to Europe or America as the centre of gravity of their intellectual life, “Africa will remain intellectually a province of Europe or America.”\textsuperscript{15} The premature intellectual independence would result into the deterioration in quality. The psychological problem was to persuade African countries to accept this filial position while they established their own intellectual style and their own techniques, until they reached maturity by becoming not only recipients, but donors, of world knowledge.

East African politicians conceded that their region could not completely divorce itself from the international community. Addressing a seminar on Mass Media, held in Kampala, Uganda, President Obote argued that before independence, English was the language of the oppressor but that his government stressed it because “we find no alternative to English in Uganda’s present position.”\textsuperscript{16} President Nyerere told African historians at a congress in Dar es Salaam that Western interest in post-colonial Africa was not an aspect of neo-colonialism but recognition that the people of Africa were now equals whom the world could not disregard but consider as its part. President Nyerere argued that it was up to the Africans themselves to show the world what they had to offer and that “it is natural and right that Africa’s new universities and institutions should from now on take a leading part in this work.”\textsuperscript{17} In his view, Africans had a responsibility to position themselves in the international scene in order to be taken seriously by their counterparts elsewhere. They could use the university to achieve that goal. Therefore the internationalisation of the UEA was, in a way, an inevitable eventuality.

But despite all the views discussed above about the UEA being an international asset first and foremost (true as that might be), the reality is that the majority\textsuperscript{18} of East Africans steadfastly held the view that the UEA was their institution. They perceived the Federal University in two ways: first, they saw it as a regional asset; second, they conceptualised the university as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ashby & Anderson, \textit{Universities}, xii.
\item \textsuperscript{18} I use the word ‘majority’ purposely because, as discussed later in this chapter, not all East Africans shared the view that the University of East Africa had to refrain from prioritizing the portrayal of its international identity at the expense of being relevant to the local (East African) needs. Some, like their British counterparts, felt that the UEA was not supposed to be different from the University of London or any European University for that matter because it was an international institution. In their view, any deviation from the ‘tried and tested’ European perception of a University would jeopardise the University’s image.
\end{itemize}
confirmation of political independence from the British colonial rule. These two perceptions are discussed separately below.

The University of East Africa as a regional asset

Regional cooperation had been a basic feature of higher education in East Africa ever since the objective of developing higher education for Africans had been agreed in 1929 ... Regional cooperation was to become even further emphasized as a basic principle in the development of higher education in East Africa.

Rastad Svein-Erik, 1972

In 1972, Roger Southall argued that the relationship of the UEA to the politics of federation in the region had never been adequately defined yet the relationship was an intricate one.19 Southall based his assertion on the fact that the question of the Federal University and the issue of regional integration were discussed simultaneously. As far as East African constituencies were concerned, the University was “only one aspect of inter-territorial co-operation;”20 it was regarded as “an indicator of that hoped-for wider unity.”21 Court maintained that in East Africa, the growth of higher education “has always been justified in terms of its potential contribution to regional and national development [emphasis mine].”22 In his view, it was not surprising that the UEA was perceived as a regional asset, among its other identities.

In fact, East Africans perceived the University as a regional asset even before it was officially constituted. The University of East Africa Act of 1962 did not only set up the University but also reminded East Africans that regional co-operation was extending its boundaries beyond the amalgamation of economic institutions; it now included higher education as one of its organs. According to Pratt, the Federal University was expected not only to affirm that the academic standards of each College were equivalent, it was also to achieve the integrated planning of higher education in East Africa. Pratt reasoned:

The conception is a grand one, a federal University transcending three international boundaries with constituent colleges in each country but with all the professional faculties being shared so that each serves the whole of East Africa.23

For him, the University served as an experiment in regional planning.

Hyslop, Principal of Royal College, Nairobi was upbeat about the inter-territorial University. He wrote to President Nyerere congratulating him on his appointment by the East African

---

20 One of the Kenyan members of the University Council speaking during the session of the University Council in 1965. Cited by Southall, “The Federal University”: 41.
Authority as Chancellor of the UEA and expressed his jubilation that the inauguration ceremony of the University would be taking place at his College. Hyslop was mindful of the regional context in which the University was founded and concluded:

... may I also express the hope that you may find time to visit the various constituent Colleges of the University during your term of office? You may be assured of a very enthusiastic welcome here in the Royal College [emphasis mine].

Some East African politicians were more conscious about the regional character of the University as revealed by the debates at the Kenya National Assembly. Ronald Ngala asked the Education Minister, Mr Otiende, how much Kenya had contributed to the University College, Dar es Salaam between 1 July 1961 and 30 June 1963, both in current and in development expenditure. On hearing that the answer to the second question was nil, Ngala inquired: “Mr Speaker, Sir, arising from the reply, why is the answer to the second part of the question nil, whereas development in this University and buildings are going on?” The issue was laid to rest when Mr Otiende stated that they were still expecting a formal request from Dar es Salaam. This debate demonstrates that the idea of Pan-East Africanism had already been entrenched in the minds of East African constituencies by this time. The University was seen as pointing the way for political relations; it “reinforced the feeling of mutual aid and regional identification …” The EACSO contributed £1 486 000 to the colleges directly and another £200 000 through the Central University organisation during the first triennium as a gesture that the University was indeed a regional institution.

The UEA inaugural speeches demonstrated that the University was perceived as a regional asset. President Nyerere reminded the audience that the Royal College and the University College, Dar es Salaam had been founded on the same East African principle as Makerere College. He continued:

... and through the partnership of our three colleges we in the University will seek to maintain and strengthen that principle and so we hope to do our part to make the federation a reality in the lives of many young East Africans.

The crowd welcomed President Nyerere’s reference to federalism with a round of applause. He expressed his belief that the students who would come from the three territories and converge at the Federal University would contribute to the on-going effort to unite the region. President Nyerere continued: “It will be one of the functions of this University to foster this spirit of federal unity” and concluded by saying:

---

27 Forward Planning for the University of East Africa. Confidential and Unofficial Paper, 28 January 1965, UON Archives. UEA Makerere University College, PUEA/12/42.
Most of all, the University, its members and its students, must join with the people of East Africa in the struggle to build a nation worthy of the opportunity we have won. May God be with us all.\textsuperscript{30}

This perception of the University led Southall to the conclusion that “it was manifestly a political institution in its own right.”\textsuperscript{31}

The Principal of Makerere College, de Bunsen, held the same view as he told the jubilant crowd that the University was “a venture for co-operation in the region.”\textsuperscript{32} He argued that the mere presence of delegates representing several universities from different parts of Africa was a clear indication that there was a growing sense of common purpose and co-operation among the African Universities. In his address, Dr Noble viewed the University of East Africa as a great experiment. He argued that through the University “a sense of unity could be realized.”\textsuperscript{33}

The mood at the inauguration ceremony was that the distance that separated the colleges was insignificant. The speakers felt that regional co-operation would transcend territorial boundaries. They invoked Lindsay Keir’s Report of 1954 which had concluded that although the RTC in Nairobi and Makerere College in Kampala were 400 miles apart, they were both inter-territorial and were intended to serve the East African region as a whole because:

To some extent, of course, these territorial divisions are arbitrary and unhelpful. They arise mainly from historical accidents due to the way in which colonisation has been carried out …\textsuperscript{34}

Porter recalled a few years later that the East African governments in 1963 –

... came to the conclusion that their endeavors in the field of higher education could best be served through the establishment of the University, with one college in each of its three capitals for a period of at least three years from 1964 to 1967.\textsuperscript{35}

Gershom Amayo recalled nine years after Porter that the presence of a University represented from many parts of East Africa was “a sign of growing sense of common purpose and co-operation.”\textsuperscript{36} The Draft University Development Plan captured the mood and the spirit of regional integration that had filled Taifa Hall (the venue for the inauguration ceremony) the previous day. It stated that there was an effort to give concrete evidence of the will in East Africa to solve common problems through joint action. Given that the constituent colleges of the University would draw its students from all over East Africa, the Plan said that the University “will increase the awareness amongst East Africans of their underlying unity.”\textsuperscript{37} It intimated that the long tradition of co-operation between the countries of East Africa in higher education had greatly strengthened the close ties between them, which made Federation possible.

\textsuperscript{30} Nyerere, \textit{Freedom and Unity}, 221.

\textsuperscript{31} Southall, \textit{Federalism and Higher Education in East Africa}, xi.


\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{34} D. Lindsay Keir, Chairman’s Report on Visit to East Africa July – August 1954, 6 September 1954, 9.

\textsuperscript{35} Arthur T. Porter, Speech delivered at the Faculty of Veterinary Science during the visit of American Vice-President, Hubert Humphrey, 8 January 1968, 2.

\textsuperscript{36} Amayo, “Co-operation in the Development of University Education in East Africa”: 10.

\textsuperscript{37} UEA. Draft University Development Plan for the Triennium 1964/67, 29 June 1963, 4 and 5.
Once the University was in full operation, East Africans sustained the spirit of regional integration, in part by singing different national anthems during the Graduation Ceremonies\(^{38}\) and by having inter-territorial representation in the College Councils. Chagula wrote to the Prime Minister of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta, stating:

> Since the University College, Dar es Salaam, Act, 1963 has now been passed by the Central Legislative Assembly, I should be grateful if your Government would nominate the three Kenya representatives on the Council of the College as soon as possible ...\(^{39}\)

East African politicians and scholars promoted the idea of regional integration because they believed that a degree from a regional institution would carry more weight than one from a national university. This belief derived, in part, from the realisation that the three countries were not big enough to be able to run individual institutions with a sizeable student population. East African politicians and scholars felt that compartmentalising higher education in the region would result into many but very weak faculties and departments. As mentioned in Chapter 2, when Dar es Salaam opened the Law Faculty the first intake comprised only 14 students and yet this was an inter-territorial College. Had there been three Law Faculties in East Africa operating at the same time, the student population would have been even much smaller.

The establishment of the UEA gave more East Africans an opportunity to interact with their counterparts from the neighbouring territories. Each of the three constituent Colleges attracted students and scholars from all East African territories. Also, the University introduced the Staff Exchange Program whereby staff members from one institution could visit the other institutions and teach for a specified period. Through these academic arrangements regional integration widened its horizons.

What also made East Africans see the University as a regional asset was that it fulfilled their dream which started in the 1920s. Makerere was an institution that did not only serve Ugandans but the whole of East Africa. Although the RTC in Kenya was initially driven by racial and territorial thinking, it soon dawned in the minds of the proponents of these ideas (Kenyan settlers and colonial the government) that planning the College as a regional institution would be more beneficial to all three countries.

East African students too perceived the University as a regional asset and as a unifying force. The constituent colleges were physically located in different territories but the spirit of East African unity was inculcated by the University. When students at the University College, Dar es Salaam protested against President Nyerere's National Service the Makerere Tanzanian Students' Union pledged solidarity with them, arguing: “If we unite we will have nothing to lose except the dictatorship and persecution.”\(^{40}\) Makerere Students Guild sent a delegation to President Nyerere to plead with him to give amnesty to the well over 300 students he had suspended from the University College, Dar es Salaam. Although the suspended students were not immediately re-admitted to the University College, Makerere students had registered their voice.

---


Furthermore, when defiant students were expelled from the Royal College, Nairobi in 1969, following the eleventh-minute cancellation of Oginga Odinga’s address by Dr Kiano, Kenya’s Minister for Education, Makerere students associated themselves with their fellow students in Kenya. Makerere Students Guild sent an open letter to President Kenyatta in which they expressed their concern over the closure of the College. J.R. Butime, President of the Students Guild, expressed his organisation’s unequivocal support to Nairobi students, stating: “We are wholly behind our brother-students at Nairobi.”41 Josephat Karanja, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Nairobi, recalled a few years after the dissolution of the UEA that Education succeeded in instilling the spirit of unity among the students since the days of Makerere College. Karanja argued that students from Kenya, Tanganyika and Zanzibar who went to Uganda to further their education perceived themselves as a unit and did not consider themselves to be foreign students studying in a foreign country; that they considered Makerere as their University and Uganda as their home.42

East Africans did not only conceive the University’s goal as being that of developing higher education in their region. They had a stern belief that as a federal institution the University also had an additional function – that of nurturing regional integration on a wide scale. While focusing on higher education, the University was expected to fit its modus operandi in the broader framework of regional integration. According to the East African Standard newspaper, the University’s function was “to promote the development of university education in the three East African countries and Zanzibar on a regional basis.”43

For some East African politicians and scholars, these regional integration and regional co-operation concepts meant the same thing and were therefore deemed interchangeable. Others drew a distinction between the two. President Nyerere sternly believed that regional integration was the primary goal which the University had to help East Africa achieve and that regional co-operation was the means to that end. In President Nyerere’s view, East Africa aspired to form an East African federation that would automatically entail co-operation. However, not all East African constituencies shared this view. In 1967, Uganda’s Education Minister, Dr Luyimbazi-Zake cautioned the delegates who attended the conference on the future of the University, asking them not to invest too much in trying to force centralised control of the Federal University but to promote co-operation between the University’s constituent colleges and other institutions that would be built later. In his view, it was unnecessary to force centralised control of the University because East Africa was never going to be a single country anyway but a region with three territories working in co-operation. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake concluded his address by calling upon East Africans to work together with a greater sense of co-operation. He believed that given the greater sense of co-operation and co-ordinated activity for common ends East Africans were likely “to achieve far more than we would through centralized control for common ends, these ends themselves being centralised.”44

The views espoused by Dr Luyimbazi-Zake raised questions about the idea that the University of East Africa was a regional asset, a view that had been taken as a given by other commentators in

42 Opening Address of the Second Meeting of the Regional Conference of Eastern African Universities held in Nairobi from 2 to 4 May 1974 by Dr N.J. Karanja, Chair and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Nairobi, 6.
the East African region. It is particularly important to note that regional co-operation in higher education, not regional integration, became the focal point during the latter part of the 1960s. For example, it was agreed at a conference held in Addis Ababa on 5 and 6 December 1968 that co-operation and collaboration between researchers in the same field in different universities in Eastern Africa would be encouraged. The scholars who had experienced regional co-operation first-hand at the University of East Africa shared their experience with other colleagues. James Cook, Vice-Chancellor of the UEA drew from this experience and reminded conference delegates about the importance of consultation among specialists to avoid duplication. Chagula stressed the importance of retaining the University’s Staff Exchange Program and hoped that it would continue even after the Constituent Colleges of the University had become national universities. The national universities that were established at the dissolution of the University in 1970 sustained the idea of regional co-operation. The dissipation of the spirit of regional integration in East Africa had a great impact on the functioning of the University and thus changed one of the many faces of the University.

This section has shown that East African constituencies and some expatriates perceived the UEA as a regional asset. Its focus was primarily on higher education but the University’s perceived overall objective was to promote regional integration already taking place at the economic level – political integration still being negotiated. The University of East Africa fulfilled this role by increasing the number of people who crossed national boundaries between Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika to perform different tasks in the sister countries, both students and academics. However, during the second half of the 1960s certain constituencies in East Africa became more vocal in questioning the idea of federalism in higher education and, by extension, questioned the very notion that the UEA was a regional asset. The irony is that the East African Community (EAC) was established in 1967 thus putting a seal on East African co-operation while at the same time the University was already falling apart.

To most East Africans, the UEA was confirmation of independence. They vowed to control their academic and political future. East African politicians and scholars perceived the University as a platform through which they could exercise their freedom. This perception of the UEA as confirmation of uhuru brought higher education and politics closer by inspiring different East African constituencies to call for radical changes at the University to portray a new outlook. We expound this point below.

The University of East Africa as confirmation of uhuru

[But] behind the thrill of traditional spectacle was something that Britain’s Oxford, Germany’s Heidelberg and America’s Harvard have not experienced for years. It was the added thrill of knowing that East Africa was embarking on a path to self-sufficiency …

Daily Nation, 29 June 1963.

---

45 Report of the Inaugural Conference held at the Haile Selassie I University, Addis Ababa on 5th and 6th December 1968, to discuss areas and forms of co-operation among universities in Eastern Africa.

46 As argued in Chapters 5 and 6, sentiments against establishing a regional university did not begin in the late 1960s. They accompanied the University from its infant stages to its demise.
The Federal University of East Africa was established at a time when the independence euphoria was sweeping across the region. Different constituencies interpreted the University’s inauguration to signify the end of British domination on higher education. They felt that terminating political domination but allowing academic subordination to continue would make a mockery of their hard-fought independence. East African constituencies resolved to terminate both forms of colonial domination and called for the Africanisation of different East African institutions. Initially, politicians focused on the Africanisation of regional political institutions such as the East African Authority while academics focused specifically on the University. But as discussed later in this chapter, national governments intervened when politicians felt that the Africanisation process was advancing at a snail’s pace at the University and its constituent colleges. The general feeling in East Africa was that both the national governments and the University should reflect an African outlook now that they were independent.

A seminar attended by East African scholars and politicians felt that –

... independence at the political level should be reflected by a new independence of thought and practice at the academic level. The new East Africa and its needs should be reflected in a reassessment of courses, the syllabi, textbooks, fields of research and teaching methods.47

Terence Nsaze, Burundi’s Ambassador to the United Nations, shared this view, arguing that independent Africa needed a new ideology best suited to Africa’s needs.48 George Urch writes:

In the attempt to decolonize and move away from a world dominated by whites, the educated African has endeavored to convey a sense of uniqueness and to declare ideological independence. In this attempt he has redefined the term ‘Africanization’.49

For Africans, argues Urch, the term ‘Africanisation’ was a direct opposite of ‘Europeanisation’ or ‘Westernisation’. For East African scholars and politicians involved in the affairs of the University the concept meant a regeneration of that which they perceived to be good and respected in the African cultures. They rejected any form of subservience to foreign domination and asserted those African rights and interests that they wished to see being promoted by the University. Urch observed that while political expediency necessitated an expansion of the educational structure inherited from the metropolitan power,

... it was soon realized by the new leaders that an educational system which reflected colonial values would neither satisfy the social aspirations of the people nor lead to greater economic wealth.50

The same epistemology guided East African constituencies. They resolved to Africanise the federal University and identified three areas where the Africanisation process would be carried out:

(i) the curriculum and the syllabus;

(ii) the administrative staff and faculty; and

---

(iii) the teaching methods.

The Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus

It is said that changing a university curriculum is like moving a cemetery.

George M. Johnson, 1966

A.C. Mwingira from the Education Ministry in Tanzania provided a succinct diagnosis of the teacher’s predicament when he stated that one of the toughest problems which face teachers is “to know what to teach.”51 This speaks directly to the curriculum issue. The faculty at the UEA faced the problem of deciding what to teach as they embarked on the job to draw up the curricula and the syllabi for their respective subjects. This section demonstrates how they did that and which problems they encountered along the way.

The curriculum and the syllabus to be followed at the envisaged Federal University became topical subjects on the eve of the University’s inauguration. Hilary Ng’weno, editor of The Nation newspaper in Kenya, opined in his thought-provoking article published about two months before the University was instituted that it could ill afford the luxury of teaching such subjects as Latin, Greek, British Empire history, the economic history of Britain and a host of other subjects which are considered indispensable in the academic curricula of British universities but had little bearing on the immediate needs of the African society. What appears necessary “is a revision of the heavy Britishness, if I may so call it, of our educational system.”52

Three days later, Ng’weno posed a rhetorical question: “Transplant Oxford, Cambridge and Harvard with all their traditions and accentricities to the three East African capitals and what do you have?”53 The East Africa Journal echoed these views a few years later, stating:

It is the duty of any university community to study, carry out research, publish and propagate all possible aspects of African art, culture, history and other subjects in the humanities instead of leaving these to people from abroad ...54

The politicians and scholars who delivered speeches during the University’s inauguration ceremony stressed the very urgent need for the Africanisation of the curriculum at the constituent colleges of the Federal University. In his address, President Nyerere reminded students and lecturers that their natural environment was rich and varied in fauna and flora, in mineral and agricultural resources. He continued: “Your chemists, botanists, zoologists, geologists, agronomists have magnificent natural stores at their disposal just waiting to be exploited.”55 In President Nyerere’s view, it would be unnecessary and improper to teach students at the UEA by drawing examples from Europe. He stressed that the University was an African institution of higher education and had to reflect an African character by Africanising its curricula and syllabi.

52 Daily Nation (Kenya), 23 April 1963.
53 Ibid., 26 April 1963.
Thomas Odhiambo, Lecturer in the Zoology Department at University College, Nairobi, echoed President Nyerere’s words a few years later:

East Africa is not a poor region in regard to natural resources. Its main difficulty is, first of all, to master science and technology, and then to utilise this knowledge in exploiting these natural resources.\(^{56}\)

Dr Noble, who was Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, concurred with President Nyerere’s view and noted that Westernisation, with its science and technology, had swept in upon most emerging nations of Africa and that imitation and adaptation had been proceeding at an ever-accelerating speed that far outstripped the growth and development of the indigenous foundations in which they should take root. Noble suggested that the universities of Africa, including the UEA, had to devote themselves to the Africanisation project more than they were doing or had done up to that point. He urged African universities to apply themselves both studiously and assiduously to the searching examination of their material environment as well as to their moral and spiritual inheritance, their ideas of law and order, their riches of song and dance and the plastic and pictoral arts. Noble continued: “There is a rich and still largely untilled field awaiting exploration and rich indeed will be the harvest it will yield, if it is properly tilled and exploited.”\(^{57}\) He concluded his address by making a plea to the people of East Africa: “You must investigate by research the purely East African heritage of indigenous culture, tradition, law, psychology and philosophy.”\(^{58}\)

These speeches set the Africanisation project in motion. They gave the impression that the University was an East African asset. Two days after the inauguration ceremony The Sunday Post reported that the character of education within the University would be colored by political, economic and cultural factors peculiar to East Africa. The article further argued that it would be erroneous for the East African University to mimic European universities and suggested that it “must gain local character.”\(^{59}\)

Two general criticisms were leveled against African universities by the academy in the 1960s. First, that research tended to give disproportionate attention to esoteric subjects that had little practical importance to the African situation. Second, that even in cases where the topic seemed relevant, the language and methodology used was indecipherable to policy makers and thus totally failed to solve the problems that were faced by African societies.\(^{60}\) M’bow argues that when African countries became ‘masters of their own destiny’ they realised that the educational system they had inherited was at odds with their national interests and called for the inclusion in the curriculum of subjects like: geography, history, culture, agriculture, environmental and scientific technology which had to be adapted to the African situation.\(^{61}\)

The main purpose of the inaugural speeches summarised above was to initiate the Africanisation process of the Federal University and instill it in the minds of those tusked to run the university


\(^{58}\) *Daily Nation* (Kenya), 29 June 1963.

\(^{59}\) *The Sunday Post* (Kenya), 30 June 1963.

\(^{60}\) David Court, “East African Higher Education from the Community Standpoint” [unpublished], 278.

that the institution had to be grounded in Africa, not only physically, but also through its curriculum and research focus. Soon after the UEA began its operation, different constituencies pressurised it to focus on relevant courses such as: African history, music, medicine, religion, literature, and art. There was a realisation that the British curriculum could not be retained simply because it was deemed excellent by the expatriate staff. Mazrui intimated: “What is relevant even if not excellent is to be preferred to what is excellent but not relevant.” In another article, Mazrui called for a new perception on the humanities, arguing that education in the humanities could be oriented towards a life of exertion rather than leisure as it was generally assumed, and that “it might be even more suited to an underdeveloped country” than to a highly complex society as it were.

African medicine and science received more attention, in part because there was a general assumption that “development depends to a considerable extent on science and technology.” Some East Africans emphasised the urgency for scrutinising the herbs and other material used by the traditional African ‘medicine man’ in his practice so that they could improve healing practices. They also thought that the active ingredients of some of those herbs would supply some drugs that could earn East Africa foreign exchange. Odhiambo summarised his call for the Africanisation of scientific and technological knowledge by stating that it was not enough for East Africa to keep informed of scientific and technological advances of foreign countries. At the lowest level, East Africa had to adapt technological innovation to the local conditions of soil, climate and society. At a higher level East African research centres had to attack the region’s own problems – problems peculiar to its particular environment, its natural resources, and its resources of energy. At the highest level, East Africa had to create its own know-how. Anderson concurred with Odhiambo and advised Africans thus:

> Africanize your program, i.e. combine what Africa has been doing traditionally in the past with what Africa learns presently from other countries, with Africa’s future goals and plans.

For years, Makerere remained the only University College offering medical courses. When another medical institution was established in Nairobi during the second triennium, Hillary Ojiambo, Consultant Physician at King George VI (Kenyatta) Hospital in Kenya, welcomed the gratifying news and reminded the public about the need to Africanise health institutions by identifying factors that should be noted when planning a medical school. One of those factors was the necessity to incalculate in the curriculum the disease patterns obtaining in the locality. Anderson shared the same sentiment a year later, arguing:

---

The medical and psychiatric needs of Africa should be focused and based on the needs of the masses rather than on what a few physicians, administrators or other professionals feel are needed.69

The call for the promotion of African literature became louder in the early 1960s throughout Africa.70 In the case of East Africa, concerted efforts were made to encourage the production of African literature. The *East Africa Journal* published special issues on literary works. David Rubadiri concluded one of his articles by saying:

> Our literary young men can now begin to write prose and verse that flows from the wells of the creative spirit, untied by the desire to justify African conflicts by mere surface solutions. Colour is important. But a painter is needed to create a true masterpiece.71

Such emphasis on African Literature put pressure on the University to produce these ‘painters’ by tailoring its curriculum and syllabus accordingly. As mentioned in Chapter 1, President Obote emphatically asked Makerere College to replace the works of authors like Shakespeare by those of Rubadiri, Zirimu, Kakooza and other African writers. He opined: “For it cannot be disputed that the soul of a nation is to be found in the temple of its literature and arts.”72 Ogot in his biography recalls that a major debate emerged at University College, Nairobi on what kind of literature should be taught at an African University. He states that the debate reached its zenith with the abolition of the English Department at University College, Nairobi, which was later replaced by the Department of Linguistics and African Languages.73

For the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus to be a success each of the three constituent colleges and each of the national governments had to play an active role. East Africans responded to this call in part by agitating for the introduction of the African Studies programme at the University’s constituent Colleges. University College, Nairobi put its weight behind this cause in part by building a library of African Literature. This was in realisation that it would be impossible for the constituent Colleges of the University to promote African Studies without having the necessary African literature as a collection to be used for this purpose.

The African Studies programme developed at a different pace in each of the constituent Colleges. As early as 1963 Nicholas Otieno, Lecturer in the Department of Botany at the University College in Nairobi wrote to Hyslop, the College’s Principal, registering his support for the African Studies programme. Hyslop conceded in his response that the African Studies programme was a necessity in all University Colleges in East Africa and went on to applaud the University College, Dar es Salaam, which had already made clear provisions to offer this course.74 In 1965, University College,

---

69 Ibid., 7.
70 Two conferences were held at Dakar University in Senegal and Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone between March 26 and April 9, 1963 to discuss the integration of African Literature in French and English in university and pre-university teaching syllabuses. For details about these conferences see: Ezekiel Mphahlele, “African Literature and Universities. A Report on Two Conferences to Discuss African Literature and the University Curriculum”, *Transition*, Vol. 4, No. 10 (September, 1963): 16-18.
72 Obote, “The Soul of a Nation”: 5.
Nairobi in its Africanisation cause established the Institute for Development Studies, which was divided into: the Social Sciences Division and the Cultural Division.

African members of the academic staff at University College, Nairobi submitted a Memorandum to the College’s Principal in which the question of the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus at the University College was the focal point. These staff members highlighted a number of areas where the University had been challenged by different constituencies in East Africa and argued: “… we are anxious to put across our views about an aspect that requires urgent consideration by the University.” They called for the training of African women to fit them into an East Africa that was changing very rapidly and argued that reference to Home Economics as Domestic Science resulted into the course being associated with women chores such as cooking, sweeping, needlework and child care. They proposed that the course should be developed as a specialised subject leading to a degree on similar lines as Medicine, Law and Engineering. Moreover, they argued that East Africa needed more locally trained women Home Economists and Dieticians to work in hospitals and pointed out that there was a dire need for research that would make the course really East African, stating: “East Africa is rich in local foodstuffs the potentialities of which very little is yet known and could only be ascertained through research.” This is how determined they were to see Africanisation become a reality.

The Annual Report for the year 1964/65 at University College, Nairobi gave the impression that the project of Africanising the curriculum and the syllabus at the UEA bore fruits within a short space of time. The Report gleefully stated: “our courses reflect greater content material from Africa, and our increasing volume of research is directed to solving East Africa’s problems.” This was deemed a great achievement since the University had only begun in 1963. But Ogot in his autobiography demonstrates that Africanising the curriculum and the syllabus was a daunting task. He recalls that when he arrived in Nairobi in 1964 the level of historical studies was rudimentary and that Professor Hanna, Chair of History had no interest in pursuing the Africanisation cause. Ogot recounts his experience with the Africanisation of the history syllabus. He recalls that the important question in drawing up the syllabi, besides emphasising African history, was to decide on what kind of non-African history to be taught at the Universities. The belief in Western history as the ‘high history’ of mankind had to be replaced with the oneness of history and in the potential of the historical method to integrate human experience. He felt that there was a need to introduce large numbers of University freshmen and women to a world history not shackled to the old western civilisation paradigm. African students had to be told in clear terms that western tradition was not world history. It was therefore necessary –

... to deal with the histories of the various regions of the world in accord with an integrated, globally oriented approach. And that is what I tried to do in the Department of history in Nairobi.

75 Memorandum Submitted to College Authorities by the Members of the Academic Staff of the Royal College, Nairobi in Support of the Retention of Home Economics as a Degree Subject in the College, 1. KNA GH/11/24.
76 Ibid., 2.
77 UEA. University College, Nairobi, Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1964/65, 8.
Ogot wrote in another article: that following the attainment of political independence in 1963, “it soon became obvious that Kenya needed a new past of her own. It became clear that political independence could only have meaning if it was accompanied by historical independence.”

On 13 January 1965, the meeting of the regional African Studies Committee of the Federal University accepted, as part of Africanisation, that African Music would be introduced as a course option at Makerere University College. Delegates envisaged that this course would benefit students doing Sociology because they would know more about the societies they were studying. The conference felt that the goal was achievable because Kampala was situated in musically the richest area of East Africa. The conference noted that excellent facilities existed at the Uganda Museum for studying instruments whilst the Ministry of Education and Mr Peter Cooke of the Makerere College Demonstration School were in the process of planning and providing instrumental training in African Music at several Uganda schools. It was hoped that co-operation would be possible to the mutual advantage of the Faculty of Education, the Museum and the Ministry of Education which would allow instrumental training to form an integral part of the course work of the proposed option. Initially, there was a problem in finding a suitable academic musicologist who would provide the planning of a suitable syllabus as well as the lecture core. The University solved this problem by approaching Dr John Blacking, an Englishman who was a Senior Lecturer in Anthropology specialising in the teaching of African music at the University of the Witwatersrand in South Africa and asked him to assist Makerere by coming to East Africa for the greater part of the second term of 1965-6 to design the course. Dr Blacking accepted the invitation and did as requested to do.

The idea of teaching African music was not new in Uganda. Mr Mbabi-Katana, a Rockefeller Lecturer in the Institute of Education for the study of African Music in East Africa, had laid the foundation when he started the first programme in African Music at Makerere University College in October 1961. This programme had a guaranteed five-year grant of £17,930 from the Rockefeller Foundation and it helped in the teaching of musically talented teachers in the area. Mr Mbabi-Katana collected songs in African languages and made use of Radio Uganda as a means of communication in order to reach schools, colleges and the public. He stated in his 1964 report that lectures on African music were broadcast on National Service in English during the Academic Year 1963-64. Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus continued at the UEA as shown in a draft syllabus for an Economics Course proposed by the University College, Nairobi:

I. Population - Population history of East Africa.

II. Ethnic Groups - The concept of ‘race’, and cultural differences.

III. Rural Society - Traditional social organisation of selected East African tribes.


81 A Report of the First Programme in African Music Being Developed at Makerere University College of East Africa by S. Mbabi-Katana, July 1964. KNA KA/2/17. It is not clear why Mbabi-Katana was not approached to teach African music at Makerere University College.
IV. Social Change
-The pattern of urban industrial society contrasted with traditional social organisation; impact of Western culture on East Africa.

V. Urban Society
-Towns as the loci of culture, clash and assimilation.82

The History Department at University College, Nairobi introduced a new syllabus in September 1967. First year students had to take two papers in African history. Options at second year level included: History of Political Ideas; Europe, Africa and the New World Since 1492; History of the United States of America since 1763; Russia in the Modern Era; Archaeology; and the Development of the International Economy.

In curriculum development the content of a course is always geared towards achieving specific goals. A district commissioner in Kenya wrote: “If it is conceded that the economic progress of the Nandi is to be on a stock farming and dairying basis then education should be directed towards this end.”83 This idea of outcomes-based education was the guiding principle for East African politicians and scholars in the 1960s.84

The argument by East African constituencies was not that their University should teach its students solely African themes but that political independence had to be reflected at the University through the incorporation of East African themes previously ignored by expatriates. African scholars argued that themes derived from the West had to supplement African themes, not to dominate the syllabus. When the three East African Colleges had a ‘Special Relationship’ with the University of London there was little they could do to achieve their own goals. The syllabus was approved in London, so were the examination questions and the quality of students’ results. With the independence of the University of East Africa came the responsibility to make all decisions that would shape the future of higher education in that region. This spirit of independence was alive among the students too. Mazrui recalls that one serious manifestation occurred in the Faculty of Law at Dar es Salaam where there was a student outcry against the Americanisation of the law syllabus. A new syllabus which had already been passed by the Senate of the University, and which in some ways was more sensitised to local issues than the old one, was denounced by the student body as an alien American intrusion into the academic process at Dar es Salaam.85

82 Arts Faculty Board Memorandum 21/11. Draft Syllabus for Examinable Course, ‘East African Society’ (3-1-1 in Economics) BA students, 11 June 1968. UON Archives. UEA Executive Senate Committee, PUEA/2A/4.
83 District Commissioner. Memorandum on Post-War Development, 15 May 1943, p. 3. KNA PC/NKU/2/1/47.
84 However, the East African case is not an anomaly. When the Church Mission Society founded Fourah Bay College in West Africa in 1827, the aim was to produce ministers and lay-workers. The content was tailored for this purpose. The aim of Prince of Wales College at Achimota in the Gold Coast was the production of the type of student who is western in his intellectual attitude towards life but who remains African in sympathy, and it seeks to preserve and develop what is deserving of respect in African life. At Ibadan in Nigeria, controversy arose over the curriculum of the degree in English, which from the very beginning included culturally alien material. The aim of the college – at least as Africans saw it – was to train Africans so that they could serve their own people, not to produce ‘black Europeans’. African politicians, scholars, and students challenged the aims of the curriculum that did not have Africans as its target group. Independence in Nigeria, Ghana and Sudan, as discussed in the surveys in Chapter 1, was followed by calls for the Africanisation of the institutions of higher education. Therefore, East African constituencies were not the first to agitate for the Africanisation of the curriculum at an African University.
85 Mazrui, Political Values and the Educated Class in Africa, 205.
Yet, the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus was characterised by various tensions. Prewitt wrote: “I agree with Joseph Okello when he writes that Africanization is one of those slogans attractive to a newly independent country but dangerous because it is situationally right.”86 Some constituencies feared that Africanisation would result into the lowering of the University’s academic standards and limit the student. When African and European scholars called for the Africanisation of Literature, for example, Ezekiel Mphahlele responded: “Are we like tethered goats? What shall we do when that patch of ground is cropped bare?”87 In East Africa, Okello-Oculi intimated:

It would be risky to stick out one’s neck and claim that knowledge can be African. Rather it is more useful to talk about the congruence between the type of knowledge disseminated and the immediate needs of Africa.88

Chagula, while agitating for the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus at the University, argued that East Africa had to think about the future too. Although it was essential for the University to be pre-occupied with the manpower problems facing the region, it was equally important for the university to train for tomorrow. This could be done by the inclusion of subjects like pure mathematics and theoretical physics in the curriculum, subjects which may appear to be of no immediate utility. He argued: “We must prepare our graduates now for living in and serving the East Africa of tomorrow.”89

At times the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus caused tensions between scholars and the politicians. Mazrui recalled his ordeal at Makerere where he Africanised the curriculum and the syllabus of Political Science. President Obote felt that Mazrui had become a politician, not a scholar and asked him: “Do you teach Politics or do you practice Politics?” Mazrui wondered if there was an alternative if the syllabus was to be changed towards local orientation. He recalled indicating to the President that he could teach Political Science in a most neutral way if he concentrated on topics as distant from the local scene as the committee system in the American congress, or relations between the Civil Service and the British Cabinet, on methods of political recruitment in the Soviet Union. His view was that the price of Africanising the syllabus, especially in the humanities, was to sensitise the syllabus.90

He cites another incident where a lecturer in the Department of Law tried to localise the syllabus and found himself in trouble. Mazrui recalls that the new syllabus in law at Dar es Salaam in 1969 included a course on military law. When the member of staff was challenged about teaching such a course he defended it in terms of relevance, arguing that the military in Africa had become increasingly important as a factor of influence in political and social processes. From the point of view of relevance, “a course in military law might therefore be regarded

88 Okello-Oculi, “Africanization and the University.”
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as pre-eminently defensible. But this was an area of relevance which merged into political sensitivity. It was too relevant!"91

Politicians espoused their views on Africanisation. Vincent Rwamwaro, Member of the Uganda Parliament from East Toro, supported the Africanisation project in principle but made contradictory statements when he contributed to the debate on Africanisation during a parliamentary session. He referred to a pamphlet advertising an MA course in African Studies offered at Makerere College and regretted that on the cover of the pamphlet there were two leopards. He found this insulting to Africans because it portrayed them as ‘primitive’ and irrelevant to the course being advertised. Yet it turned out that the two leopards were examples of art from Benin, Southern Nigeria, dating to the 14th century thus reflecting the richness of African history. In fact, Rwamwaro challenged the very idea of having an MA course in African Studies, arguing that British universities did not have degrees in British Studies – so why should Africa have one? He seemed to have forgotten that the primary aim was to Africanise the curricula and the syllabi at the UEA, not to emulate British universities or Western universities in general.

This section has demonstrated that arguments for the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus at the UEA were inspired by the political mood of the 1960s when Africans resolved to take charge of their own affairs by changing the face of their political, economic and educational institutions. However, as the discussion has shown, the Africanisation project did not go unchallenged.

Meanwhile, East African politicians and scholars realised that Africanising the curriculum and the syllabus was not enough to change the character of the University; equally important was finding the right people to do the actual teaching and conduct the kind of research envisioned by the proponents of the Africanisation project. Also, they realised that there was an urgent need to Africanise the administration of the University to ensure that University policies were not antithetical to the Africanisation cause. This realisation inspired East African constituencies to call for the Africanisation of staff.

The Africanisation of staff

Progress in education, as in every other field of human endeavour in East Africa, will be achieved through the recruitment of better people, introduction of improved practices and the development of a system which encourages the ablest in the profession to exercise the widest possible influence …

Proposals for the localisation and upgrading of teacher-training tutors in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

Deciding what to teach is as important as finding the people who will teach. The Africanisation of the syllabus is inseparable from the Africanisation of staff and there are times when it is assumed that “the curriculum and syllabus cannot effectively be localized unless the staff
This relationship between the curriculum, the syllabus, and the staff echoes Chagula’s submission that decisions on who should be admitted as students, which curriculum will be used, and who should be appointed as staff is the prerogative of the University as an institution yet “these are subjects of public interest and thus become macropolitics.”

A.C. Mwingira, the MP referred to earlier, shared the same view, arguing: “I know that this question of choice of research topics is inextricably linked with the appointment of staff, and in particular of senior teaching staff, at any university.” As stated in Chapter 1, Ki-Zerbo’s firm contention was that without going so far as to maintain that only Africans can teach what is African, it is indisputable that Africans are better placed to appreciate that which is African.

The Africanisation of staff at the University received more attention than the Africanisation of the curriculum and the syllabus mainly because the predominance of the expatriate staff at the University was more conspicuous than what happened in the lecture theatres and laboratories. Secondly, the replacement of European staff by Africans had already started at the East African Common Services Authority. Therefore, when politicians and scholars in East Africa agitated for the Africanisation of staff at the University Colleges they were continuing a process that had already been set in motion at other regional institutions. It is for these reasons that the Africanisation of administrative staff and faculty seemed to be radical.

Calls for the Africanisation of staff in East Africa became stronger on the eve of independence. By 1961 members of the Central Legislative Assembly of East Africa were already calling for the Africanisation of regional institutions. Sir Edgeworth David, the Administrator, reported to the House during the sitting of the second session of the fourth Assembly that two African officers had been promoted to the B and C salary scales in an attempt to Africanise middle-level administrative positions. Some members of the House applauded the move. However, many African Members were not impressed. Francis Khamisi from Kenya immediately took the Administrator to task and inquired: “would the Administrator tell us that out of all the African serving officers, only two were eligible for promotion to these posts?”

The Administrator stated that the process had just begun and that more Africans would be promoted soon. Khamisi then provided concrete reasons why he felt it was necessary to Africanise the staff at the East African regional institutions. He submitted:

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that: Be it resolved that this Assembly do urge the East Africa High Commission to exert every endeavour to expedite now the Africanization of staff employed in all its services so as to ensure continuity of all projects after independence.

Khamisi did not believe that there was anybody who could deny that it was very imperative that when East African Territories became independent they would be served by people of all races; but that the majority who would serve these Territories had to be African natives. For him, the building up of Africanisation was most essential in the interests of the country and would be more economical; there would be no inducement allowances, no expatriate privileges, no
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great amount of money to be spent on passages and educational facilities, and so on. Secondly, Africanisation would benefit indigenous Africans. He contended that it would be of no use telling the Africans, “This is your Government now,” if they go round Government offices and find that in actual fact it is not so because they are not sufficiently represented in the services of the Government. Moreover, he argued that immigrant races would be exonerated if African Governments made mistakes; the blame would have to be borne by the African officer. In the same meeting, Wilberforce Nadiope, another Member of the House, accused the High Commission for treating the matter of Africanisation lightly and intimated that there was a need to synchronise the services otherwise there would always be a screech. He continued:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Africans will never learn any business or take up responsible posts unless they are tried out. We have got several Africans who are capable of doing the job but they are not being given a chance. It is no good trying to say that we can learn to swim by looking at the water.97

The East African Common Services Authority responded to these calls by appointing a Commission on 4 December 1962 under the Chairmanship of Mr J.O. Udoji from Nigeria.98 The four terms of reference of this Commission were:

(i) To ascertain the present and probable availability in East Africa of suitably qualified Africans for recruitment to the services of the EACSO, either by direct appointment to the various grades in which non-Africans are employed or for training for such grades;

(ii) To consider in what cadres and in what numbers there is a need for the continued employment of expatriate staff, and the rate at which such staff can be replaced by African officers;

(iii) To review the current training programmes, and facilities, both local and overseas, provided by and for the various Services of the EACSO with the object of ascertaining whether adequate arrangements are in train for Africanising the East African Common Services as soon as possible, having due regard to the maintenance of standards of service; and

(iv) To consider what further measures may be necessary or desirable to accelerate the appointment or promotion of African officers, having regard to the need to maintain standards.99

African leaders wanted to change EACSO’s outlook to reflect its African character. Where there were no suitable Africans to take leadership positions, it was suggested that individuals would be identified and trained for such positions. The University was part of the regional federation project and therefore could not be insulated from the ‘winds of change’ cutting across the region. It is partly100 for this reason that the Africanisation of staff at the University received more attention.

---

97 Ibid., Col. 500.
98 Other members of the Commission were: W.W. Kalema, C.M. Kapilima and C.W. Rubia.
100 I say ‘partly’ because even if Africanisation did not start at the East African Common Services Authority’s offices the University would have initiated it, although it is possible that the process might have been slower if there was no pressure from other institutions.
In fact, the Africanisation of staff at the University was already a topical subject during the planning stages. De Bunsen stressed the need for Africanisation at Makerere College when he presented the report for the year 1961-1962. He reported that a fund was being created, with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation, for supernumerary posts aimed at making it possible to appoint “specially selected East Africans at the time when they become qualified without waiting for established posts to fall vacant.”\textsuperscript{101} De Bunsen argued that it was important that the priorities Makerere College set itself within the overall planning of the UEA should have relevance to the needs of East Africa, especially in the professional fields. In April 1963, Africans constituted only 9% of the faculty in the entire University and this vindicated those East Africans calling for the Africanisation of the UEA.

The Africanisation of staff continued to dominate the discussions, both at the Constituent Colleges and at the inter-territorial meetings, soon after the University had been officially constituted. The meeting of the Council held at Makerere College on 2 August 1963 recorded:

(i) That Council fully accepted the necessity and desirability on social and academic grounds of a rapid rate of East-Africanisation, and considered that this could be achieved more expeditiously in administrative than in academic posts;

(ii) That in general the term ‘East AfricanAfricanisation’ should be taken to refer to the appointment of persons holding citizenship of East African countries;

(iii) That in taking steps to maintain an increase in the rate of East AfricanAfricanisation, it should be ensured that attempts in this direction should not only be made but should be seen to be made, and

(iv) that it should always be borne in mind as a primary consideration that in the interests of East Africa the high standards which had been built up in the College should be maintained.\textsuperscript{102}

In the same meeting, Makerere University College Council resolved:

(i) that the Executive Committee should be charged with the responsibility of producing a comprehensive scheme for East AfricanAfricanisation, especially of the administrative staff with recommendations as to a compensation scheme and be invited to consider co-opting additional members for this purpose with a view particularly to the representation of African opinion; and

(ii) that no general compensation scheme be introduced for academic staff.\textsuperscript{103}

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Provisional Council of the UEA initiated the University’s Development Plan (UDP), which was subsequently discussed at the Como Conference in October 1963. The Conference approved the Plan to transform the University into one manned and led by local staff of the highest caliber, and to bring it some way forward to achieving this by the end of the first triennium.\textsuperscript{104} The Draft Plan had set a target of 18% East Africanisation

\textsuperscript{102} Minutes of the 69\textsuperscript{th} Meeting of the Makerere University College Council, 2 August 1963, 4. KNA KA/2/17.
\textsuperscript{103} Minutes of the 69\textsuperscript{th} Meeting of the Makerere University College Council, 2 August 1963, 4. KNA KA/2/17.
\textsuperscript{104} Report of a Conference on the University of East Africa, Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, 21\textsuperscript{st} to 25\textsuperscript{th} October 1963, 20.
of academic staff by the end of 1967. The conference concluded after considering a number of factors\textsuperscript{105} that this target would be easily met and subsequently set a new target of 40% by the same period. The delegates were optimistic. They looked back in time and concluded that the potential for the Africanisation of the University and other regional institutions was much greater than had been in the 1950s. In 1955, the East Africa Royal Commission\textsuperscript{106} raised concerns that at that time East Africa only had one University College, Makerere and felt that there was a need for more centers of higher learning to address the dearth of Africans capable of rising to the highest positions in the public service and in commerce and industry. By 1963 this situation had changed significantly. The number of skilled East Africans had increased, thus validating a case for Africanisation.

The Press Release issued at Bellagio on 28 October 1963 after the Como Conference stated:

> The recruitment of increased numbers of Africans to the staff of the University was recognized as one of the most important and immediate problems. Representatives of the University described their plans for Africanization and substantial offers of technical assistance were made by outside donors to enable this to go forward.\textsuperscript{107}

Government and University delegates returned from the Como Conference reinvigorated and resolved to implement Africanisation at the University. Subsequently, the Development Committee of the UEA agreed to set up, as a Sub-Committee of the Development Committee, an East African Africanisation Committee consisting of two members of the academic staff of each college, one of them the Senate representative on the Development Committee and the other to be nominated by the Principal of the College, with the University Registrar as Chairman. The proposals of the East Africanisation Committee would be communicated for decision to the Development Committee.\textsuperscript{108}

The East Africanisation Committee began its task soon after the Como Conference. It noted in its Memorandum that public opinion, government opinion, and college intramural opinion in East Africa seemed to agree that the most intensive efforts at East Africanisation had to be exerted in the administrative sphere, adding that this opinion derived from two reasons:

(i) Governments and the public firmly believed that administrative officers wield power, and influence policy to a much greater extent than academics of corresponding grade;

(ii) There were a good many more East Africans with high-level administrative experience than with high academic qualifications; yet the University had only a few administrative posts and a great many academic ones.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{105} For example, the fact that some East Africans already had qualifications and some were about to finish their degrees in overseas universities.


\textsuperscript{107} Telegram No. 207 From CRO London to UKREP, Dar es Salaam, 31 October 1963. KNA GH/11/31.

\textsuperscript{108} Minutes of the Third Meeting of the University Development Committee, Nairobi, 8 November 1963, 4-5. UON Archives, UEA Academic Board. PUEA/3/2.

\textsuperscript{109} The East Africanisation of Senior Administrative, Senior Library and Technician Posts by East Africanisation Sub-Committee. Draft III, EC Memo 5/2/1, Document BI. UON Archives. UEA East Africanisation Committee, PUEA/16/1, 24 December 1963.
In the meantime, each of the three Constituent Colleges of the University made individual efforts to accelerate Africanisation. The Academic Board of Makerere University College recommended, inter alia that the College Council resolve as follows:

(i) That every effort be made to accelerate the rate of East African Africanisation in the college staff at all levels and in all functions;

(ii) That in functions where it is unlikely that candidates with suitable qualifications will present themselves, earnest consideration be given to the preparation of East African candidates by further study, courses of training, in-service training or any other means; and

(iii) That in advertising all vacant posts, special consideration be given to East African candidates.¹¹⁰

Africanisation could only work at the expense of the expatriates. This reality sometimes caused tensions. Mwai Kibaki, a Member of the Kenya Parliament, pointed out in the Central Legislative Assembly that the University College in Nairobi was run by “a few gentlemen who are determined to resist any change. The expatriate staff – with a few outstanding exceptions which simply prove the rule – feel insecure about their positions …”¹¹¹ Two of the many issues that became the locus of the tensions were:

(i) whether the Africanisation project would maintain or lower the revered international academic standards; and

(ii) whether the expatriate staff would be compensated for losing their positions.

Politicians and scholars, both East Africans and expatriates, had divergent views on these issues. With regard to the first issue, one argument was that the University needed expatriate staff who already had the required experience and expertise needed by the University if it were to maintain international standards. An opposing view, held mainly by East African scholars and politicians, was that qualifications had to take precedence over experience. Politicians such as E.M.K. Mulira from Uganda argued that East Africans who had the necessary qualifications could be appointed as assistant professors and as Deputies in administrative posts so as to accumulate experience and be appointed straight into leadership positions whenever they met the requirements. Aggrey Awori, the University’s Liaison Officer, insisted that East Africans should be used in policy-making within the University.

Posts filled from 1963 where an expatriate and an East African qualified, revived the embedded tensions. For example, A.J. Hanna from Southampton in Britain was appointed as Chair of the History Department at the Royal College, Nairobi in 1963. This appointment sparked a debate within and outside the University. One newspaper launched a scathing attack on the University administration for appointing Hanna, stating that although he was competent, his mission was not to serve East Africa. It asked: “Can he reflect a view of African history which is indigenous to Africa?”¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Makerere University College. 65th Meeting of the Council, Paper AB/62/1, East Africanisation. UON Archives. UEA Makerere University College, PUEA/12/18.


¹¹² Pan Africa (Tanzania), 28 August 1963.
Ogot recalls rather sadly his experience with Hanna and how the latter perceived Africans. Ogot argues that Hanna’s book, *The Story of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland* (1960) recorded the rise and fall of British supremacy and its effects upon the African population, from the coming of the missionaries and traders to the dissolution of the Central African Federation. Hanna also recorded in the book his attitude towards Africans and their history. He –

... refers to nineteenth century Central Africa as ‘these impulsive children of nature’ who lacked prudence and forethought ... This was a man who was appointed to provide leadership in the young, and hardly established Department of History in Nairobi.\(^{113}\)

Hanna resigned from the University when Ogot was promoted to Senior Lecturer position in the History Department in January 1965.

The planners of the University were caught up in the war of words between different constituencies and made indefatigable efforts to incorporate different views in their plans. For example, regarding the fate of the expatriate staff, the Council of the University resolved on 13 February 1964 that officers who lost their posts in the interests of East Africanisation or reorganisation would be fairly compensated.\(^{114}\)

From 1964, the Africanisation of the constituent colleges of the University began in earnest. S.H. Ominde, who had been working at Makerere, moved to Nairobi where he was appointed Chair of Geography and became the first African Professor at the University College in Nairobi. Ogot followed him and joined the History Department; he later recruited Saulo Were. The 1964/65 Annual Report of University College, Nairobi stated that the Special Lectureship programme had been given a boost by the Rockefeller Foundation, whereby promising young Africans could be appointed to supernumerary positions in the colleges for up to three years, while established positions were being created or became vacant.\(^{115}\) The Report was optimistic that the target of 40% East Africanisation by 1967/68 that was laid down in the revised University Development Plan would be reached (this optimism was not farfetched\(^{116}\)). According to the Report, senior and middle management had also been shaken significantly. From April 1965, David Wasawo took up his appointment as Deputy Principal of the University College. Sam Waruhiu was elected to the Vice-Principalship. Solomon Karanja replaced Mr. Eustace as Registrar while Peter Cege replaced Mr Tovell as Finance Officer. These developments brought optimism.

The new incumbents had a heavy task on their shoulders; they had to service the whole of East Africa. What made their assignments even more challenging was that they had taken over from expatriate staff. The *Makererean*, a student weekly newspaper at Makerere University College maintained:

> It is common experience in Africa that whenever Africans try to change any institutions left by the colonial regime, the colonial elements and reactionaries come out and warn of


\(^{114}\) East Africanisation of the Administration (G.P. 25/3/64) RC Memo 18/8 Document H., UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/16.

\(^{115}\) UEA. University College, Nairobi. Annual Report and Accounts for the Year 1964/65, 8.

\(^{116}\) The 1967/68 Report of University College, Nairobi alone shows an increase of East African Staff from 36 to 56 – which was 28 percent of the total teaching staff.
For some University authorities, Africanisation was non-negotiable. Aggrey Awori argued that in any University, it is academically, politically, culturally and economically desirable that a majority of those who teach and run the institutions should be of the same nationality as their students. In his view, the services of expatriate teachers could not be relied on indefinitely.

East African politicians took a vanguard position in championing the Africanisation cause and this raises an important question: How did East African politicians respond to the way in which the UEA implemented Africanisation? As mentioned earlier in this chapter, East African politicians first looked to the University’s administrators to implement Africanisation and only put pressure when they realised that the process was advancing at a slow pace. An analysis of territorial and inter-territorial parliamentary debates shows the tensions that occurred in parliamentary circles regarding this issue.

Rwamwaro, referred to earlier in the present chapter, asked the Uganda Parliament to intervene in the affairs of Makerere University College regarding the pace in which the College implemented Africanisation. He argued:

> We must seriously think of direct Government intervention in this college. I do not mean to say the university should be a Government department – far from it. But I feel there is room for the Government to go in ....

Rwamwaro went through the list of predominantly European staff at Makerere University College and argued that the Government could not just look on while this trend continued. He found it unacceptable that the expatriate staff could dominate an African University College.

Rwamwaro, in his long speech, cited a comment made by William Lamont, former Principal of Makerere College in which he said that the College should produce many graduates to serve not only Uganda but the whole of East Africa. Governor Sir John Hall was not impressed by the idea and the two officials clashed, resulting into Lamont’s resignation in 1949, at which time he was subsequently replaced by “a civil servant who had worked in Palestine.” Some African politicians believed that the political influence was the main reason why Makerere was so slow in Africanising itself. They accused de Bunsen for being Governor Hall’s agent who had been given instructions to ensure that Makerere University College produced very few African graduates and that it became as unattractive to prospective candidates as possible by delaying the Africanisation of staff.

Rwamwaro contradicted himself at times. For example, he blamed Governor Hall for interfering with Lamont’s vision while at the same time calling on the government of Uganda to step in

---

118 Awori, “East African University Must be Africanised”: 15.
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120 Rwamwaro was referring to Bernard de Bunsen who was appointed Acting Principal of Makerere College in 1949 and took over as Principal in 1950. He later became the first Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Africa in 1963. As it turned out later in the debate, de Bunsen did not become Makerere’s Principal straight from Palestine. He first became lecturer in the Education Department at Makerere College and assumed the Principalship position soon after becoming a Professor in the Education Department.
at the College to accelerate the Africanisation process. This submission did not remove the political influence from the College’s affairs. Rwamwaro was acutely aware of this tension in his submission. He later urged members to accept the idea of the university being independent, but also urged Government to have some say in the higher institutes of learning. He concluded: If the colonial government had a say why should we not have a say. J.M. Okae (Ugandan MP) raised a motion for speeding up of Africanisation at Makerere. The House passed the motion, thus authorising the Uganda government to exert pressure on Makerere College to accelerate the Africanisation process.

When the UEA was established there were few Africans who qualified to take up senior positions. Africans and Europeans took extreme positions when addressing this issue. Europeans exaggerated the shortage of trained Africans and failed to promote those who qualified for senior positions, using as a justification for their action the mundane argument that there were few qualified Africans. An East African seminar on the role of the University noted inter alia that although East Africa needed expatriates,

... we tend to exaggerate the need and to receive expatriates too readily and without discrimination. We should evaluate the need and the type of post to be filled by any expatriates. We should not accept the ‘free’ man, unless: 1. He is of experience and quality; 2. We have been involved in his selection; 3. His proposed post is one we have decided we need.

Thomas Odhiambo recalled the early years of the UEA in the following manner:

At that time, the senior administrative and academic staff in the University was overwhelmingly expatriate; and one heard the argument that although the University was keen to Africanise, it was finding it extremely difficult to get suitably qualified and experienced East Africans to occupy University posts ... East Africans on the other hand over-emphasised the Africanisation issue and expected to see the UEA and its constituent Colleges Africanised almost overnight. However, there were instances where realistic proposals were made. Delegates concluded at a conference held in Oxford that curriculum development units should be staffed by nationals and proposed that:

... where expatriates are needed, they should be people who have not only the required expertise, but also the empathy needed to enable them to see the problem from the point of view of the host country.

Parliamentary debates in the national governments and at the East Africa Legislative Assembly were characterised by tensions. Joseph Kiwanuka, MP from North Mubende in Uganda, cautioned the House not to lose sight of the issue at hand and reminded Members that the question was not one of standards but of Africans at the University College being regarded as junior staff even if they qualified for senior positions. According to Kiwanuka there were

121 Uganda Argus, 20 July 1963.
122 Summary of the Seminar on the Role of the University, 30.
123 T.R. Odhiambo, “The Crisis of Science in East Africa”:
Europeans who held senior positions at the College even if they had the same or even lower qualifications than those held by Africans. He cited the Geography Department, arguing that a white professor had an MA degree while there were two African lecturers – one with an MA and another with a PhD yet neither of them was a professor. This evidence refuted de Bunsen’s claim that no suitably qualified African had ever been denied a position.

According to the figures cited by Members of Parliament for 1963, out of a total of 144 academic staff at Makerere, there were only 20 Africans. Some members found this situation disturbing and argued that the near absence of African members of the teaching staff was detrimental to the students since many of them found it easier to talk to an African member of staff than an expatriate faculty whenever they had problems, both academic and personal. According to these MPs, flooding the College with expatriate faculty was a disservice to the African students.

Tensions regarding Africanisation were not confined to race; the proponents of the Africanisation project attacked all statements against Africanisation regardless of the person or persons who uttered them. When Dr Paul Kigundu sustained the argument that there were very few Africans with the requisite qualifications to be lecturers and professors, he found himself heckled by his own Government side to the extent that part of his speech was inaudible. At times emotions were exceedingly high during the debates on Africanisation. Humphrey Luande unabashedly told the Uganda Parliament that Africanisation was a national birthright in Uganda and therefore non-negotiable. Anyone [emphasis mine] who tried to impede it was ‘only looking for trouble’. Luande endorsed the view that European lecturers only came to East Africa for money; they were not interested in the well-being of the Africans. He suggested: “the sooner they go so that we can start afresh the better.”125 Luande then broke his generalisations down into specifics by identifying positions that could be Africanised overnight. He argued that the College Principal could be easily replaced because he did very little other than going to ceremonies. The personnel officer received the most severe criticism from Luande who accused him of knowing nothing about negotiation.

The view expressed by Dr Kigundu that Makerere students had to be sent abroad for further study and then return to take employment at Makerere did not receive a warm welcome in the House. William Kalema, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education, burst out: “To the Africans, Africanisation must come right now and to the non-Africans it should never come at all, because the standards would fall.”126 If Europeans thought they were the only ones with impeccable ‘standards’ to be maintained, Kalema’s statement forced them to revisit that assumption.

The call for Africanisation at Makerere was not unexpected. Even before the sitting of parliament Kalema told the media that the Government was planning to Africanise its departments and that it was going to say to Makerere: “You have heard the feelings of the people of the country on Africanisation and it means bold step is required of you.”127 Makerere was not to Africanise every post, but the College Council had to give good advice to Makerere College to Africanise in all those areas that were unduly sensitive to the public.

---

125 Uganda Argus, 21 July 1963.
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As it turned out, there was a long list of the ‘sensitive areas’ that needed immediate Africanisation. These were: College Secretary, registrar, personnel training officer, chief clerk, wages clerk, all six assistant bursars, four domestic bursars, superintendent of works and estate officer. What forced the Government to take drastic action was that the College was “a model of a good English university that is situated in Africa.”

Ogot recalls the tensions that occurred among East African scholars and politicians regarding the Africanisation of the UEA when he was teaching at Makerere University College. He writes: “One of the most important debates that shaped the futures of the university colleges in East Africa occurred in 1963, following the publication of the Rogers’ Report on Salaries and Terms of Service in the University of East Africa.” The Report recommended that the salary structure and terms of service at the University should be related to those found in the civil service and in industry; proposed different salary structures, one for the local staff and one for the expatriates, proposing more pay to the expatriate staff; argued that there would be accelerated localisation of University posts; and asserted that the new terms of service would ensure that standards were maintained.

The Makerere University College Academic Staff Association (ASA) was not impressed by the Report and subsequently drafted its response entitled: ‘Comments and Recommendations of Makerere College Academic Staff Association Concerning the Draft New Terms of Service and the Rogers Committee Report, June 1963’ in which they expressed concern that the terms of service and the proposed salary scales would scare prospective East African specialists away from the University and thus delay the Africanisation project.

Ogot, Lecturer in the Department of History; S.H. Ominde, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Geography; Semei Nyanzi, Lecturer in Economics (and an Acholi from Northern Uganda) felt that the Memorandum written by the ASA had only raised concerns but did not recommend the course of action. They then drafted a separated memorandum entitled: ‘Africanisation of Administrative Posts in Makerere College, June 1963’ in which they stated the responsibilities of each expatriate senior officer in the hierarchy of university administration; outlined the training required for each position; and provided the names of East Africans already working at Makerere College who possessed the necessary qualifications for each post. The three scholars concluded that it was possible to Africanise administrative posts overnight. Ogot summarises the tensions caused by the second Memorandum by stating that the reaction to it was varied. The expatriates were shocked and warned that the implementation of such a policy would undermine standards and possibly lead to mass exodus of staff. Most Ugandan members of staff, including senior academics encouraged by expatriates, thought they could detect a conspiracy hatched by Kenyan Nilotic lecturers to disrupt the smooth development that had been taking place at Makerere in order to divert attention and resources to the Royal College, Nairobi. Ominde and Ogot were
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131 The East African seminar on the role of the University held in 1965 made a diametrically opposed argument, stating that staff salaries should be consistent with the rest of the economy and that as part of the solution to the high cost arising through staff salaries, “staff localisation should proceed as rapidly as possible.” See: Summary of the Seminar on the Role of the University, in East Africa Journal, Vol. 2, No. 5 (August, 1965): 17.
faced with all kinds of threats and insults, demanding their resignation or transfer to Nairobi. Eventually, they both moved to Nairobi on promotion in 1964.132

The memorandum sparked the debate within and outside the University. Members of parliament were eager to know from their colleagues how the process of Africanisation at Makerere College was progressing. Kalema responded by saying:

(i) Makerere could not find highly qualified East Africans for senior academic and administrative posts at the College;

(ii) East Africans were being attracted to other posts outside the University and therefore could not be attracted to or retained by the University;

(iii) Localisation in East Africa had to be accelerated without compromising existing standards or jeopardising the position of existing members of the college staff; and

(iv) Makerere provided supernumerary posts for openings in regard to first-class East African graduates.

This response sustained tensions. The Ministry of Education conceded that Makerere College was experiencing problems in obtaining qualified East Africans who could accelerate the Africanisation process by filling senior academic and administrative posts but concluded: “however, it is not correct to say that the College cannot find such people.”133

Ominde, Nyanzi and Ogot issued a rejoinder affirming that the College had not done enough to Africanise itself. In their view, the assertion that there was a dearth of qualified East Africans to Africanise university posts was unfounded and they argued that administrative posts, including that of the Principal, could be Africanised immediately. The Makerere College Employees Union subsequently challenged the authorities of the University to advertise all the posts, which, according to the University authorities, could not be Africanised. The Union recommended that applicants should be interviewed by an independent body set up by the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Education. The College Administration took up the challenge. Ogot gleefully recalls: “The response was excellent, and all these posts were immediately Ugandanized.”134 Dr Yusuf Lule sealed the Africanisation of administrative posts at Makerere College by becoming the College’s Principal. The three scholars (Ominde, Nyanzi and Ogot) who had been labeled by their colleagues as the ‘conspirators’ were vindicated at the end of this long episode.

Change is traumatic because the new world remains a mystery until it is discovered. Clark Kerr (1963) argued that change comes in different forms. Sometimes it takes the form of the slow process of persuasion; sometimes it comes as a result of subversion and dominance or the use of force. People’s response to change takes two main forms: they either accept or resist it. The third group falls somewhere in the middle and agitates for modifications to the proposed changes but neither accepts nor rejects the changes entirely. Washington Okumu and Thomas Odhiambo fell on the third group. They maintained:

132 Ogot, My Footprints on the Sands of Time, 121.
133 Uganda Argus, 5 July 1963.
134 Ogot, My Footprints on the Sands of Time, 122.
We are not opposed to change per se, particularly when a society or an institution is to be improved in one way or the other, where excess or defect is evident; but we are opposed to the type of change in which, while putting one thing ’right’, something else is put wrong, and to the detriment of the whole institution.1

Some Ugandan politicians shared Okumu and Odhiambo’s view by refusing to endorse the idea of rushing the Africanisation of staff at the University of East Africa without necessarily refuting the idea altogether. Basil Bataringaya, leader of the Opposition in the Uganda Government, asked Members of Parliament to calm down and ruminate about any possible step to be taken by government regarding Africanisation. Bataringaya, while endorsing the idea of Africanising the University, cautioned the House against closing the door to international staff who came to the University to do research and teaching. He asked the Government to be careful how much it got involved in the College’s affairs. Bataringaya cited the case of Ghana, arguing that President Nkrumah tried to intervene in Ghana’s universities but found it difficult and changed his position. Mr J.S. Mayanja-Nkangi addressed himself to the question of expatriates at the University and dismissed as unfounded the view that Europeans had no interest in Africans. He warned that such views could break the heart of some very great people and reminded parliament that when he was a student at Makerere he was not taught by an African but by expatriate staff.

Dr Kigundu too, told Uganda’s parliament that he accepted Africanisation in principle but was opposed to indiscriminate Africanisation of the University. When other Members of the House heckled him he retaliated by asking how many BA’s and BSc’s and how many Doctors of Philosophy Uganda had. He received no answer. When parliament finally calmed down Dr Kigundu sounded a warning: “Some people believed that because Uganda was independent they should Africanise ipso facto. This was nothing but childish thinking, blindness, and narrow-mindedness.”2 Dr Kigundu maintained that it was a norm in independent Africa to promote people regardless of their ability and suggested that this was opportune time for Uganda to set a good example and not fall on the same trap. He acceded:

I agree that we should Africanise wherever possible and where we have suitable applicants but I don’t agree with Mr Luande who says we should Africanise all at Makerere. That is complete nonsense.3

This submission echoed the words of Tanganyika’s Minister of Education, Solomon Eliufoo, who warned his colleagues as follows:

I know the Honourable Members are interested in Africanisation. Africanisation does not mean only to go into the street and pick up somebody only because he is African. It means you have to provide him with the necessary equipment, with the necessary qualifications, so that he can handle the responsibility to your own satisfaction.4

---

1 Okumu and Odhiambo, *Africanisation and Staffing Policy in the University of East Africa*, 1.
3 *Ibid*.
E.M.K. Mulira took a neutral position in Uganda’s parliament. He found it outrageous that the qualifications for the warden post at Makerere were very high and alluded to the fact that this was aimed at shutting Africans out, but conceded that there were insufficient Africans with the required experience to take over from their white counterparts immediately. Mulira then suggested that more Africans should be appointed as assistant professors and deputies so that they could gain the required experience and later take up the relevant positions.

The issues debated at the national governments of the three East African territories were also tackled at the East Africa Legislative Assembly. The question of the expatriate staff became a pertinent issue during the proceedings of the East Africa Legislative Assembly, forcing the Administrator to return to it late in the debate, stating that there was a small remark dropped by Mr Kamaliza which might be misconstrued if not explained. This referred to the statement that the expatriate officers in the High Commission Services were serving the Colonial Government and not the East African governments. The Administrator’s view was that expatriate officers had served the interests of the people of East Africa.5

Other Members of the House insisted that Africanization could not be divorced from political independence and thus called for radical changes. Mr Kamaliza told the House that Britain was obliged to help East Africa, adding: “In fact it is not a matter of assistance, it is a matter of paying back what has been ripped from the Colonial Territories.”6 This statement did not go down well with European members of the House. Bruce Mackenzie, a Member of the House representing Kenya, failed to control his emotions and burst out: “Nonsense!”

In a nutshell, the Uganda Government was not satisfied with the pace at which Makerere College was implementing Africanisation. Ugandan politicians felt that as leaders of an independent state, they were duty bound to take the initiative if the College’s authorities seemed to have forgotten that East African higher education was no longer in British hands and that the University belonged to an independent region.

So far, this section has focused on Uganda. However, this should not create the impression that only Uganda was serious about the Africanisation of the University of East Africa. Kenya and Tanzania were engaged in the same struggle. The Department of Education in Kenya pushed University College, Nairobi to speed up the process of Africanising its staff. Edwyn Isaac, Acting Principal at Nairobi College, wrote to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education stating: “I can assure you that we at the College share your concern that Kenyanisation of the Administrative posts here should proceed with the utmost urgency ...”7 The tone of the letter suggests that the Education Ministry had contacted the Nairobi University College on this subject. The Nairobi College was determined to make its contribution in changing the outlook of the University of East Africa but the Kenya Government still felt it necessary to satisfy itself that the Africanisation process was being implemented by the College’s authorities.

Different departments at the College took giant strides in the implementation of the Africanisation process. Correspondence between Hyslop and Miss E. Ricketts, Head of the

6 Ibid.
Department of Domestic Sciences, referred to three Africans who had been identified for appointment as Assistant Lecturers in the Department.\(^8\) Wasawo wrote to Porter during his [Wasawo] first month in office as Deputy Principal of Nairobi College and opined:

\[
\text{... I do not know what the Vice-Chancellors and Principals normally talk about but it seems to me that one of the things that would be useful to discuss would be the methods of rapid Africanisation of the academic staff.}\(^9\)
\]

Although Wasawo had just assumed his new position he had no doubt that Africanisation was one of the pertinent issues at the time and thus qualified to be included in the agenda of the Principals and Vice-Chancellors’ meeting. East African politicians and scholars worked without stint in an effort to Africanise the University staff with the hope that the latter would change the curriculum. But as Taban Liyong argued in 1969:

\[
\text{The very fact that we are Africans is no guarantee that we are authorities on things African. Knowledge about Africa can only be gained, as indeed knowledge on anything whatever, through hard study.}\(^10\)
\]

Mazrui echoed these words nine years later, arguing: “The Africanization of the staff is not by itself a guarantee of accelerated Africanization of the syllabus and the curriculum.”\(^11\)

The Africanisation process moved very slowly, prompting Chagula to state in his Presidential Lecture in 1967 that “Universities and Colleges in most developing countries in general, and the University Colleges in East Africa, in particular, still have a predominance of expatriate academic staff ...”\(^12\) Idrian Resnick held the same view a year later, arguing that universities in Africa “are typically staffed by expatriates or ‘black Europeans’ whose ideas are, at best, non-African.”\(^13\)

Ogot’s assessment of the Africanisation project in East Africa in 1968 led him to the following conclusion:

\[
\text{Already, the University has done much to reorient itself to an African environment. Most of the syllabuses have been radically changed; the East Africanisation of staff is being pursued vigorously; and much of the research done in the University is relevant to the needs of the region.}\(^14\)
\]

However, Ogot conceded that there was still more work to be done in Africanising the University. Figures from the University Bulletin issued at the end of 1969 showed that Makerere was 32% East Africanised while Nairobi and Dar es Salaam were 33,7 and 31,8 respectively, thus bringing

\(^8\) The letter does not provide the names of these Africans.
\(^9\) David P.S. Wasawo to Arthur T. Porter, 30 April 1965. Internal Memo. UON Archives, UEA Conferences, Lectures and Papers. PUEA/13/3.
\(^12\) Chagula, “Academic Freedom and University Autonomy”: 408.
the total percentage of East Africanisation to 32.4.\textsuperscript{15} During the first half of 1970, out of a total of 817 established posts at the University, only 265 were held by East Africans.

As the Africanisation project advanced slowly, some commentators shifted the focus from \textit{East Africanisation} to \textit{localisation}. C.H.F. Rowell and J.P. Thurston, Lecturers in the Zoology Department at Makerere University College, argued:

\begin{quote}
Recently there have been several discussions about the rate at which East Africans are being appointed to the Senior Staff at Makerere College but not much has been said about the rate of localization in the past.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

The two scholars then provided figures showing the rate of localisation of senior staff between 1958 and 1968. These figures showed an increase from 10 during the 1958-9 academic year to 88 in June 1968. The number of the expatriate staff increased from 102 to 205 during the same period.

Peter Wankulu from Uganda addressed Africanisation broadly. He revealed in his letter the source of the tensions regarding the Africanisation of staff in East Africa and said the the tensions were likely to continue in future. He was worried that European, American and Asian descendants were still classified as non-Africans. His view was that most of them were born, and lived permanently in Africa; they had become citizens and therefore had to be treated and tried just like an indigenous African. He regretted: “We are very much against \textit{apartheid} policies or racial discrimination but, at the same time, we indirectly talk and think of and act on Africanisation to mean only Blacks.”\textsuperscript{17}

East African politicians and scholars argued that deciding what was taught at the University of East Africa and who taught it was key to changing the face of the University. But they also felt that the method of teaching was equally important.

\textit{The Africanisation of teaching methods}

East African constituencies and some expatriate staff too realised that Africanising the curriculum, the syllabus, the administrative staff and the faculty at the University but retaining teaching methods imported from outside Africa would slow down the Africanisation process. As mentioned in Chapter 1, scholars like Ki-Zerbo argued that the manner of giving is more important than what is given. David Court in his paper on higher education in East Africa opined: “much is said about what ought to be taught and little about how it is to be learned …”\textsuperscript{18}

Chagula was one of those East African scholars who thought aloud about the need to adopt new teaching methods, arguing:

\begin{flushright}


18 David Court, \textit{The Experience of Higher Education in East Africa}, 1.
\end{flushright}
It would be futile if the University of East Africa simply increased its teaching staff without reviewing critically its teaching methods inherited from an era which was in many ways very different from the present.\textsuperscript{19}

Chagula expounded his submission by citing the case of Britain where the University Grants Committee had conducted an inquiry into university teaching methods and argued that if Britain had begun to question the suitability and effectiveness of teaching methods in her universities, there was an even greater need and urgency for the UEA to review its teaching methods if it were to be of any relevance locally.

In 1965, President Nyerere stressed the need to develop “a really African history” by changing the method in which African history had been taught in the past. He argued: “Up to now the world’s knowledge of this continent – and even modern Africa’s knowledge – has been drawn almost exclusively from the outside.”\textsuperscript{20} He regretted that most people who studied African history globally, still learnt of the “discovery of Africa”, and the journeys of the great explorers. For him, it was only when these things were looked at from Africa outwards that an ‘African history’ would develop. For the UEA to be able to teach its subjects from an African point of view, it was felt that it was not only the curriculum, the syllabus and the staff that needed to change. The Eurocentric teaching methods too had to be discarded.

The call for the Africanisation of the University was a preemptive move, a realisation that expatriate staff would eventually leave East Africa. In part, it was a response to the political mood at the time, the spirit of independence. Also, the different constituencies that agitated for radical changes at the University were inspired by the belief that “an African university should have a spirit reflecting the spirit of the community it serves.”\textsuperscript{21} This trajectory raises the questions: Did the UEA serve the East African society? What were the views expressed by East African scholars and politicians regarding the nature of the relationship (real and imagined) between the University and the society? These questions are explored below.

The university and the East African society

East Africans had high hopes about the UEA but the University had an identity problem. This raised doubts about its commitment to being a service institution for the East African society. Soon after the University had been instituted, concerns were raised about the extent to which it brought the society on board. A commentary in the \textit{East Africa Journal} argued that important Reports on the University had been produced between 1960 and 1963 but “all these reports have been accessible only to members of the University and the Ministries of Education. The public has remained ignorant of the basic issue concerning University development in East Africa.”\textsuperscript{22} This section analyses the relationship between the University of East Africa and the East African society.

\textsuperscript{19} Chagula, “The Role of the University of East Africa”: 36.
\textsuperscript{21} Awori, “East African University Must be Africanised”: 15.
\textsuperscript{22} Commentary, “U. of East Africa: Local Malaise”: 27.
The general purpose of the university is “to educate men and women who will promote the development of society to the highest attainable level.” The university stands at the apex of the education system as a place for the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Historically, the goals of the university have been defined as follows:

(i) to transform themselves to legitimate national institutions of higher learning;
(ii) to produce the skilled human resources necessary to manage newly independent countries;
(iii) to generate developmentally relevant research;
(iv) to provide community service; and
(v) to constitute a diverse and representative student body.

The UEA carefully considered these universal goals, objects and functions in defining itself. According to the 1962 University of East Africa Act, section 5(1) (a) and (b), the objects and functions of the UEA were stated as being: “to assist in the preservation, transmission and increase of knowledge and in the stimulation of the intellectual life and cultural development of East Africa.” It was felt that these objects and functions would make the University responsive to the needs of the East African society and this provided the overall vision of the planners about the Federal University. Chapter 1 of this book discussed the vision of African politicians, the people on the spot, the academy and the students about African universities. It was mentioned inter alia that these constituencies shared the view that African universities had to reflect an African outlook and had to be responsive to the needs of their immediate societies without losing their international character. The same views were expressed with regard to the UEA.

President Nyerere was explicit in his succinct summary of the reasons why the University of East Africa had been established. He stated that it had not been established purely for prestige purposes. It had a definite role to play in development, and to do this effectively it had to be in, and of, the community it had been established to serve. The University had to draw upon experience and ideas from East Africa and the rest of the world; it had to direct its energies towards meeting the needs of East Africa.

23 Document A. “The Purpose of the University.” Presidential Address by F. Cyril James at the Opening Session of the Fourth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Tokyo, 31 August 1965, 1. UON Archives, UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/8. Cyril O. Houle and Charles A. Nelson in their work The University, The Citizen and World Affairs (Washington DC: American Council, 1956), 54 argued that the university teaches students “not because it wants to make money or build its popularity, but because it believes that such teaching serves a vital social purpose.”

24 Emmanuel Ngara, The African University and its Mission Strategies for Improving the Delivery of Higher Education Institution (Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies, 1995), 5. F.R. Leavis in his work Education & The University: A Sketch for an English School (London: Chatto & Windus, 1948), 137 argued that with the universities ignoring their function, it would be idle to hope much of education in general.


26 University of East Africa Act, 1962. See also: A Memorandum to the University Senate on the possibility of Establishing a University of East Africa Press, by S.H. Ominde, Chairman and Bernard Onyango, Secretary, 27 October 1966. UON Archives. UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/13.

In President Nyerere’s view, if the UEA had been established to serve the East African society, it could not divorce itself from that society and subscribe blindly to international notions of a university simply for prestige purposes. He argued in another article:

... when people are dying because existing knowledge is not applied, when the very basic social and public services are not available to all members of a society, then that society is misusing its resources if it pursues pure learning for its own sake.28

President Nyerere was opposed to putting emphasis on pure knowledge with no relevance to the practical problems affecting the society. He regarded as unpatriotic the tendency by the newly established institutions of higher education in East Africa to be receiving all the time and argued that they should reciprocate. For President Nyerere, the University had a moral obligation to address the needs of the East African society. As discussed in Chapter 1, Presidents Obote and Kenyatta made the same argument. President Kenyatta argued: “It would surely be wasteful, were such an institution to adopt the role of a spectator, neglecting a potential contribution of objective example and influence.”29

The people on the spot, the academy, and the students shared the views espoused by East African politicians regarding the nature of the relationship between the University and the society. They argued that it was the task of the University to provide solutions to societal problems and that the University could only succeed in performing this task if it identified itself with the society. A commentary in the East Africa Journal stated:

Also, for an African university to neglect extra-mural work and adult literacy, is to ignore the masses. Everything possible must be done to extend learning to those areas of the nation which are remote, and to initiate facilities for better health, improved agricultural practices, etc.30

The commentator recalled that the theme of the 12th International Student Conference held in Nairobi in July 1966 was the position a university occupies in society and argued that the UEA could not ignore that theme.

Porter told the congregation during a graduation ceremony held at University College, Nairobi that the College had to respond to both the civic and political needs of the country and had to provide answers to the economic and technological problems of the day. He continued: “In short, it must be identified with the society it serves.”31 Porter concluded his address by making a promise that with the support of the Chancellor, the Chairman of Council and other University authorities his College would not fail East Africa. B.M. Gecaga, Chairman of Council at University College, Nairobi reiterated the views espoused by Porter. He reminded the congregation about the ‘Special Relationship’ programme from which University College, Nairobi had emerged and stated how far the College had progressed since its establishment. Gecaga then advised the

29 President Kenyatta, Address at the Graduation Ceremony held at Makerere University College, 26 March 1965. Cited in Kenyatta, Suffering Without Bitterness, 271.
30 Commentary, “The Task of a University”: 35.
31 Arthur T. Porter, Speech delivered at the Graduation Ceremony held at University College, Nairobi, 6 November 1964, 4.
College to regard the past as a springboard not as a sofa. Inferred in this metaphor was a salient warning that the College still had a lot to do. For Wasawo, the University had a specific role to play in society: “We in the University of East Africa are charged, among other things, with producing the high level manpower needed for our countries.”

The people on the spot made concrete proposals outlining how the UEA could become part of the East African society. Cranford Pratt, the first Principal of The University College, Dar es Salaam, argued that the University –

... must be a committed institution, actively relating our work to the communities it seeks to serve. This is in no sense in contrast to, or in contradiction of, the intellectual objectivity and respect for truth which must also be an essential feature of a university. Commitment and objectivity are not opposites, are not in contradiction to each other. Rather the best scholarship is often a product of deep commitment ...

Pratt argued that the UEA had not been established to build ‘sky-scrapers’ to enable few lucky individuals to develop their own minds. It had to produce students who would go back to their communities to fight poverty and diseases. Research findings at the University had to be relevant to the local problems. The seminar on the role of the University, referred to earlier, proposed that in the development of new courses and departments, and the development of research areas, the University ought to be guided by national needs to ensure that it remained part of the society.

The University of East Africa met this challenge in part by establishing a working relationship with different East African research institutions to enhance African-based research. The East African Virus Research Institute based at Entebbe, Uganda was recognised by the Senate and Council of the Federal University as a connected institute. Similar relationships were established with the Coffee Research Foundation and the Maize Research Section, also in Uganda. Several members of the staff of the Maize Research Section registered with the Faculty of Agriculture at Makerere University College. This was acclaimed “a most desirable development, as it improves the status of our research work here, and also higher degrees obtained in East Africa are greatly to the benefit of the local people.” In Kenya, the Ross Institute of Tropical Hygiene, East African Branch was recognised by the Senate and Council of the University of East Africa as a connected institute of the University. The History Department at University College, Nairobi started the Staff-Student Research Project where students carried out oral research in their communities mainly during the long vacations. The University College, Dar es Salaam established a relationship with a number of public and research institutes and bureaus such as: the Institute of Public Administration, the Institute of Swahili Research, the Economic Research Bureau, and the Bureau of Resource Assessment and Land Use. The National Museum was also affiliated to the University College. Through these various bodies and the research being done

32 B.M. Gecaga, Speech delivered at the Graduation Ceremony held at University College, Nairobi, 6 November 1964, 4. UON Archives, UEA Principal, PUEA/1B/1.
33 Wasawo, “The Nation and the University”: 5.
36 Memorandum of Association Between the Ross Institute of Tropical Hygiene, East African Branch and the University of East Africa, UON Archives, UEA Academic Board, PUEA/3/34.
by the College’s teaching staff and students in Tanzanian studies and through the production of graduates to take up all sorts of careers in the country; “the University extends itself to all parts of the country and all aspects of national life.”

Politicians, scholars, and individuals served as the watchdogs of the society, applauding whenever they felt the University had done well and taking it to task when they felt that it was failing to execute its duties. Mr Mbabi-Katana, the music Lecturer referred to earlier, collected indigenous songs from all over East Africa to be used in schools. Edward Mpangi from University College, Nairobi found Mbabi-Katana’s work particularly relevant to the needs of the society and commented: “It is, therefore, highly commendable that such efforts as those of Mr Mbabi-Katana at Makerere should have the greatest possible public sympathy and government financial support.”

One scholar argued that the UEA –

... does have an obligation to offer officials and citizens intellectual help in working through the major public problems. The politicisation of education which is certain to infringe on university autonomy will be intensified if university spokesmen avoid making such analysis. National leaders need to be warned about emergent dilemmas in educational policy.

President Nyerere shared this view, arguing that members of the University –

... must serve East Africa as menials, collecting and disseminating the facts we ought to want. At the same time they must be torch-bearers of our society and the protectors of the flame should we, in our urgency, endanger its brightness.

The question of the national language put the University’s commitment to serving the East African society to the test. A commentary in the East Africa Journal asked:

Who should take the lead in this matter, the Governments or the University? We believe the University, as a body responsible for planning the development of a nation’s mind, has missed the bus on the issue.

The view was that it was the three university colleges which had to assume the role of plodding Nairobi, Dar es Salaam, and Entebbe into taking a decision on how to move forward under the prevailing political climate.

East African students embraced the views expressed above. Makerere students told John Kakonge, Uganda’s Director of Planning that they shared their government’s resolve to increase the number of African scientists that would provide solutions to societal problems but called upon the government to act accordingly.

40 Nyerere, Freedom and Unity: Uhuru na Umoja, 221.
If the government were sincere it would do well to consider introducing science study incentives, possibly in the form of inducements, in order to accelerate the process of training the much needed local scientists.42

Students in Kenya followed national issues with a keen interest. In February 1968, a group of economists in Kenya published a paper in the *East Africa Journal* entitled ‘Economics and Kenyanization’. The paper was widely distributed and it sparked a debate. The Students’ Union in Nairobi arranged an open meeting where the late Minister of Economic Planning and Development, Mr Tom Mboya, confronted all the 17 economists who had jointly written the paper. The Taifa Hall was packed to capacity, and there was lively discussion and exchange of views.43

But East African students did not confine their comments solely to issues that affected the East African micro society; they also commented on continental issues. At times this made them vulnerable to public criticisms. In 1966, the University Students’ Association of East Africa wrote a letter to the African Heads of States stating that the Commonwealth Conference held in Lagos was a ‘conference of Wilson’s errand boys’. Subsequently, a commentary in the *East Africa Journal* stated:

> ... we read first with considerable irritation and then a bit more compassion of a letter recently circulated to all Heads of States in Africa by the University Students’ Association of East Africa ... One would think that there are other subjects far more appropriate and nearer home to which the association could address itself.44

Among the issues mentioned in the commentary was lack of involvement by educated persons in the welfare of the rural communities. Kenneth Prewitt asserted that students were cohorts in the Westernisation of Makerere45 and therefore did not represent their society.

Some constituencies defended East African students. Nelson Kasfir, Lecturer of Political Science at Makerere, challenged Prewitt’s assertion that Makerere students were not intellectually active to make any contribution to society. Kasfir inquired: “How many students must participate in intellectual activity before we will regard it as characteristic of the College?”46 Ogot too, refuted the indictment of students, stating that many things had been said about them by different observers who charged them of living in an ivory tower. He wondered: “We don’t know which students such observers talk about.”47 In his view, the majority of the students were born and bred in the countryside. Many of them worked during the vacation in order to pay fees for their younger brothers and sisters or to pay taxes for their old fathers. Therefore, the charge had nosubstance. Ogot concluded his comment by posing a rhetorical question: “Can we afford

---

45 Prewitt, “Makerere: Intelligence vs Intellectuals”: 38. Joel D. Barkan’s survey published in *Transition*, Vol. 7(vi), No. 37 (October, 1968) under the title: “What Makes the East African Run”, portrayed East African students as being less innovative, arguing: “Rather than wanting to exercise power by making decisions which will affect the lives of many of their countrymen, most East African university students prefer to implement the decisions of others. Rather than wanting to innovate new policies to deal with the myriad of problems confronting their countries most students want merely security for themselves and their families.”
to do without them?” For President Obote the students were part of the society. He held: “The mission of the ‘Student Power’ is essentially the same as the mission of the Nationalist Movement I lead in Uganda and the mission of the African Revolution.”48

In a nutshell, politicians, scholars, students, and the general public shared the view that the University of East Africa had to be responsive to the needs of the society without compromising its image as an institution of academic excellence. The University responded to the call but could not satisfy all the constituencies, hence the sustained debates about the University’s role in society. This was bound to happen given that by nature people do not always see things from the same vantage point.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated that the University of East Africa had many faces. Two broad conclusions could be drawn. Firstly, political factors which brought the University into existence influenced the way in which the UEA was perceived once constituted. The expatriates perceived the University as an instrument for continued domination; to the East African constituencies the University was an instrument of liberation from British domination. Secondly, these two constituencies used different methods to achieve their aims about the University. The expatriates resolved to produce students who would be similar to those produced by British universities. East Africans on the other hand expected the University to produce students who would not be divorced from their society and environment and thus resolved to implement the Africanisation process.

The next two chapters address the problems faced by the University of East Africa at different stages of its development with a view to establishing why it collapsed in 1970. Chapter 5 addresses this question by discussing a wide range of problems the University grappled with, demonstrating how each problem played its role in the eventual collapse of the University. Chapter 6 focuses on the role played by nationalism and independence in the demise of the University of East Africa.

---

PART III

THE DEMISE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EAST AFRICA
CHAPTER 5

The University of East Africa and its problems

The difficulties which face universities in developing countries are similar in kind to those facing universities elsewhere – but they are often different in degree.

Letter by David Wasawo to J.M. Hyslop, 30 April 1965

Introduction

The demise of the University of East Africa in 1970 was the culmination of a number of problems that had haunted the University from its infant stages. Some of the problems were specific to the East African case while others were typical of federal universities in general. The Asquith Report of 1945 had anticipated that the great distance between the constituent colleges would portray the federal university as a machine for conducting examinations and for granting degrees, not a community. The Report also argued that a federal university would have no personality of its own and that the colleges, not the University as such, would influence both the character and outlook of the students thus making each of the colleges distinct from the other. These problems, according to the Asquith Report, would add to the problems faced by any type of a university.

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate how various problems contributed to the eventual collapse of the UEA. The question why the University was dissolved is difficult to answer because the problems it encountered are complex and intertwined to the extent that it is impossible to say with precision where one set of problems ends and where the next set picks up. The University started falling apart as it was being instituted, thus leading to the conclusion that it was like a stillborn child. In fact, from the very beginning the aim was not to establish a permanent university in East Africa, but to build a university that would exist for at least ten to fifteen years. But even if East African constituencies had planned to establish a permanent University that goal would have been impossible to achieve due to various problems faced by the UEA at different stages.

One of the earliest problems was that the UEA encompassed three territories. This problem first manifested itself when the heraldic device of the University was designed. The planners considered two options:

(i) to use three devices showing each country supported by further motifs indicating a seat of higher learning as well as a unity of three in one; or

(ii) to use a device symbolising the University and its three colleges.
In the end, it was considered useful to extract –

... some salient motif from the arms of each country, and the crowned crane of Uganda which appears as a supporter on the national arms, the rampant lion of Kenya which appears in the Kenya arms, and the torch of freedom from the crest of Tanganyika were employed.¹

According to Todd, this choice presented difficulties from the heraldic point of view because each device was elongated vertically thus making artistic distribution on a shield difficult. As the University’s development process unfolded, these territorial differences served as constant reminders that Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika were separate political units.

Another related problem was that there was a significantly long distance between the constituent colleges as the Asquith Report had anticipated. Bernard James writes:

While it would certainly be difficult to prove that the physics of geography was the critical over-riding factor in eventual decentralization of the university, there is data from the social sciences that suggests that physical distance affects formation of social systems in a far more subtle and pervasive sense than is commonly understood.²

Such problems demonstrated that establishing and sustaining the UEA was going to be insurmountable.

The view that “the history of the development of African education is largely a history of the development of the grant-in-aid system”³ and also the fact that African Universities today are in an economic crisis could easily lead to the conclusion that lack of funds to sustain the University led to its demise. It is important therefore to begin by demonstrating that while funding later contributed to the collapse of the University, its initial role was minimal; it was to be given agency by other factors.

The three constituent colleges benefited from the benevolence of different funding agencies and the British government before and after the establishment of the University. Between April and June 1963, Makerere University College received $58,550 from the Rockefeller Foundation and $81,200 from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). RCN received $84,240 from the Rockefeller Foundation. The University College, Dar es Salaam (collaborating with the Tanganyika government) completed negotiations with the USAID for a loan of $800,000 for the construction of a Library, the Refectory and other blocks. His Highness, The Aga Khan donated to the College an undisclosed sum of money sufficient to build five lecture theatres and a swimming pool. This was in addition to a $96,000 grant from the Ford Foundation for the construction of a block of six flats for visiting research workers.⁴ The British Overseas Development Ministry made three grants to Royal College:

1 C. Todd, “General Comments”, 1, UON Archives, UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/8.
2 James, “The University of East Africa in Retrospect”: 3.
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(i) A grant of £5 810 to provide for a research appointment in the Department of Law and Government for research into problems of land registration in the East African region;

(ii) Assistance with research appointment in the Faculty of Veterinary Science; and

(iii) Assistance with two temporary appointments in the Registrar’s Department.5

When the University was inaugurated, it received birthday gifts up to £93 000. Before then, Britain had already donated £1 000 000 for the construction of five new buildings at Nairobi College and £50 000 to buy books and equipment. The American government promised laboratory equipment worth £43 000 to the University College in Nairobi. This brought the American government’s aid to the College to £215 000. The Uganda Argus commented soon after the University’s inauguration thus:

The statesmanlike speech by Mr Julius Nyerere showed the ideals which would inspire the university and it was plain that financial and administrative backing to put these ideals into practice was already in place.6

Funds continued to flow in after the University had been established. The East African Standard reported under the headline ‘£1 million Gift to EA University’ that: “The British Government is to make £1 050 000 gift to the University of East Africa, the Commonwealth Relations Office in London announced yesterday.” The said gift was to consist of a contribution of £850,000 towards the capital needs of the University and equipment and other forms of technical assistance worth about £200 000 over the next three years. Towards the end of 1963, Standard Bank proposed to make a grant of £8 000 to the Veterinary Faculty for the building of a large animal isolation block in the Veterinary School property. In August 1964 the Ford Foundation made a grant of £50 000 payable in three years “to help relieve the acute shortage of suitable undergraduate teaching materials based on East African conditions.”8

One year before the end of the University’s first triennium, individual Colleges received significant amounts of money from different donor agencies to enable them to perform their various functions. In 1966, The Standard Tanzania reported that the University College, Nairobi, had received a grant of almost £10 000 from the Ford Foundation, New York, towards the cost of a conference on education, employment and rural development which the college was planning to hold from 25 September to 1 October of that year.9 Towards the end of 1966, Bernard Onyango, Registrar at the University, addressed a memorandum to the Principals of the three University Colleges, stating:

5 UEA. University College, Nairobi. Memorandum by R. B. Eustace, Registrar (RCMemo 16/5 Doc E.). UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/12.
6 Uganda Argus, 4 July 1963.
8 East African Teaching Materials Fund. Memorandum for the 3rd Meeting of the University Social Science Research Council, 10 September 1965, by H. Brooks (Registrar). UON Archives. UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/7.
9 The Standard Tanzania, 2 May 1966.
This memorandum is intended to convey to you the very good news of a grant of £25,000 recently received from the Ford Foundation for the purpose of facilitating exchange of staff within the University.10

Throughout its existence, the University entered into agreements with donor agencies to ensure its financial viability. Project Agreement 62-1 with the USAID made available $102,000 for the construction of the administrative wing of the para-clinical building at the Royal College and $98,000 for equipment. Project Agreement BAA-1 provided $242,000 to finance a contract with Colorado State University. Project BAA-2 provided $489,115 to finance the construction of the north-east wings of the para-clinical building. Project BAA-3 provided $70,000 for the procurement of additional specialised equipment, while Project Agreement BAA-4 provided $95,000 additional funding for the Colorado State University contract. There was also $7,300 set aside for items and equipment. Projects BAA-5 and BAA-6 as well as Project Agreement VET-7 provided a total sum of $196,300 to fund different projects.11 The *East African Standard* reported on 8 August 1968 that the World Bank’s Headquarters in Paris had indicated that the possibility of a Faculty of Agriculture at the University College, Nairobi was explored at a meeting held in London. Funding was promised.

Until the dissolution of the University, donor funds were still forthcoming. In February 1970, I.C.M. Maxwell, Secretary of the Inter-University Council, wrote to Sir James Cook, Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Africa, with some assurances that the IUC was proposing to continue its support for visits by external examiners and consultants to overseas universities in the financial year starting from 1 April 1970 to 31 March 1971. He stated:

> We are planning on the basis of up to 15 visits for East Africa. Some of these visits may, I understand, be required for University of East Africa Examinations in Nairobi in May/June 1970, whereas the majority may not be required until after the projected dissolution of the University of East Africa at the end of June 1970.12

Therefore, the demise of the University of East Africa cannot be attributed to lack of funds *per se*. Reasons must be traced elsewhere.

### Inequality between the constituent colleges

The early establishment of Makerere College in Uganda did not augur well for the smooth development of higher education in East Africa. Inter-territorial tensions became evident soon after the publication of the De la Warr Commission Report. In 1938, the Chief Secretary of Kenya in his letter to the Acting Chief Secretary of Uganda stated that regarding the funding of Makerere by the three territories –

> ... our main difficulty is that, while the Chief Native Commissioner agrees with me that it would be very right and proper for our Local Native Councils to provide money for the

---

10 Memorandum by Bernard Onyango, UEA Registrar (Ref. No. G5/12/21), 13 October 1966, to the Principals of University Colleges Makerere and Dar es Salaam. UON Archives. UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/10.


12 I.C.M. Maxwell to James Cook, 3 February 1970. UON Archives. UEA Senate Meetings, PUEA/2B/16.
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purpose suggested, it is not at all certain that they will be prepared to vote any considerable sums towards a building which they have never seen and whose nature they imperfectly understand.13

In 1949, Makerere became the only University College serving the whole of East Africa and was already “looking to a future University status.”14 As mentioned in Chapter 2, by 1949 the settler community in Kenya and the colonial government had already decided to establish another regional college. This created inter-territorial tensions. In 1954, Lindsay Keir commented on Makerere and the RTC. He argued that these were two wholly independent institutions; each had its appropriate and separate responsibility to fulfil and ought to go its own way. In his view, association between them was not only unnecessary but also undesirable, since there was no satisfactory pattern on which association between a University College and a Technical College could be based.15

Keir was totally opposed to any attempt to merge the institutions he perceived to be different and unequal in status. He sympathised with Tanganyikan students who had to be sent to institutions in environments that were deemed to be ‘alien and distasteful’. He anticipated that the demand for the establishment of an institution of higher education in Tanganyika would soon be made. In Keir’s view, Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika were separate political institutions and had to develop separately.

When the RTC opened its doors in 1956 it ended Makerere’s preeminence as the only institute of higher education in East Africa.16 The two colleges were not on a par with each other and therefore could not compete in facilitating the development of higher education in the region. When the Second Working Party presented its Report in 1958, it maintained that inequality was a serious problem in planning higher education in that region and that this was a dilemma. It noted that this inequality of stature led to the conclusion that Makerere College must either “wait for a greater measure of academic autonomy longer than would otherwise be necessary, or take its place as possibly the sole college working for East African degrees at a time when other colleges in the same area are working for University of London degrees in special relationship.”17

According to the Asquith plan, the UEA would be made up of regional colleges based in Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika. But the question became: What was Makerere going to gain from two young and inexperienced colleges? The comment from Makerere University Council on the Report of the Second Working Party stated inter alia that Makerere University Council desired to emphasise that all the East African territories had a stake in whatever provision for higher Education existed, or might be brought into existence, anywhere in East Africa. It argued that the development of any College at the expense of another would be harmful to the whole pattern of higher education and cautioned: “It must also be remembered that the

13 Chief Secretary, Kenya to Acting Chief Secretary, Uganda (Ned.11/2/1/11/55), 20 September 1938. KNA ED.52/4/6/1.
newer Colleges will not be able for years to undertake certain work which Makerere is now able to do.” 18 Inferred in this statement was the view that bringing together three colleges that were at different stages of development was a recipe for failure. What would have been acceptable to Makerere University Council and the Uganda government would be for the two young institutions to become its constituent colleges. President Obote espoused this view in the Uganda Legislative Council on 13 November 1959 as follows:

Makerere should be allowed to progress to university status and ... London University should continue to guarantee Makerere degrees ... Nairobi College should then be a university college of Makerere. 19

Unsurprisingly, Kenya and Tanganyika could not accept such an arrangement. They both wanted Makerere College to wait for them until they reached its level of development before merging as equals to form a Federal University. Thus the envisioned relationship between three inter-territorial Colleges in East Africa was indeed “a somewhat frustrating relationship for Makerere, because it had to mark time while the two newer colleges forged ahead in Kenya and Tanganyika.” 20

This problem of inequality frustrated the planners of the UEA and politicians like President Nyerere who perceived the envisioned University as part of regional integration. Makerere and the Uganda government rejected the recommendation made by the Nicol Report of 1962 regarding ‘parity’ between the East African Colleges. The main reason Uganda later acquiesced in the Plan was pressure from international donors. American foundations such as USAID and the American Department of Technical Cooperation stated that their assistance to the East African Colleges was contingent to the three East African governments accepting the University Development Plan. Therefore, not all constituencies shared the unity displayed to the international community at Taifa Hall. Southall writes:

Behind the bold face of unity put forth to the world by Chancellor Nyerere at the inauguration ceremony of the University on 28 June, 1963, there were desperate attempts to hold the University together. 21

It is clear from this discussion that the UEA was built on a shaky foundation since its would-be constituent colleges did not develop at the same pace. This problem accompanied the University throughout its developmental stages. Two areas in which the problem of inequality manifested itself were the site of the University and the issue of the distribution of regional funds. Both these factors are given specific attention below as a way of demonstrating how each of them created problems for the Federal University.

21 Southall, Federalism and Higher Education in East Africa, 67.
The site

The site where the University would be physically located was a very contentious issue due to the advantages that were deemed to accrue from hosting a regional institution. Despite conspicuous inequality between the colleges, each of them showed an interest in hosting the University. This was not unexpected. In fact, the Asquith Report had anticipated this problem, arguing that each country would want to host the University.

Indeed there was a deadlock when all three colleges expressed their willingness to host the UEA. But other educational authorities from outside Uganda acknowledged that Makerere was the most suitable college to host the University. Mr Mathieson, Kenya’s Minister for Education, conceded in 1960 that the right place for the University’s home was Uganda, arguing that nobody with a regard to the work of Makerere could seriously challenge this claim, even if the buildings required were somewhat removed from Makerere. When the Provisional Council of the UEA was appointed in June 1961, it was a fore-gone conclusion that the proposed regional university would be sited in Uganda given Makerere’s advanced developmental status. Deliberating on this issue was just a mere formality; a gesture that the Provisional Council was nonpartisan.

The decision to locate the University in Uganda sustained inequality and tensions between the colleges. The University was a regional institution but the staff at the Central Office in Uganda was predominantly Ugandan and did not reflect the regional character. This unequal distribution of staff continued until the dissolution of the University. In December 1969, for example, out of a total of 27 staff members at the UEA’s Central Office, Uganda boasted of 17 employees – leaving only 10 positions to be shared by Kenya, Tanganyika and Britain. Kenya had three employees (two drivers and a clerk) while Tanzania had two (one Planning Officer and one Assistant Registrar). The British filled the remaining five positions. This planted one of the seeds that killed the UEA.

The distribution of funds

Tensions regarding the distribution of funds were an inevitable corollary of conspicuous inequality between the colleges. Given its advanced stage of development, Makerere University College already had more buildings and other teaching and learning facilities than its two sister colleges. Furthermore, in its history of existence, the College had been able to build an endowment fund and continued to secure funds from different donor agencies and from the inter-territorial governments. The other colleges (especially the University College, Dar es Salaam) still needed more buildings as well as teaching and research facilities. The Nicol Report had recommended that large sums of money from Makerere should be diverted mainly to Dar es Salaam, the least developed of the three colleges, but also to the Royal Technical College in Nairobi. Makerere University College could not hide its resentment. These forced transfers of funds aimed at bridging the gap between the colleges planted another seed that would later sustain inter-territorial tensions in the region. A letter written by Frazer Murray from Dar es Salaam to Donald MacGillivray demonstrates that inequality and funding were inter-linked. In

---

22 Kenya had hosted most of the regional institutions such as the East Africa High Commission and had benefited economically, forcing Uganda and Tanganyika to complain.


his detailed letter, Murray expressed his dismay over the Mitchell Hall episode, arguing that the use of regional funds in Uganda was a contentious move. He recalled:

The particular recommendation of the recent Needs and Priorities Committee that work on Mitchell Hall [at Makerere] should be suspended was a last minute attempt to correct a situation which we have strived fruitlessly to remedy for almost eighteen months.25

The tone of this letter shows that its author had been seriously disturbed by the way discussions had proceeded between the spokespersons of the University College, Dar es Salaam and the Provisional Council of the University regarding the issue of funding the regional colleges. Although Murray stated in his letter that he was expressing his personal views, other authorities in Tanganyika shared his concerns. A statement written on behalf of the Tanganyika Government by El Haj A.S. Fundikira, Tanganyika’s Minister of Justice, stated:

The Tanganyika Government greatly regrets that at a time of serious capital shortage and after the decision had been endorsed that there should be rapid development of the University College, Dar es Salaam, that another college should proceed to build a Hall of Residence which in East African terms was a project of very low priority ...26

Minister Fundikira in his statement mentioned that the Tanganyika Government had no plan to obstruct the construction of Mitchell Hall. However, he proposed that instead of the University College, Dar es Salaam sharing the £85,000 held in suspense for the extension of Northcote Hall the whole amount should be diverted to Dar es Salaam. Moreover, Minister Fundikira proposed that the £50 000 share promised to the University College, Dar es Salaam should be increased, although he did not specify by how much. He then summed up the views of the Tanganyika Government on the question of funding, saying:

(i) they were grateful for the thought and care with which the Needs and Priorities Report had been prepared;

(ii) they hoped the Council would accept the recommendation of the Needs and Priorities Committee that first priority be given to bring UDC to a position of parity with other colleges;

(iii) they were disappointed that they had not been able to benefit from the specific recommendation to reallocate funds from Mitchell Hall;

(iv) they hoped it would be possible to recommend the reallocation of the full amount held in suspense for Northcote Hall (£85 000); and

(v) they hoped it would be possible to increase the share of the University College in any reallocation of the existing revenue due to Makerere and that any allocation to the Veterinary Faculty was ruled out by the previous decision of the Council.27

As far as Makerere was concerned the Tanganyika government was asking for too much. However, the latter felt that its request was legitimate and justifiable given the amount of work

25 Frazer Murray to Donald MacGillivray, Provisional Council Minutes for 12 February 1963, Annexure B. UON Archives, UEA. Minutes of the Provisional Council. PUEA/1A/58 Vol. 3.
26 Statement by El Haj A.S. Fundikira, Provisional Council Minutes of 12 February 1963, Annexure C. UON Archives. UEA. Minutes of the Provisional Council, PUEA/1A/58 Vol. 3.
27 Ibid.
that still had to be done to bring the University College in Dar es Salaam at the same level of development as Makerere University College.

Politicians and scholars voiced their opinions at different moments during the debates regarding the distribution of regional funds. Hyslop wrote to L.M. Young, Registrar at the Federal University, complaining that the University College, Dar es Salaam was receiving more attention than the other two colleges. Hyslop confided that he was perturbed to see that the college at Dar es Salaam was singled out for special mention while the Royal College was given cursory treatment. 28

The discussion thus far demonstrates that none of the three colleges was satisfied with the developments regarding the distribution of regional funds. The University College, Dar es Salaam felt that as the least developed college it deserved to be the beneficiary of the new dispensation. Makerere University College on the other hand sternly believed that as the most advanced college in the region it was its prerogative to play a leading role in the development of higher education in East Africa. The Royal College, somewhat in the middle, felt that it did not receive due attention from the University’s Central Office. Meanwhile, the gulf between the three colleges widened.

Both East African and British constituencies were acutely aware that inequality was a reality in East Africa. Officials were mindful of this fact when executing their duties. As mentioned earlier, the British government made a grant of £50 000 to the constituent colleges of the UEA to mark its inauguration. The British government gave directions that the money should be used to buy library books and scientific equipment; it further stated that special consideration should be given to the needs of the newest of the three East African colleges. Subsequently, the University Council agreed to recommend that the said figure should be divided between the three Colleges as follows:

(i) The University College, Dar es Salaam: £36 000;
(ii) The Royal College, Nairobi: £7 000; and
(iii) Makerere University College: £7 000.29

It is clear from this discussion that the distribution of funds between the three colleges at different stages of development caused serious inter-territorial tensions and widened the cracks that had already developed between the colleges. It is also clear that inequality among the three East African colleges predetermined the fate of the Federal University right from the outset. The ramifications of this problem are demonstrated by the discussion on the site and the issue of the distribution of regional funds.

29 UEA. University Council. Minutes of the Second Meeting held at the Royal Technical College, Nairobi, 30 July 1963, 11. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/4.
The university calendar

The University Calendar was one of the vexing problems faced by the planners of the UEA from the beginning and it remained unresolved until the University collapsed. This problem was a constant reminder that Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika were separate political institutions that could not be easily lumped together. Paragraph 99 of the Report of the Second Working Party noted that the academic years of Makerere College and the RTC did not coincide. At that time Makerere’s academic year ran from July to April while that of the RTC ran from October to June. The Working Party then proposed that this lack of coincidence should be removed because it made planning for the University more difficult. The key question was which college would be prepared to compromise.

The first meeting of the regional Joint Government/University Committee was held at the Royal College, Nairobi on 30 December 1963; de Bunsen was the chair. The meeting realized that it would be difficult to agree on the academic year beginning in July. The Royal College found it hard to agree to a long vacation from April to June on the grounds that the incidence of the long rains in Kenya during that period made it a wholly impracticable time for the fieldwork in anthropology, sociology, biology, physics, etc.,

... for which it was essential to make provision during the University Long Vacation. The period was for the same reason unsuitable for family holidays and travel, and there were therefore strong arguments against it as a period covering the long school holiday.30

The Uganda government in its comments addressed the calendar question in its broader regional context. T.W. Gee, Permanent Secretary in the Uganda Ministry of Education, stated in his letter to the Registrar of the University that proposals to change the academic calendar of the University to start in March were rejected for three reasons:

(i) The proposals conflicted with the whole of government machinery because the school year was geared to the local government financial year in each country;

(ii) The proposals would create chaos in the school system, upsetting children at different levels (top primary, bottom secondary and top secondary, that is, Higher School Certificate [HSC] level). If the proposed change was effected, pupils not in school would have to wait for the whole year before they were admitted and this would create an unmanageable backlog of pupils at secondary entrance level and at University entrance level; and

(iii) The proposed calendar would create a two-term gap in schooling between the end of the HSC course and the beginning of the University course. Consequently, pupils would lose the necessary habit of study and many would be lost to the University – some would take up employment rather than just wait at home; others would secure bursaries and further their education abroad.31

The proposed calendar for the University of East Africa to which the Uganda Education Ministry was reacting was as follows:

---

30 Memorandum on Proposals by the Joint/Government Committee for the Introduction of New School and University Year in East Africa. UON Archives, UEA Academic Board. PUEA/3/10 (i), 1.

31 T.W. Gee to the Registrar of the University of East Africa, 30 November 1964. UON Archives. UEA. PUEA/2B/5.
The University of East Africa and its problems

Table 4. Proposed Calendar for the University of East Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>No. of weeks</th>
<th>Vacation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st: Mid-March to about end of May</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd: Late-June to mid-September</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3-4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd: Early October to 3rd week of December</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dec. to mid-March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UEA. Senate Meeting, 7 January 1964. UON Archives, PUEA/2B/5.

The fact that the University College in Dar es Salaam was established when the calendar issue had already emerged further exacerbated the problem. The University College, Dar es Salaam, like the other two sister Colleges, was linked to the financial year of the Tanganyika government and therefore could not fit its calendar to that of Makerere University College or University College, Nairobi. Meanwhile the differences that existed between the three colleges became even more evident.

The problem of the University calendar was further compounded by the fact that secondary school examinations in East Africa were controlled by Britain, not by East African governments. For example, the Secondary School academic year in East Africa did not fit in with either the University’s academic year or the governments’ financial year. The Uganda government was not happy with both the Cambridge School Certificate and the Higher School Certificate Examination papers being marked outside East Africa, arguing that this caused unnecessary delays and contributed significantly to the calendar problems. Tanganyika shared this view. D.S. O’Callaghan, Tanganyika’s Permanent Secretary in the Education Ministry reasoned:

… there is on the one hand a frustrating hiatus between the time when pupils obtain their examination results and when they take up their places at University, and on the other, great difficulty in recruiting teaching staff especially from overseas at the most suitable time.32

He blamed the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate for failing to align the regional calendar.

When Syndicate representatives were asked to change the examination dates at a meeting held in Dar es Salaam in June 1963 they argued that for this suggestion to be entertained East African Ministries of Education had to first rationalise the dates of the Secondary School academic year, which varied from country to country and sometimes within the same country. O’Callaghan suggested that the school academic year and the academic year of the University’s constituent colleges should begin in July and end in April or May of the following year. P. Vowles responded on behalf of Makerere College, suggesting that the University should give some careful thought to the administrative implications of O’Callaghan’s proposal. Vowles expatiated on his view by reminding his counterpart that: “Until 1954 we had a similar situation, and one of the reasons for changing our academic year was to allow time to inform the students, arrange bursaries, etc. Now that there are three Colleges, and not one only involved, the comprehension of the gap to the extent proposed in this letter [O’Callaghan’s] would lead to chaos.”33 Chagula,

32 D.S. O’Callaghan, Permanent Secretary, Dar es Salaam (Ref. No. EDG/22/26/5) 09 October 1963, to the Permanent Secretaries of Kenya and Uganda. UON Archives. UEA Executive Senate Committee, PUEA/2A/1.
33 P. Vowles to the Registrar, UEA, 22 October 1963. UON Archives. UEA Executive Senate Committee, PUEA/2A/1.
responding on behalf of Dar es Salaam, had no problem with the three-month gap between the end of the School Year and the beginning of the University Academic Year. He argued that this would give education authorities ample time to plan for the new academic year. These adversarial positions confirmed the already existing inter-territorial tensions and demonstrated that sustaining the University would be difficult.

As early as 1962, territorial and inter-territorial Academic Boards in East Africa were debating the calendar question without finding any lasting solution. Noticeably, by 1966 the issue of the University calendar had still not yet been resolved. On 20 April 1966 representatives from the Head Office of the UEA met with the Tanzania government in an effort to find a lasting solution to the calendar problem. The Tanzania government stated that it was prepared to co-operate with the University in solving this problem but first wanted to know Nairobi’s response to the proposal that Kenyan authorities should bring their academic year in step with Makerere University College and the University College in Dar es Salaam. Despite all attempts to resolve the calendar question, a combination of factors made it impossible to reach an agreement. Therefore, the calendar problem lingered on.

The reason why the issue of the calendar was so difficult to resolve is because it was multifaceted. Firstly, for the idea of a uniform calendar to work some students in one or two of the three East Africa territories would have to make a sacrifice by waiting at home after finishing high school until those from the sister-country (-ies) finished their final examinations and then join the University together. Secondly, the regional colleges would have to agree that they would be without first year students for about a semester or two, during the waiting period. Alternatively, one or two of the regional governments would have to agree to change their financial year so that it corresponded with the proposed University calendar. As discussions proceeded, it turned out that none of these options was easy. Therefore, the question of the University calendar remained unresolved until the dissolution of the UEA. During the last session of the University, each of the three University Colleges followed its own calendar as shown in the table below:

### Table 5. Calendar for the Last Session of the University of East Africa, 1969/70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1st Term</th>
<th>2nd Term</th>
<th>3rd Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


This section has demonstrated that the calendar question revealed the differences that existed between the three constituent colleges of the UEA and served as a constant reminder that Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania were different political institutions. The fact that each of these colleges was linked to a government that had a different financial year and, therefore, followed an academic calendar different from that of the other two colleges, meant that neither coercion nor persuasion could solve the calendar problem.
The student population

The number of students available in East Africa caused two sets of problems. First, when the University started there were very few students, not enough to fill the three regional colleges. Second, as the student numbers increased, the colleges could not absorb all of them. The first problem caused tensions within each territory and between the three territories, some individual politicians and scholars arguing that conventional admission policies should be modified to suit the reality in East Africa; others steadfastly argue that the idea of East African exceptionalism would culminate in the decline of academic standards. The latter argued that the UEA should not lower admission requirements. These divergent views created inter-territorial tensions and widened the already existing cracks. The second problem was more instrumental in the eventual collapse of the University. As students tried in vain to secure places at the inter-territorial colleges, some national governments became impatient and resolved to establish national universities that would respond to the increased local demand for higher education.

Small student population

Lindsay Keir in his 1954 Report had anticipated that the initial small student population cohort would be one of the vexing problems of the envisioned Federal University during its early years. His comment on the RTC was that the target of a total enrolment of 1,500 would take a number of years to reach due to the shortage of students. A few years later, Hyslop identified one of the features of the existing and future situation in East Africa as being “the likelihood of unfilled places for the next few years in Makerere College and in the Royal College, Nairobi.”34 About two months before the University was inaugurated, its Provisional Council announced that there would be places for over 250 students at the constituent colleges in the first year. Hillary Ng’weno, editor of The Nation newspaper in Kenya, commented: “These places are expected to remain unfilled for at least two years due to lack of properly qualified students.”35 Ng’weno went on to cite President Obote who argued that Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika urgently needed all the able people they could get in order to fill the colleges. The Federal University began its operation with this problem still unresolved. Hyslop conceded in his letter to the Prime Minister of Kenya soon after the inauguration of the Federal University:

At first sight it may appear that in the Plan the staff/student ratio in the Royal College is unduly high but it is inevitable that a ratio such as 1:15 cannot be achieved until the student population has reached an adequate size.36

He noted that in some universities members of staff were appointed before students were admitted to make adequate preparations for their arrival.

The small student population in East Africa derived from more than one source. First was the shortage of Secondary School teachers. This meant that only few Secondary Schools could be built in the region. The corollary of having few teachers and few Secondary Schools was that there would be few students with Higher School Certificate, which was the requirement to enter

---


35 Daily Nation (Kenya), 20 April 1963.

36 J.M. Hyslop to the Prime Minister of Kenya, 1 August 1963. KNA KA/2/17.
any of the three regional colleges. It was in part for these reasons that national governments
could not fill most of the spaces reserved for them by the colleges. Senteza Kajubi argued that
the crucial obstacle to the expansion of education in East Africa was the critical shortage of
secondary school teachers. Kajubi stated that two priorities – the expansion of high-school
enrollments, as well as the expansion and improvement of facilities for the education and
training of teachers – stood out as the most pressing needs.37

East African politicians felt that prompt action was necessary to address this situation. The
EACSO was particularly concerned about the region’s slow progress in offering Secondary
Education and subsequently made three recommendations:

(i) That the EACSO should use its offices to impress on the Territorial Governments the basic
importance of Secondary Education in the Africanisation programme;

(ii) That in view of the empty places both at Makerere and at the Royal College, and in view
of the pressing needs for high-level manpower in East Africa, the authorities concerned
should be asked to review the existing requirement of a Higher School Certificate as a
qualification of entry into the University of East Africa as well as the time it took to produce
a graduate; and

(iii) That in order to achieve the best results with available finance and manpower the
organisation should adopt the Wartime-Training-Within-Industry method in all its training
programmes.38

These were rational proposals based on pragmatic grounds.

Indeed, each of these recommendations was deemed important in its own right. The first
proposal was premised on the understanding that for Africanisation to become a reality, more
African students had to undergo training. The third recommendation is self-explanatory. The
most crucial recommendation was the second one because it hit at the core of the conundrum
faced by the UEA In essence, the University tried to pursue two diametrically opposed points of
view. On the one hand was the view that the University should attract more students to fill its
colleges. On the other hand was the view that the University should maintain high academic
standards. The latter view entailed raising entrance requirements. For the first view to be
implemented, the UEA had to reduce its entrance requirements to a minimum level. These
positions were antithetical to each other. The UEA chose to subscribe to the notion that careful
screening of students is indispensable to maintaining high standards39 and therefore insisted
on setting high entrance requirements. But were the entrance requirements at the East African
University Colleges exceedingly high or was it just a perception? In setting those requirements,
did the University consider the local situation? These questions are addressed below.

37 W. Senteza Kajubi, “Priorities in Investment in Education”, in John Karefa-Smart (ed.), Progress Through
Cooperation (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1966), 174-175.
38 Report of the Africanisation of the Public Services of the East African Common Services Organization, March
1963, 55, p. 147.
Entrance requirements at the University of East Africa

The University of East Africa over-stretched itself in an effort to maintain the revered high international academic standards. Pratt was concerned about this mode of operation and suggested that there was a need for special entry to the University in response to the reality in East Africa. Pratt summarised his argument, thus:

(i) If the development of Higher School Certificate classes keeps pace with the output of qualified school leaving graduates, then there is little need for special entrance examination. However, if Higher School Certificate places are not sufficient in number then Colleges are likely to be under strong and legitimate pressure to relax their entrance requirements. The alternative may well be an uncontrolled relaxation initiated from outside; and

(ii) University Colleges ought not to appear unresponsive to the pressing needs of the country. At a time when more senior Universities in the rest of the English-speaking world are accepting East African students with School leaving certificate, it is likely to appear incongruous if we refuse to admit that any Cambridge School Certificate student can appropriately be taught at our Colleges.40

Pratt was not alone in making this call. Hyslop conceded that the insistence on the Higher School Certificate as the only entrance requirement made East Africa extremely vulnerable to overseas competition. He noted four advantages of admitting students at a lower level:

(i) There would be no risk of having unfilled places in the Colleges;

(ii) The tendency towards congestion in Makerere University College and the Royal College, Nairobi would provide a real educational incentive to the College in Tanganyika to admit Arts and Science Students as early as possible;

(iii) The University of East Africa would be able to compete on equal terms with scholarship awarding institutions overseas; and

(iv) East African governments would be able to channel their resources on the expansion of School Certificate instead of investing too much on HSC.41

Pratt and Hyslop’s views did not go unchallenged. Goldthorpe argued: “About entry standards, I cannot imagine why anyone should regard it as a service to a developing country to lower the standard of attainment required to enter the university.”42

The view that University entrance requirements in East Africa were excessively high was not without substance. In 1955, some authors argued that Makerere’s entry standards “are somewhat lower than those in the United Kingdom.”43 However, evidence shows that Makerere University College and University College, Nairobi adopted entrance requirements of the University of

41 Memorandum by J.M. Hyslop, “University Education in East Africa”, 13 February 1962. Annexe H. Academic Committee Minutes, 06.03.62. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/53.
London and consistently raised the bar. Makerere University College increased its entrance requirements from 3 to 5 credits in 1958. From 1961 a pass at Higher School Certificate was a prerequisite for admission. It soon became clear that few students met these requirements but Makerere University College could not lower them simply because the students felt they were inaccessible. Instead, the University College responded by offering one-year remedial or pre-entry courses, a pass in which was considered equivalent to a Higher School Certificate. This issue of entrance requirements sustained tensions between different constituencies in all three East African territories once the University came into being. Ronald Ngala, a Member of the Kenya Legislature gave notice of a motion that the House urged the Kenya Government to negotiate with the East Africa University Authority with a view to obtaining permission for students to join the University Colleges soon after completing school certificate courses instead of first having to complete higher school certificate classes which were very few among the Kenya secondary schools. Implicit in this citation was that Kenya faced a situation different from that obtaining at the two sister territories. Therefore Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika could not apply the same criteria when addressing the question of entrance requirements.

From time to time different constituencies, including officials from the University’s Central Office, made special requests when they realised that the University’s entrance requirements excluded even students who were deemed to be University material but could not meet the entrance requirements due to a variety of reasons. A letter by Onyango, Registrar at the University of East Africa, epitomises such cases. He noted that some applicants did not fulfil the minimum Entry Requirements with regard to their offerings at ‘O’ level while having performed quite adequately at HSC level and even at ‘O’ level. In most cases they were short of only one subject of the approved five. For him, this was one of the problems. He then suggested:

In order to avoid possible injustice to the students concerned, it is recommended for the consideration of the Board that the candidates whose details are attached as an appendix be considered notwithstanding the inadequacy at ‘O’ level.

In 1963, one Report argued that the standard required for East African University Colleges –

... is higher than that demanded in many parts of the English-speaking world, and suggests that the University Colleges are more concerned to educate an elite than to produce a large number of graduates and diplomats suitably trained for East Africa’s present needs.

---

44 According to the Notes on Makerere College, 1938 (Ref. No. M. C. 32/IX) KNA DC/KMG/2/8/60, the following examinations were accepted for entrance to the college in 1939: (a) The Cambridge University School Certificate; (b) The Makerere College Entrance Examination; (c) The Kenya Junior Secondary Leaving Certificate and (d) Certain other Approved Public Examinations. See also, a comment by Hilary Ng’weno, Daily Nation (Kenya), 23 April 1963.
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48 Extracts from: Education in Uganda (The Castle Report), 1963, 1, par. 85. UON Archives. UEA Executive Senate Committee, PUEA/2A/1.
Increased pressure from different constituencies necessitated the review of the entrance requirements of the UEA “to relate them to the East African environment” and the following entrance requirements were agreed upon:

(i) A School Certificate or General Certificate of Education with passes in five approved subjects, obtained prior to the sitting of the Higher School Certificate OR Advanced level of the General Certificate of Education;

(ii) One of the following combinations of passes in the Higher School Certificate OR Advanced level of General Certificate of Education:

(a) Two principal level passes at the same sitting;

(b) One principal level pass plus three subsidiary passes at the same sitting;

(c) One principal level pass at Grade ‘D’ or higher plus two subsidiary passes at the same sitting; and

(d) Two principal level passes not at the same sitting provided they are of grade ‘C’ or higher.

Even then, professional faculties could still expect their students to satisfy additional requirements to cater for their special needs. In the end, entrance levels in East Africa did not only resemble those in British universities but, in fact, exceeded them. This situation did not augur well for the future of the University because politicians and scholars from different territories time and again questioned this practice, arguing that it kept the East-African region perpetually under British domination. These embedded tensions exploded after independence (see Chapter 6 below).

The planners of higher education in East Africa had to contend with the reality that there were old prospective students who could not meet the set requirements but were deemed fit to join the University on the basis of their work experience. The planners agreed that students from 25 years or older could be admitted to the University but that “entry requirements must be as rigorous as possible.” It was argued that these students would have to be recommended by their tutors, sit for two examination papers and then be interviewed at length before being admitted. On 25 May 1963, Lindsay Young, Registrar-Designate of the UEA announced that 24 students had been admitted to the University Colleges for the 1963-64 academic year. These students were selected from 97 who took the entrance examination, 43 of whom were called for an intensive interview. A press and radio release described 24 as “a number which considerably exceeds the original expectation of the organizers of the scheme” thus indicating the level of determination by education authorities to retain high academic standards.

As demonstrated above, this strictness could not be sustained in its pure form; consequently the planners found themselves dealing with ‘special’ cases. Makerere’s Deputy Principal, J.P.

---
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Andrews in his letter to the Registrar of the University asked the Senate to consider the case of Mature Students of between 40 and 50 years who would be unsuitable for entry to an undergraduate course on account of age and experience. He wrote:

> It is suggested that consideration might be given to the possibility of allowing selected persons of mature age and adequate background to register for the degree of (say) MA by thesis, without first securing a bachelor’s degree – or in short, to consider exemption from the first degree requirements in the special case of such mature persons.\(^5\)

Some scholars argued: “To wait for the output of secondary schools as yet unbuilt is not by itself enough. We need to discover and train the latent talent which already exists in the adult population.”\(^5\) Russel Parkes summarised the rationale behind the recognition of Mature Age Entry Scheme at the UEA, stating that the Mature Age Entry Scheme was based on the belief that in any society there is a fund of university-quality people who for one reason or another, usually not of their own making, fail to go through all the stages of education up to the university entrance level.\(^5\) He added that no society could afford to lose the university talents it may possess and that the scheme was designed to benefit individuals and to give societies the use of their fully trained talents.

High entrance requirements sustained inter-territorial tensions. For example, the Ministry of Education in Uganda experienced a serious manpower shortage in the supply of scientists and subsequently notified other East African Colleges and governments that the Uganda government thought it would be justified in asking the University to make emergency arrangements similar to those adopted by British Universities after the Second World War. The Uganda Education Ministry in its letter considered both short-term and long-term solutions and stated that Government considered that this might be too drastic a step at the time and suggested that High School Certificate candidates with one principal pass and two subsidiaries, should be considered for admission to the first year of graduate courses in 1963 and 1964 appropriate to their principal pass; the position to be reviewed thereafter in the light of the prevailing situation.\(^5\)

Kenya and Tanganyika vehemently challenged this view, fearing that if inadequately qualified students were admitted there would be a strong temptation to adjust the level of the degree examination to maintain a normal percentage of passes.\(^5\) The Provisional Council in its meeting of 27 May 1963 noted the exceptional circumstances in which some candidates with only one Principal pass had been admitted for the 1963-64 academic year direct to the four-year degree course in the Faculty of Veterinary Science. But the Academic Committee of the Provisional Council of the UEA was opposed to the one Principal Level entrance standard suggested by Uganda. These tensions inspired Uganda to call for the establishment of national universities.

---
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There were many other factors that compounded the problem of having a small student population at the East African colleges. One such factor was that some of the students who met the University’s entrance requirements managed to secure overseas scholarships and subsequently left East Africa to pursue their tertiary education abroad.

**Overseas education**

Overseas education played its part in keeping the student population low in the East African colleges. Views on whether to promote or discourage overseas education caused inter-territorial tensions which threatened the life of the University. There were a variety of reasons that inspired East African students to pursue their higher education abroad. When the First Working Party began its investigation in 1955 it discovered that a large number of students were seeking higher education overseas and it reported that the total number at that time, especially in the United Kingdom or in the Irish Republic was 1,600. The reason for this move abroad was lack of facilities in East Africa.57

Initially, lack of educational facilities in East Africa was a reality. But even when these became available in the 1950s and 1960s, a number of students still aspired to travel abroad. The table below shows the large number of students studying in Britain and in America in 1961 when East Africa already had more than one University College.

**Table 6. Number of East African Students in British and US Universities in 1961.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Country of study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not clear whether Uganda had no students studying abroad during this year or if the figures were not recorded in the source.


---

When the UEA was established in 1963, two divergent views emerged:

(i) the view that students should be discouraged from leaving the region so that they could join the three constituent colleges;

(ii) that more East Africans should be encouraged to travel abroad to further their education so that they could return and replace expatriate staff at the EACSO offices and at the University.

The first view was prompted by three reasons:

(i) Many of these students were bright and desperately needed in East Africa to keep the academic standards high;

(ii) Training these students locally would accelerate the Africanisation process; and

(iii) East African colleges had a small student population and it was hoped that these students would boost the numbers in the respective colleges.

Another reason can be gleaned from the De la Warr Commission which stated that a stage had been reached for East Africa to press forward to provide full secondary and higher education within her borders. It was thus “desirable that Africans should stay at home for these stages of education in order to promote educational development within their own country [emphasis mine].” But the establishment of the UEA did not prevent students from travelling abroad. Between the mid-1950s and 1966 a total of 1 448 students travelled abroad for academic purposes as shown in the table below:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kenya was only second to Nigeria which had a total of 1,861 students.

On the eve of the demise of the UEA, East African students were still leaving for overseas universities in pursuit of their education. As more Africans travelled to European and American universities for further study, Asians headed for either India or Pakistan for the same purpose, in part because India and Pakistan had low costs and lower entrance requirements compared to British and American institutions. Some East African students received scholarships from the Indian government and pursued their education in Indian universities. Students from poor families could not resist overseas scholarships to join one of the University Colleges in East Africa where they had to foot the bill. Despite the demand from British students for places in their home universities, opportunities still increased for African students because a special

---

The University of East Africa and its problems

quota gave Commonwealth students a definite advantage in the proportion of places available to them overseas. Also, East African students were beneficiaries of the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme, under which Commonwealth governments created 1,000 postgraduate Scholarships to be held in various Commonwealth countries. Half of those scholarships were provided by Britain and this resulted into more students from East Africa travelling to Britain to study.

The debate on whether or not to encourage students to travel abroad took two forms. First, Africans argued that students should remain in East Africa while overseas sponsors attracted the students to overseas institutions. Second, East Africans debated this issue at the inter-territorial level, with each of the three territories considering its immediate manpower needs. In both instances, reaching consensus proved to be impossible since the whole debate revolved around economic and political power and territorial interests.

The University depended largely on foreign funds for its survival. Therefore, the economic power allowed donors to control overseas education. As mentioned above, East African Colleges needed the best students to keep academic standards high but as Dr Luyimbazi-Zake told the University Council, “the donors do also expect to receive first rate students.” Dr Luyimbazi-Zake tacitly admitted that his Ugandan government had no control over the situation. His colleague, S.K Nkutu, shared the same views. On 15 March 1965, members of the Senate Joint Admissions Board raised concerns about Uganda’s decision to send her best students abroad. The meeting mandated the Vice-Chancellor to write to the Uganda government asking for clarification. Nkutu responded on behalf of Uganda’s Education Ministry, stating that he was anxious to maintain the standards of the University of East Africa. However, he noted that Universities overseas also insisted on only having the best. Thus, “we have now and again, therefore, to give them some of our best students. On that score I have asked that five scholarships should be awarded to some five Engineering students for study overseas.” The impression given by the two Ugandan authorities was that their government felt obliged to satisfy the donors so as to save the relationship.

East African constituencies were determined to keep their students in the region and pleaded with outside sponsors to work through them when offering overseas scholarships. But they also contributed to this migration by denying the students access to University education on the grounds that they did not meet the University’s entrance requirements whereas overseas institutions accepted such students and they finished their courses. The American Consul-General in Kenya and the Chairman of the Selection Committee of the African Students Foundation in Canada reminded East Africans about this fact. But even besides this circumstantial reason, the history of overseas education in the whole of Africa shows that Africans valued overseas education, or education attained outside their countries. It is in part for this reason that the number of East African students studying abroad showed an upward trend.
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The shortage of students who qualified to join the three inter-territorial colleges frustrated the planners of the University. When the student population increased a few years later, another problem emerged; the University could not absorb all the students who qualified for admission at the constituent colleges. This new development had a significant contribution to the demise of the University of East Africa.

The increase of the student population

The question of the student population was a timed-bomb. Educational authorities and politicians from Britain and East Africa had anticipated that at some point student numbers would increase and that this would put the future of the University in jeopardy. They soon realised that the East African countries seemed to be developing faster than had been anticipated. Each country’s manpower needs were more than the University could handle, and there was increasing political pressure to provide places for all students who qualified.63 The resolve by East African territories to implement the Africanisation project unwittingly forced them to send even more of their students to the University’s constituent colleges. Therefore the period from 1963 to 1970 “had rapid growth as its characteristic.”64 The Principal’s Annual Report for the academic year 1965/66 at University College, Nairobi stated:

In 1964, enrolment at the college was 625. In 1965/66 it was 921 and in the last year of the triennium, numbers are expected to reach 1 179 – an increase throughout the triennium of about 86%.65

By 20 May 1966, out of a total of 1 994 applicants for the 1966-67 academic year, only 1 283 offers had been made, leaving 711 students stranded. As the number of students at East African colleges increased, the call for the establishment of more universities became louder.

In 1965, President Obote stated in a BBC broadcast in London called ‘African Forum’ that proposals were being examined for creating separate universities in Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. A Nigerian student studying in London at the time asked President Obote why Uganda wanted to break Makerere away from the University. President Obote’s response was that the assessment of the East African situation was not fair; that those who made comments on the issue failed to read and interpret it well. He opined:

I have been wondering how long a University College should take before it becomes a University – five, 10 or 20 years? This is the basic problem in East Africa. We have 27 000 000 people, with only one university. We have been re-examining the problem, and we feel each of these colleges should in 1967 become universities, so that we create new university colleges. We are thinking in terms of 50 000 – not 5 000 – students.66

An increase in the student population in the various colleges had its ramifications, and these did not augur well for the future of the UEA. The corollary of admitting more students was an

66 Uganda Argus, 2 July 1965.
increased demand for more staff. Moreover, residential accommodation became inadequate, thus forcing college authorities to double up students in rooms originally meant for single students—a decision which students resented. The University also needed more lecture theatres, more books, and more teaching and learning facilities such as laboratory equipment. These new demands squeezed the budget of each college. The University’s Central Office could not afford to give the colleges the amount they had requested, thus forcing each college to fund-raise so as to supplement its share. Tanzania used its Development loan from Britain for the operation of its University College. The Uganda government requested for more funds from the British government to fund Makerere University College; a sum of £62 000 was granted. Makerere used this money to build additional halls of residence for its students and for staff accommodation. Part of the money was used to build a cafeteria and to expand the College’s Medical School.67

The problems experienced by the UEA as a result of the increase in the student population forced the East African Authority to appoint a Working Party late in 1968 in view of:

(i) The increasing needs for expansion of facilities for higher education within East Africa;

(ii) The likelihood that at some time after the next triennium planning period (ending in mid-1970) this would lead to the natural growth of three or more separate universities in place of the present three constituent colleges of the University of East Africa; and

(iii) The desirability of maintaining some types of co-operation between the three constituent colleges as they developed into separate universities in special matters of interest to the people of East Africa.

The Working Party was under the Chairmanship of Professor George D. Stoddard. Other members were: the Principals of the Constituent Colleges, three representatives from the three governments and the Vice-Chancellor of the University. The Working Party met in September 1968.

When the University Council held its confidential meeting on 8 November 1968, it noted that the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa had begun its work on 16 September 1968 and that it would be submitting its Report and recommendations to the East African Authority in the near future. The Report was submitted to the three East African Heads of States on 31 January 1969. Three of its main recommendations were:

(i) Each College should become a University on its own right;

(ii) An Inter-University Committee for East Africa should be established by the East African Community, to maintain co-operation among East African universities;

(iii) Each country should constitute an independent *ad hoc* University Grants Committee to examine the financial needs of each university and advise the government accordingly. In making its recommendations the Working Party considered a wide range of factors that would impact on higher education. For example, according to the United Nations statistical yearbook for 1967 the ratio of inhabitants per physician in East Africa was as follows:

Table 8. Ratio of inhabitants per physician in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda in 1967.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>12,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>18,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Basing its argument on this statistical data, the Working Party approved all plans to expand facilities for medical education in the region. It argued that it was acutely aware of the political significance of the University but recommended that each college should become an independent university with an effect from 1 July 1970. It felt that this recommendation was ‘sound on academic grounds’. The Working Party also argued that individual states could start their own projects outside of regional plans. The East African Authority accepted the recommendation of Stoddard’s Working Party to dissolve the UEA out of necessity. It then became evident to the East African Authority that –

... developments in Higher Education in the three countries of East Africa in the mid-sixties had indicated demand for according full university status to the then constituent colleges of the University of East Africa.

In 1969 both the University Council and the Senate were informed that University College, Nairobi would be compelled by shortage of accommodation to restrict student entry into its Common Faculties. This was contrary to the policy of the East African governments which stated that the University would admit all qualified East African students. There was also a Ministerial Policy regarding the distribution of students into Common Faculties in terms of which each of the colleges had to have a roughly equal number of students. Looking at this situation, Onyango wondered:

The question which now arises is whether the East African governments still wish the University to take in all qualified East Africans in which case if Nairobi is compelled to restrict admission, whether Makerere and Dar es Salaam will be allowed to admit students in excess of the figures stipulated in the Ministerial Formula.

These developments showed that any attempt to sustain the life of the University in the late 1960s was tantamount to trying to square a circle. The student population had increased significantly. The statistics for the 1964/65 academic year show that University College, Nairobi had a student population of 650; in the 1968/69 academic year this figure had increased to 1 850. During the 1969/70 academic year Makerere University College had 764 undergraduates; University College, Nairobi had 852; and the University College, Dar es Salaam had 611. Applications for Mature Age Exemption increased from 587 in 1964 to 1 373 in 1968. Thus, the increase in the student population played a key role in the demise of the University.
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Race

Race was like a double-edged sword in the history of the University of East Africa. On the one hand it created tensions within each college community. On the other hand it caused a schism between the three different colleges. In fact, race was one of the niggling problems in East African higher education long before the name ‘University’ was given to the three inter-territorial colleges. Its impact was felt at different moments as the University was being constituted. The shortage of tertiary institutions in East Africa affected racial groups differently. European secondary schools prepared their children to pursue their education at European universities. Most Asian students attended Indian universities. African students had no guaranteed destination after completing at Makerere College. Kenya’s Director of Public Works confided in a letter to the Chief Secretary in Nairobi thus:

I wish it to be clearly understood that it is not only my opinion but that of all Engineer members of this Department that facilities do not exist in East Africa for the training of European, Asian or African engineers, no matter what academic qualifications they might attain, but I appreciate that in due course facilities will be available.71

While acknowledging the fact that all racial groups in east Africa needed engineering facilities on an equal basis, the Director suggested that Europeans should go to the British Isles or to South Africa to qualify as Engineers and that Asians should travel to India for the same purpose. This automatically left Africans being the only racial group that had nowhere to go, thus implying that they had to remain at Makerere College, perceived to be a College for Africans in the first place.

The fact that Kenya was a settler colony while both Uganda and Tanganyika were predominantly black meant that the colleges built in these territories would display racial differences in terms of their student population. From its first day of existence, Makerere had been conceived of, and to a very large extent remained, almost purely a school for Africans. For example, in 1941, the College admitted only one Indian student who came from Zanzibar. This was abnormal for a regional institution. The race issue remained central in much of the discussions and controversies, from the first visit to East Africa by the IUC in 1946 to the opening of RTC in 1956. Goldthorpe argues that although the De la Warr Commission of 1937 and subsequent Commissions had recommended that Makerere should be open to all racial groups, there were fears among the African constituencies that Africans might be swamped if Indians were admitted to Makerere.72

Kenya had always been reluctant to entrust her young Africans to Makerere, fearing that they would be vulnerable to political agitation; and its other two races, Europeans and Asians, were not attracted to a predominantly African College.73

It was only in 1951 that Makerere was formally declared a non-racial college. But this formal announcement did not result into any major change in the composition of the student population. In 1954, Makerere University College had only one European and three Asians. Rastad Svein-Erik asserts that Makerere deliberately discouraged Asian students from applying
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and that “no Asians were admitted with the excuse that Makerere did not have the necessary standards to meet the needs of the Indian community.”\textsuperscript{74} As a result of these racial debates the Asian community in Kenya called for the provision of commercial education facilities while European settlers pressed for technical education. Joint effort by the two racial groups gave rise to the RTC discussed in the previous chapters, thus making this new College a product of racial wrangling between different constituencies. Ogot argues that the establishment of the RTC marked the beginning of the end of the concept of a unitary university restricted to Makerere.\textsuperscript{75} As discussed in Chapter 2, the University College, Dar es Salaam had not been established yet but the structure of the envisaged University was already crumbling.

When the First Working Party conducted its investigation in 1955, it discovered that there was an increasing awareness that both Kenya and Tanganyika were following their own lines of development and that each would need its university pretty soon. The Working Party continued:

This consciousness seemed to us to be more fully developed in Kenya than in Tanganyika, and this may be attributed to the fact that Europeans and Asians form a larger proportion of the population in Kenya than in the other territories.\textsuperscript{76}

Therefore, the settler population in Kenya regarded Makerere as ‘the other’ from the outset and this meant that for many years to come Makerere would remain predominantly African while the RTC had a significant number of European and Asian students. These racial tensions continued unabated until the inauguration of the UEA.

The De la Warr Commission had predicted that race was a temporal issue that would dissipate once the University had been established. The Commission predicted that once the university was ultimately established, questions of race would tend to become irrelevant.\textsuperscript{77}

But the Commission was later proved wrong. Racial issues dominated territorial and inter-territorial meetings on the eve of the establishment of the University and after. The Chairman of the Admissions Board of the UEA asked the Senate to address racial problems, arguing that such problems impacted negatively on the functioning of the University. He maintained that the preference of Asian students to live in Nairobi had resulted in a proportionately heavier enrolment of Asians at University College, Nairobi than at the other two East African colleges. The Chairman asked the Board to keep in balance the racial composition of each college. The Asian question was compounded by the fact that many Asians living in Kenya had not declared whether they wished to take up Kenyan citizenship or not. This made it difficult for the Kenyan government to decide whether or not to give them bursaries. Some professional faculties of the University did not reserve any places for late applicants, consequently some good candidates had to be refused their first choice; in the case of candidates with overseas degrees in Arts who wished to do law, this effectively excludes them from the University.\textsuperscript{78}

All the University Colleges were affected by race. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Rogers’ Report on Salaries and Terms of Service in the University of East Africa caused pandemonium in the
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University community. The Provisional Council of the UEA highlighted this problem in 1962, stating: “Discussion in the Provisional Council revealed the presence of a good deal of uneasiness about the difference in total emoluments of ‘expatriate’ and ‘local’ staff.” 79 Soon after the publication of Rogers’ Report in 1963, the Academic Staff Association at Royal College, Nairobi wrote a Memorandum to the Provisional Council of the University in which they vehemently challenged the proposed terms of service. The Association argued that these terms were bad, both in principle and in detail because they reflected racial prejudice and had a potential to ruin the future of the University if implemented. The Association was strongly against the introduction of a salary differential as between local and expatriate staff, which would drive a wedge between them. It noted that it was unrealistic to expect well-qualified local people to offer their services to institutions in which there were marked disparities in salaries, particularly as initial salaries would be well below those ruling overseas. 80

The thrust of the argument made by the Academic Staff Association was that all existing members of staff, not just expatriates, had to benefit from the changes in British salary scales. This view was succinctly captured by the preamble to the recommendations made by the Academic Staff Association’s Sub-Committee, which stated that it viewed with concern the inevitable deterioration in personal relationships among staff that would be caused by differentiation in basic salary and felt very ‘strongly’ that the international market value of a member of staff should be the determining factor in the fixation of his basic salary in the Academic Community, rather than his place of origin. 81

But it was not only the Africans who found the proposed salary scales displeasing. Professor Royston Jones from Royal College, Nairobi put his full weight behind the Academic Staff Association. Jones in his Memorandum addressed to the University’s Provisional Council in May 1963 identified two most disturbing features of the proposed terms and conditions of service:

(i) The injustice to the African or local members of the University staff; and

(ii) The breaking of what was a moral obligation and what could be the legal obligation to the African/local staff.

According to Jones, these terms had two negative effects:

(i) destruction of morale; and

(ii) a severe straining of staff relationships as a result of the discrimination on racial grounds.

Jones subsequently provided the following solution: “In view of the small number of the present staff involved (about six at The Royal College), the most practical solution is to treat all present members of staff as expatriates.” 82 This view concurred with a reminder by the
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Executive Committee of the IUC (citing the Asquith Commission Report) that all staff members had to be paid at the same rate, regardless of their race or place of origin.

The rift already existing between expatriate and East African academic staff widened even further following the manner in which the administration at the Royal College, Nairobi had handled the boycott by students who were understandably infuriated by the cancellation of Oginga Odinga’s address that was supposed to take place at the College’s premises in 1969. East African lecturers and Professors wrote a joint statement in which they deplored a circular issued to the students at the weekend by the Acting Registrar, M.L. Shattock. In that circular, the Registrar had blamed the students for their actions. The black faculty claimed that the circular distorted the position of the academic staff on the crisis, thus distancing themselves from what they perceived to be a racial issue. The black faculty sympathised with the students and put the blame squarely on the administration.

Expatriate staff interviewed after this incident indicated that they were totally annoyed at the attempts by their East African colleagues to show their stand on the students’ boycott. Some even threatened to resign en masse.83 What had started as a minor issue took another turn once the racial factor was brought into the equation. As these racial tensions built up, East African constituencies looked forward to the dissolution of the UEA and the establishment of national universities to be administered by East Africans themselves.

This section has demonstrated that the establishment of the RTC in 1954 was inspired mainly by racial attitudes towards Makerere University College. The settler community and the colonial government in Kenya considered Makerere as ‘the other’. Therefore, the establishment of the Federal University was a ‘forced’ marriage. In the end the dissolution of this institution became a fore-gone conclusion.

**Uncertainty**

Uncertainty about the future of the UEA was a problem from the start. During the planning stages there was a constant attempt to balance the economic capabilities of East Africa and the political aspirations of each territory. Both factors were unpredictable. The planners of the University conceded that it would be dissolved as soon as regional economies improved. However, no one knew for sure as to when that time would come. Therefore the planning process was based on speculations. The inauguration ceremony “was the culmination of a tortuous history of indecision in higher education policy.”84 The first University Development Plan focused solely on the first triennium period ending in the middle of 1967. The planners argued that prevailing circumstances would determine the next step. This meant that the University could dissolve anytime after that period but no one could confirm this assumption. There was more uncertainty towards the end of the first triennium, some constituencies working on the assumption that the University would continue its existence after the first triennium while others assumed that it would be dissolved. Eventually the East African Authority decided that the University would continue its operation at least until 1970.
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Uncertainty continued even after this decision had been made, some individuals arguing that there was insufficient time left to allow for the smooth dissolution of the University and thus intimating that its life be prolonged for at least one more year, while others such as Dr Luyimbazi-Zake stated that the University would be dissolved in 1970. Therefore, uncertainty pervaded the University from its birth and accompanied it to its demise. This section demonstrates how this problem played itself out.

The UEA was inaugurated in June 1963 but by 1964 the problem of uncertainty was already apparent. Towards the end of 1964, the University Planning Committee asked de Bunsen to write a Memorandum inviting the views of the three governments and the colleges on certain fundamental questions, which included the following: “Have the Governments and Colleges views, however tentative, on the possible length of life of a common University of East Africa?”

There was no immediate response.

Uncertainty frustrated the administrators. Early in March 1965, de Bunsen stated in his letter to the University Council Executive that it would be impossible to find suitable people to fill the Vice-Chancellorship (when his term ended) and Registrarship positions given the on-going uncertainty about the future of the University. In his view, “no good man will give up a worthwhile appointment to become even potentially a caretaker or undertaker.” The University Council was in a dilemma. On the one hand it could not make conclusive plans because there was no certainty that the University would continue its operation after 1967. On the other hand, deferring its business – including the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar – would be tantamount to prejudicing the actual existence of the University even before a final decision on this matter had been made. De Bunsen subsequently suggested that the Council should work from the assumption that in one shape or another, the University had a future but he had nothing tangible with which he could support his optimism.

Uncertainty became a topical subject in the meetings of the University Council and the Senate towards the end of the first triennium. Members of these bodies were in a state of confusion, not knowing whether to plan for the future of the University or to prepare to take up new jobs elsewhere. One item on the agenda of the seventh meeting of the University Senate of October 1965 was to consider the recommendation of Senate Executive Committee that the Joint Government/University Committee should not be reconvened until a firm decision on the future of the University has been reached. The Committee’s failure to meet meant that no administrative decisions could be made. The University Council in its eighth meeting held in Nairobi on 12 November 1965, considered the Senate resolution that –

... in view of the harm being brought to the University by the uncertainty of its future, and in view of the fact that planning in and for the University beyond 1967 must begin now, Senate requests the University Council to request those who may be concerned to reach a decision as soon as possible ...

85 The UEA. Memorandum by the Vice-Chancellor on the Basis of Future Development Planning, November 1964, 3. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/13.
86 UEA. Confidential Memorandum to Members of the Council Executive by Vice-Chancellor de Bunsen, 5 March 1965, 1. UON Archives. UEA University Council, PUEA/1A/14.
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Eventually the East African Authority decided that the University would continue its existence as a federal institution for at least the triennium planning period ending on 30 June 1970. The decision to sustain the life of the University beyond 1967 gave the planners the much-awaited relief and provided the green light to plan for the second triennium. However, uncertainty lingered on regarding the University’s future beyond 1970. The Vice-Chancellor in the confidential meeting of the University Council held on 16 September 1968 drew attention to the unsettling and demoralising effects of the uncertainty about the future of the University on the staff, more especially senior staff at the University’s Central Office in Uganda. He expressed his concern about a situation that would arise should senior staff members take steps to secure other posts elsewhere before the work at the Central Office was completed. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he could not hold these staff members back because he, too, was uncertain about the future of the University. The confidential meeting agreed on two issues:

(i) To draw the attention of Professor Stoddard’s Working Party to this problem and the desirability of being able to assure the staff of the University Central Office comparable positions either in the Colleges or in Government service should the University cease to exist, and request that the Working Party should include this matter in its recommendations; and

(ii) To draw the attention of the Governments and Colleges to the experienced manpower likely to be available at the Central Office.89

The University Council then instructed the Vice-Chancellor to have confidential consultation with College Principals regarding the possibility of their Colleges absorbing the officers at the University’s Central Office.

The East African Authority did not make a decision about the future of the University soon after receiving the Report of Stoddard’s Working Party. Although the Report had been submitted on 31 January 1969, no decision had been made towards the end of the year. On 4 November 1969 Erik K. Kigozi, Acting Registrar at the University of East Africa, wrote a lengthy Memorandum in which he stated that although it had been hoped that the East African Authority would have made known their decisions on the Report of the Working Party, unfortunately this did not happen. Consequently “members of staff at the Central Office have continued to work under a cloud of uncertainty.”90 He admitted that the situation had a demoralising effect on the staff such that three secretaries left the University service within a matter of two weeks. He feared that they might be an exodus of staff which could lead to a premature closing down of the Central Office. Lastly, he urged the University council to suggest and agree on what kind of steps should be taken to get senior members of staff at the Central Office absorbed by the new Universities or Governments in the event of the dissolution of the Central organisation.

The tone of this memorandum demonstrates clearly that uncertainty about the future of the University put the entire University community in the dark and made it extremely difficult for the administrators to execute their duties. Yet, there was very little they could do since the decision to dissolve or to sustain the University was beyond their power.

89 Confidential Minutes of the University Council held at Makerere College on 8 November 1968. UON Archives. UEA. PUEA/1A/49.

Sir James W. Cook, Vice-Chancellor of the UEA argued in a Working Paper entitled ‘The Future of the University of East Africa’, that there was insufficient time left before the dissolution of the University. On 10 November 1969, a Council Committee had been appointed by the Federal University Council to make recommendations for the implementation of the proposals of the Working Party on Higher Education in East Africa in so far as they were directly relevant to the role and functions of the University as distinct from the Colleges and on the assumption that the proposals would be accepted by the Authority and the respective Governments.\textsuperscript{91} Cook suggested to the Council Committee that it should consider postponing the proposed dissolution by at least one year so that proper arrangements could be made for a smooth hand-over to the new national universities. In his view, there was no inherent reason why the University could not co-exist for some time with the new national universities. The problem was that by July 1970 there would be no senior staff available to run the University should its life be prolonged.

The East African Authority finally took a decision on 25 March 1970 that the University would split into three independent Universities based in Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. By this time it was already too late to salvage the University even if the Authority had wanted to. Some employees had already resigned at the Central Office. Moreover, there was insufficient time left to apply for funds to sustain the University should the Authority decide to keep it. Above all, Uganda had already made it clear that she was planning to establish a national university. Cook was only able to report to the University Council during the 19\textsuperscript{th} and final meeting held on 16 June 1970. At this meeting it was noted that Cook had received official intimation:

(i) that the East African Authority had taken a decision that the University of East Africa would be dissolved on 30\textsuperscript{th} June 1970; and

(ii) that the three constituent colleges would become national universities of their respective countries with an effect from 1 July 1970.

It was also mentioned at this meeting that the Authority had notified members of staff at the Central Office that their employment would thus be terminated on 30 June 1970. The twentieth and final University Congregation was to be held at the University College, Dar es Salaam on Friday 26 June 1970. By the time this meeting ended the cloud had eventually been cleared on what would become of the University at the end of June 1970. Therefore, uncertainty, together with the rest of the factors discussed in this chapter, played a pivotal role in the demise of the Federal University of East Africa.

**Conclusion**

The thrust of the argument in this chapter is that the Federal University of East Africa was a stillborn child. The University was built on a shaky foundation, with territorial and inter-territorial tensions already enshrined. These tensions continued unabated after the University had been formally established. The official dissolution of the UEA was a saturation point of problems that had been part of its life from its infant stages. Therefore 30 June 1970 only marked the end of a long and protracted struggle for the University’s survival.

\textsuperscript{91} UEA. Minutes of the University Council. UON Archives. PUEA/1A/50 Vol. III.
The present chapter began by demonstrating that although inadequate funding affected the University in the late 1960s as anticipated, this was not a problem at first. It has been demonstrated in this chapter that the UEA received financial support from different funding agencies and the British government throughout its life. The above discussion has shown that inequality between the constituent colleges, the University calendar, the student population, race, and uncertainty were the key factors that combined and brought the University of East Africa to its knees. Some of the problems discussed above were specific to East Africa while others were typical of federal universities.

The UEA was established at a time when the three East African territories were celebrating their political independence from Britain. At this moment it is apt to consider the role played by nationalism and independence in the eventual collapse of this regional institution. Such an analysis is both proper and relevant because it shows how the spirit of nationalism prevailed over regional integration through higher education. As shall be seen below, having joined forces to make the expatriate staff dispensible at the University the East African academic and political leadership started focusing more in the promoting the nationalist agenda thus calling for the establishment of national universities.
CHAPTER SIX

Nationalism, independence and the University of East Africa

Introduction

The concept nationalism has deep roots in the historiography of the Western world, while the term independence gained popular currency in Africa in the 1960s. Barbara Ward intimated in her work that to understand nationalism in the modern sense we must follow the development of Western Society in its cradle of the Mediterranean and Western Europe. In her view, “here nationalism, as we understand it today, was born.” Kofi Agyeman argues that African nationalism owes its origin to the colonisation of Africa by the European imperial powers. He adds that nationalism has also been a reaction against the same domination which brought it into existence. There is general consensus in the academy that the rise of nationalism in Africa took a better shape soon after the end of World War II and reached its apogee in the early 1960s when modern African nation-states were born. However, other scholars argue that it would be erroneous to ignore the 1920s when discussing the rise of nationalism in Africa precisely because it was during this time that the solid foundation was laid. Lylyan Kesteloot writes: “It has become a cliché that the year 1960 is remembered as ‘the year of Africa’. Some observers undoubtedly saw the sudden eruptions that led to independence of African country after African country as the product of kind of ‘chain reaction’.” She also notes that what is generally overlooked is that the demand for independence was being prepared on the
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intellectual plane as early as the 1920s, and that the African revolutions of the 1960’s erupted only after a slow revolution.

Tied up with the rise of nationalism and the struggle for political independence by African countries was the call for the development of higher education. This derived from the fact that throughout Africa, “one of the most potent symbols of national independence was a national university on equal terms with other universities throughout the world.” Chapter 3 of this study has shown that politics and education were inseparable from each other. As the struggle for political independence gained momentum, East Africans pressed for the establishment of a Federal University. Presidents Kenyatta, Obote, and Nyerere chose June 1963 as the date for the inauguration of the UEA so that it would coincide with the independence of Kenya, the only one of the three East African territories that had not yet achieved its political independence from Britain at the time. Chapter 4 demonstrated that when the University was instituted East Africans perceived it as a regional asset and as a sign of independence from British rule. Thus, between 1961 and 1963, the three East African countries did not only achieve political independence from Britain but also withdrew their University Colleges from the ‘Special Relationship’ programme with the University of London.

Nationalism in East Africa played a dual role. First, there was broadly defined nationalism which united East Africa as a region against British imperialism. Second, was the narrowly defined nationalism, which only embraced the people living within the geographical boundaries of one country. The latter was motivated by the achievement of political independence and it marked a total shift towards parochialism where national interests overpowered regional consciousness. Subsequently, the UEA lost its original political attraction of being perceived as a unifying factor. It was now perceived as a stumbling block to complete national development. As these nationalist sentiments gradually gained momentum, the future of the University was jeopardized.

The purpose of the present chapter is to demonstrate how the spirit of nationalism and independence contributed to the demise of the University of East Africa. The chapter begins by briefly discussing the two faces of nationalism in East Africa (nationalism as a unifying force and nationalism as a divisive factor) with a view to providing the wider context in which the demise of the UEA should be understood. It then provides a chronological analysis of the role played by nationalism and independence in the eventual collapse of the University, starting from 1961 when Tanganyika became the first East African territory to achieve political independence from Britain to 1970 when the UEA was officially dissolved. The chapter then discusses the relationship between the state and the university by addressing the role played by manpower requirements and the national pride of each state in the demise of the UEA, and concludes by demonstrating how the spirit of nationalism and independence was confirmed in the middle of 1970 when Makerere University, the University of Nairobi and the University of Dar es Salaam were formally instituted as national universities.

---

Nationalism, independence and the University of East Africa

Nationalism as a unifying force

Nationalism has many faces; it unites nations while simultaneously dividing the world into little compartments. In Africa, nationalism first took a Pan-Africanist dimension, inculcating the spirit of African brotherhood among the African people and portraying white domination as anathema. Thus, according to Mazrui, modern nationalism in Africa “started with a racial consciousness rather than a territorial identity.”6 The racial base of African nationalism was valuable because it promoted a sense of solidarity with fellow Africans in other territories. African politicians argued that in the same way as French and German nationalism had to be annihilated for the sake of European unity, African states had to put the interests of the African continent before those of their smaller nations. As Mazrui aptly put it, “a political abortion was needed to put an end to the territorial monstrosities which Africa conceived in her contact with colonialism.”7 A new spirit of African brotherhood had to be cultivated for the sake of African unity.

Another form of nationalism which, although limited in scope, was perceived to possess the unifying element, was inter-territorial or regional nationalism. In East Africa, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika sought to oust Britain so that they could take charge of their own economic, political and educational institutions. Presidents Kenyatta, Obote and Nyerere interpreted their efforts towards establishing the first East African Community (which collapsed in 1977) not only as a means to unite their three territories administratively as the British had planned to do, but also as a contribution towards the promotion of regional African nationalism. As the cause of a united Europe demanded that French and German nationalism should be allowed to die, “the cause of a united Africa sometimes demanded that Kenyan or Tanganyikan patriotism should not be permitted to be born.”8 In June 1960, President Nyerere expressed his willingness to delay Tanganyika’s independence and wait for Uganda and Kenya to have their dates of independence confirmed by Britain so that the three territories could then move towards independence as a region. President Nyerere argued that there was a general belief that a federation of the East African states would be a good thing. He noted: “We have said, and rightly so, that the boundaries which now divide our countries were made by the imperialists, not by us, and that we must not allow them to be used against our unity.”9

It was this inter-territorial nationalism that inspired East African constituencies to embrace the idea of a Federal University. East African constituencies anticipated that the University would promote the spirit of East African brotherhood. As discussed in Chapter 4, having established the UEA, East African politicians and scholars sought to Africanise it by recruiting administrative staff and faculty from locally. Furthermore, they Africanised the University’s curriculum and syllabus so that it could serve their region. Africanisation was thought to perform a dual function. First, it was deemed to have a quantitative dimension in that it significantly reduced the overall dependence upon the expatriate staff. Second, it was deemed to have a qualitative dimension because it provided the type of training that was appropriate for future staff.
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members. Therefore, according to the discussion above, the spirit of nationalism united the African continent and East Africa as a region. However, nationalism also had a divisive face. This point too needs to be investigated.

Nationalism as a divisive factor, 1955-1960

Nationalism is, by definition, divisive and discriminatory. It means different things to different people. One of the meanings which the Oxford Dictionary ascribes to it is that it is another word for egotism. Ashby moves from this universal definition of nationalism to nationalism as applied in the African context and argues that African nationalism “is really an amalgam of three ingredients: loyalty to a race, loyalty to a culture …; and a passionate distrust of foreign influences in any form: imperialism, trusteeship, the paternalism of protectorates.”

By the mid-1950s, the spirit of parochial nationalism had engulfed East Africa and was already creating cracks between the East African territories in different spheres of life, including higher education. When the First Working Party visited Tanganyika in 1955 it discovered that generally there was no overt expression of dissatisfaction of the Tanganyikan people with Makerere University College. However, the Working Party noted: “At the same time it is now realized that Tanganyika is following an independent course of development. As this sentiment grows, Makerere College will come to be regarded as an institution belonging to another territory and as such, however admirable in itself, not entirely fitted for the young people of Tanganyika.” Indeed, it was the spirit of nationalism that inspired Tanganyikan constituencies to perceive Uganda and her college as ‘the other’. The Working Party was not surprised to hear that the Tanganyikan government under Governor Twining had already put aside a total sum of £700,000 as a nucleus of a fund for the foundation of a university college in Tanganyika. He argued that no national government could willingly be entirely dependent for the higher education of the bulk of its graduates on foreign countries. The Working Party conceded that while it was appropriate for East African territories to co-operate in specific areas, it was understandable that each independent state would soon aspire to have its own national institution of higher learning.

The spirit of nationalism became stronger in 1960 when Tanganyika was granted responsible government by Britain, with confirmation that complete independence would be granted in 1961. Some Tanganyikans considered both Makerere University College and the Royal Technical College as stumbling blocks in the development of national higher education in Tanganyika, arguing that while it had been justifiable for the East African region to organise its higher education system through the East-Africa High Commission, independence nullified this arrangement. The proponents of this view argued that national governments would be expected primarily to respond to the needs of their immediate society before those of the region. An analysis of Parliamentary debates in the Tanganyika Legislature provides a glimpse on how some of these nationalist sentiments were articulated.
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The Chief Minister of Tanganyika (Julius Nyerere before he became President) moved a Motion during the sitting of the Tanganyika Legislative Council in 1960 proposing that the Tanganyika government must approve a sum of £4,777 to be given to the Royal Technical College in Kenya as part of regional planning of higher education in East Africa. Mr Tumbo, one of the Members of the House, expressed his uneasiness about this motion. He lamented that Tanganyika had been incurring unnecessary expenses to fulfil her obligations in running the Royal Technical College and added:

If I were to ask the Minister for Education for the number of students from Tanganyika who are in the college in comparison to the number of students in the same college from Kenya, of course the number from Tanganyika would appear to be negligible and therefore, until such time that Tanganyika is able to use the facilities provided by the college effectively, I would refrain from voting any assistance to that college.13

Bhoke Munanka, another Member of the House, concurred with Tumbo, adding that he did not really see the need for trying to get this amount of money to the Royal Technical College from which they derived very little benefit, bearing in mind that sooner or later they would be building their own college or university. He suggested that “we reserve that money for further purposes of our own.”14 A third Member of the House, Mr Mponji, held the same view, arguing that the money available for educational purposes in Tanganyika should be spent to serve the people of Tanganyika and added: “We are not going to send money outside just because we want to fulfill our moral obligations. We should spend money in order to serve our people … We are prepared – at least for myself I am not prepared, to vote for this Motion in order to fulfill our moral obligation only, leaving our people to starve, just because we want to transfer this money to Kenya.”15

The Chief Minister had a hard time convincing these and other Members of the Tanganyika Legislative Council about the need to sustain Tanganyika’s relationship with Kenya and Uganda even after attaining full political independence. Having listened to these arguments against his Motion, The Chief Minister responded, conceding that it was true that it had taken the government a long time to make full use of the advantages offered by the Royal Technical College but added that before Members talked about waste of money, they had to think what they really meant. He argued that they were talking of £4,777, of which £4,500 had already been given to the college which was becoming a university college and concluded: “Government could not contemplate refusing to pay its own contribution to the other colleges when other Governments have agreed to make the same kind of contribution to our own University College when it is established.”16

Nyerere told Mponji that by voting against the Motion he would not be doing justice to his own intelligence. But it was clear that Tanganyikan politicians were no longer analysing the development of higher education in terms of how much East Africa would benefit from it. Their concern had now shifted to Tanganyika as a country and planned to serve its people. The University had not yet been established at this time and Tanganyika had not yet achieved full
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political independence from Britain, but the writing was already on the wall that nationalism and independence would make it almost impossible to sustain the life of the University once it came into existence. Part of the reason was that there is an assumed relationship between the state and the university. Tanganyika was about to become an independent state therefore, these politicians felt that their independent state would need a national university that would assist in national development plans since the two institutions complement each other.

Independence, the state and the University, 1961-1970

National governments and national universities are considered key institutions in the development of any nation. It is generally assumed that these two national institutions reciprocate each other – the former providing financial support while the latter provides the high-level manpower desperately needed to develop the state and its people. The intention of African governments to control universities in the 1960s was usually stated as being “to make them more responsive to development plans.” Mohamed Hyder argued that African universities like most similar institutions “derive the bulk of their financial support from the state. This economic relationship in many ways defines (although some would say, complicates) the university-state relationship.”

When East African territories achieved their political independence between 1961 and 1963, it was almost a given that higher education would be part and parcel of their national planning. Although East African politicians and scholars initially suppressed this reality for the sake of the Federal University, others conceded that university planning and national planning were inter-linked and that this was a stark reality East Africa had to accept. Solomon Eliufoo, Tanganyika’s Education Minister, addressed the conference on the University of East Africa held in Nairobi in 1967 and argued that university planning in a developing country is a part of national planning. He continued: “We have, however, seen the need, in a developing country like ours, to define with some precision the areas of decision for which the Government must assume responsibility and the areas in which academic discretion is essential.”

According to Eliufoo, the Tanzanian government would involve the University in its national plans, not because it wanted to interfere with the University’s autonomy, but because the government felt that it could not draw up and implement its policies single-handedly while the national University did nothing or designed divergent policies. The same belief led Principal Wilbert Chagula to the conclusion that the traditional concepts of academic freedom and university autonomy could not take root in and were totally unsuitable to East Africa. A chronological analysis of the development of higher education in East Africa between 1961 and 1970 shows that the achievement of political independence by each of the three East African countries played an instrumental role in the dissolution of the Federal University in 1970.

Independence and the University of East Africa, 1961-1963

By 1961, it was already evident that East African territories already perceived their University Colleges as the stepping stone towards the eventual establishment of national universities that would be run by the new national governments. The Second Working Party of 1958 had recommended that the University College, Dar es Salaam should open during the 1965/1966 academic year. Tanganyika’s government led by TANU pressed for an earlier date. Britain proposed a compromise date, suggesting that the College’s initial intake of students should begin in 1964. The Tanganyika government was still not satisfied. Having attained responsible government towards the end of 1960, Tanganyika’s Council of Ministers felt that 1964 was too far off, and that there would be a big gap between the celebration of full political independence and the establishment of the anticipated College in Tanganyika. The Council of Ministers subsequently announced that the University College would open in 1961, the same year in which Tanganyika attained her independent status from Britain. This move was considered to be ‘a brave decision’, not just ‘a political gesture without sound foundation’ but a decision which became ‘educationally sound’ because the University College in Tanganyika provided law courses that would be desperately needed by the national governments, especially during their early years of independence.21

The fact that the College buildings were not ready yet did not deter Tanganyika’s politicians from their resolution. TANU displayed its unwavering support to the University College by making its new headquarters building in Lumumba Street in Dar es Salaam available for use by the University College, Dar es Salaam until a new campus on Observation Hill at Ubungo, about eight miles outside the city, was ready for occupancy (these new premises for the University College, Dar es Salaam were opened in 1964 in a colorful ceremony attended by President Nyerere). Southall writes: “The opening of the Dar es Salaam College some three years earlier than the QAC [Quinquennial Advisory Committee] had allowed for, naturally called into question concurrent developments in Kampala and Nairobi, given the scarce resources available for higher education.”22

When Tanganyika became independent her politicians called on their countrymen (fellow politicians, scholars and students) to demonstrate the spirit of nationalism and its offshoot, patriotism. They persuaded Wilbert Chagula, already earmarked to become the first African Professor of Anatomy at Makerere University College to return to his home base in Tanganyika where he became the Registrar at the University College, Dar es Salaam and then later became the University College’s Principal. Independence and the spirit of nationalism had made these politicians perceive Makerere as ‘the other’, thus confirming the postulation made by the First Working Party in 1955 that once the East African region rid itself of British domination, each independent state would want to control its own national education system, more especially, higher education, and that this would put the life of the Federal University in jeopardy. In principle, Tanganyika was not opposed to the idea of a regional University. However, nationalism overpowered the spirit of regional integration in higher education.
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Initially, Tanganyika had supported the regional Veterinary School, which first belonged to Makerere University College and was transferred to Nairobi following the upgrading of the RTC into the status of the University College in 1961. But the Tanganyika government decided to take a different position soon after achieving its full political independence. It notified the Provisional Council of the Federal University that it had reversed its previously favorable attitude towards the continuation of one Veterinary School in East Africa. Tanganyikan authorities stated that the Tanganyika government would satisfy its need for Veterinarians by sending Tanganyikan students abroad for their training in this field. Despite the fact that sending students overseas would be more costly to the government of Tanganyika than sending them to the regional Veterinary School in Kenya, Tanganyikan politicians resolved to proceed with the plan so as to satisfy national interests.

The main cause of this change of position by Tanganyika was a sum of $500,000 the Rockefeller Foundation had promised to donate to the University of East Africa for the maintenance of the Veterinary School. The University College, Dar es Salaam was receiving financial support from the same funding organisation. Tanganyika’s fear was that if this money ($500,000) was given to the Veterinary School as planned, then the Rockefeller Foundation might not have sufficient funds to assist the University College in Dar es Salaam in its plans to strengthen its faculties of Arts and Science. The Tanganyika government also derived its inspiration from the feeling that if the development of the Veterinary School did not proceed as planned, part of the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund capital grant promised to the Veterinary School could be diverted to the Dar es Salaam. Pratt wrote a stream of letters to the Provisional Council of the University of East Africa requesting it to make a decision regarding the priorities of the University. In effect, “he was seeking a declaration that the development of the Dar es Salaam College was regarded as more important than that of the Veterinary Faculty, and that according to that logic, Rockefeller should transfer its aid from the latter to the former.”

This issue was so serious and divisive to the extent that the Chairman of the Provisional Council of the Federal University, Sir Donald MacGillivray, wrote an urgent letter to the Rockefeller Foundation requesting it to delay its public announcement about the $500,000 grant. Meanwhile, MacGillivray summoned an urgent meeting of the Executive Committee of the Provisional Council to debate the issue. The Committee unanimously agreed that both the Veterinary School and the University College, Dar es Salaam were of ‘paramount importance’ in the development of higher education in East Africa. Dar es Salaam was not satisfied with this agreement and so the problem lingered on. The Provisional Council then asked the Rockefeller Foundation to comment on the on-going war of words between different constituencies in East Africa and to state whether there was any competition between the two regional institutions.

The Rockefeller Foundation in its statement allayed Dar es Salaam’s fears by stating that as far as the Foundation was concerned there was no cause for alarm because to the best of its knowledge, the Veterinary School and Dar es Salaam were not in competition for funds. The statement argued that the Foundation considered requests on the basis of their merits and their relationship to the organisation’s policies. For these reasons, therefore, there was no way the two projects would compete against each other. The statement by the Rockefeller Foundation was followed by further deliberations between the regional governments. In January 1962,
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all three East African governments eventually agreed to accept the $500,000 donation to the University’s Veterinary School. At last the problem was resolved but it had already left an indelible mark on the inter-territorial relationship between the two institutions.

There was obvious tension in the actions of the University College, Dar es Salaam and the Tanganyika government between promoting regional and national interests. On the one hand, Dar es Salaam called for a more centralised and coordinated process of University planning. On the other hand it simultaneously pursued every possibility of securing financial aid for its own development. These were parallel approaches.

Furthermore, in 1961, the Tanganyika government took a decision to up-stage Makerere by opening a medical school at the former Medical Training Center in Dar es Salaam where students with school certificate (obtained after four years at secondary level) would be admitted. This appeared as duplication of educational facilities but because Tanganyika stood to benefit most from the Federal University and was anxious not to threaten it, the Tanganyika government proposed that these rural practitioners should receive diplomas rather than degrees and should be licensed as Assistant Medical Officers. Nationalism and federalism were in tension in independent Tanganyika.

When Uganda achieved her political independence in 1962, the adversarial nature of nationalism became more evident. National interests and regional interests regarding the development of higher education in the region clashed significantly thus putting the life of the University in jeopardy. As discussed in Chapter 5, Minister for Education, Dr Luyimbazi-Zake vehemently challenged the recommendations of the Nicol Report of 1962, regarding parity between the three East African colleges. He argued that such recommendations were ‘unreasonable’ because they supported the development of higher education in Kenya and Tanganyika while delaying the development of Makerere.

The Central Office of the UEA drew up a draft Development Plan for the triennium 1964-1967. The Plan was ready for discussion by March 1963 but nationalist sentiments made it impossible to take the Plan to the next stage. De Bunsen opined: “... I am glad that other colleges are springing up in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam which will prevent us dreaming of a colossus, taking in the whole of Wandegeya or offering to buy out Kampala.” The general feeling at Makerere University College and in the Uganda government was that the expansion of the University Colleges in Kenya and Tanganyika was uneconomical because the facilities already existing at Makerere were not fully utilized. The other two University Colleges argued that this expansion was necessary because it would ensure that Uganda did not remain the only territory with higher educational facilities in the region. Makerere’s hostility towards the University Development Plan was fully endorsed by President Obote’s government, which stated that it could not accept it as a suitable basis for the development of higher education in East Africa because it was not in the interest of Uganda to compromise her development in higher education for the sake of Kenya and Tanganyika.


By the first half of 1963 there was already a duplication of educational facilities in East Africa. This development caused tensions at the East-Africa Central Legislative Assembly and became one of the focal points during the sitting of the Assembly. Semei Nyanzi, one of the Members of the Assembly, expressed his dissatisfaction about the establishment of many faculties by the University Colleges despite the initial agreement that each University College would specialise in either one or two faculties. Yet, Nyanzi was one of the advocates of the view that the idea of having a single University in East Africa was not a good one. He reminded the House that those who had supported the formation of the federal University pointed out that in the long run it was not necessary to have only one University in East Africa. He buttressed his view by citing India as an example of a country with many universities and added: “You find this kind of situation prevailing in many other African countries as well.”

Chief Fundikira from Tanganyika agreed with Nyanzi that specialization had been approved by the Central Legislative Assembly and by the Provisional Council of the UEA from the outset. He continued to say that it was also agreed that there should be developed at the three colleges what would be called basic faculties, such as sciences and arts. It was also the intention that the two colleges, the newer ones, should develop these basic faculties as quickly as possible, so that there would be a rough parity regarding these faculties at the three colleges because “the needs of the peoples of East Africa with regard to these basic faculties could not be met by Makerere alone.”

Sheikh Almoody’s contribution to the same debate was that the criteria that was supposed to guide the Central Legislative Assembly when deliberating on this matter was that while it was desirable that full use be made of the already existing educational facilities in the various East African constituent colleges “the ultimate objective should be that these territories should be self-sufficient in higher education. I think this is very important on our educational evolution.”

These debates demonstrate that by this time the idea of a Federal University was already being subjected to serious scrutiny. When the University was inaugurated in June 1963 the spirit of nationalism had already cast a cloud on it. The colorful inauguration ceremony in Nairobi gave the impression that all the constituencies embraced the idea of having such a University. However, it was already a fore-gone conclusion that the spirit of nationalism and independence would eventually terminate the life of this University. In June 1963, Njoroge Mungai became Kenya’s Health Minister and reversed existing policies almost overnight. Without consulting the University, he sought the assistance of the World Health Organization (WHO) to open an undergraduate Medical School at Nairobi during 1966. Kenya’s move put pressure on Ugandan politicians, the majority of whom were already demonstrating uneasiness about the continued existence of the UEA. Uganda proposed to expand Makerere’s intake to ninety medical students per year as a charge on general University fund. Kenya and Tanganyika refused to make any contribution to the fund. Kenya proposed that the additional students should be sent to Nairobi to do their clinical training. Some of them did so during the 1965/66 academic year. Mungai managed to secure funds and identified staff for his new Medical School. President Kenyatta
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made a public announcement that the School would officially open in 1967. This “sounded the death knell of the University as an institution of planning.”

Ugandan politicians continued demonstrating their nationalist sentiments. Sir Bernard de Bunsen in his letter to the East African Heads of States in July 1963 reported that the University Council had accepted the third draft of the University Development Plan for 1964-1967 and stated that the issue of the University Development Plan was now being referred to the Heads of States for their immediate comments. De Bunsen drew the attention of the three East African leaders to the fact that the Como Conference initially scheduled for August 11th had to be postponed because there had been no agreed policy between the three governments regarding the University Development Plan. He concluded his letter by stating that since the major organisations had already indicated that such a conference could only be successful on the basis of a Development Plan agreed with the three East African governments, the urgency for an East African settlement would be appreciated and East Africans would be grateful if this settlement could be reached at the meeting of heads of Governments on the 9th of August.

The meeting of the Heads of States scheduled for 9 August 1963 was postponed due to President Obote’s reluctance to attend. It was agreed that the meeting between the Ministers of Education from the three territories and the Principals of the three University Colleges would proceed as planned on 8 August 1963. However, “this time it was the Ugandan Minister of Education, Dr Zake, who was ‘unable’ to attend, and the meeting had to be carried on without him; indeed it seems that Dr Zake was playing ‘follow my leader’.” The Ministers of Education from Kenya and Tanganyika at their August meeting amended the concept of parity in an effort to appease Makerere University College and the Uganda government. They agreed that the University Development Plan would be based on the “necessity to produce viable faculties at the Royal College, Nairobi, and the University College, Dar es Salaam, which will enable them to teach to a comparable standard and range as that at Makerere.”

The Heads of States eventually met on 16 August 1963 where President Obote informed his two counterparts from Kenya and Tanganyika that the removal of the iniquitous parity was sufficient to ensure Makerere and the Uganda government’s full participation in the University of East Africa. Thereafter, it was pointed out in the University Development Committee Meeting held in Nairobi on 26 August 1963 that the University Development Plan had been substantially revised in response to the concerns raised by the Uganda government and Makerere University College. Reference to the achievement of ‘parity’ “had been replaced by the more modest aim of ensuring the viability of the common faculties in the Colleges in Kenya and Tanganyika, and it was difficult to make further concessions without destroying the concept of an East African University with three constituent Colleges.” The storm temporarily calmed down but inter-territorial tensions were far from over.
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The above tensions demonstrated that any attempt to forge inter-territorial unity in East Africa at this time was bound to fail due mainly to the spirit of nationalism and independence. This spirit of nationalism had adverse effects on different spheres of life. Nathan Mnjama writes: “It has even been argued that the collapse of Regional co-operation in East Africa began soon after Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika gained independence.”35 In 1964, Ernst Haas and Philippe Schmitter wrote an article on political integration in Latin America. In their comment on the East African experience they observed: “Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika have been united in a common market for 37 years and have maintained a Common Services Organization for a number of costly and important administrative functions for almost as long; yet there is evidence of political disintegration in their relations since they achieved independence.”36

The establishment of the UEA at a time when the three East African countries were getting their political independence from Britain predetermined the fate of the Federal University. Political independence consolidated territorial nationalism, which had already been part of East African politics. At the core of this type of nationalism were national interests, which overwhelmed both continental and regional interests. Some individuals within each of the three territories expressed their uneasiness about continued inter-territorial co-operation. Inevitably, tensions emerged as each territory tried to push its national agenda. Therefore, a war of words characterised the period from 1961 to 1963. However, the tensions derived from nationalism were to become more pronounced during the first triennium period of the University of East Africa which began in 1964.

_Independence and the University of East Africa, 1964-1967_

East African constituencies were acutely aware of the inherent problems in setting up a Federal University at a time when the region was simultaneously establishing national governments. A commentary in the _East Africa Journal_ in 1964 stated that the newly established University of East Africa was unique in Africa in the sense that it was federal, comprising three autonomous University Colleges each located in an independent country. The commentary continued: “But this unique nature of the University creates many problems that do not confront other universities. National aspirations have to be reconciled with the interests of the whole University, and all the numerous problems which normally characterize any federal set-up – devolution of power, bureaucracy, high cost – are trebled because of the international feature of the federation.”37

President Obote tacitly conceded that any attempt to unite East Africa after independence was wishful thinking when he argued: “our problems are different … Our political structure [in Uganda] is completely different to the political structures of Kenya and Tanganyika.”38 Two months later, Pratt echoed this view, arguing: “East Africa is not a unitary state. Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic are each vigorous and independent states whose national plans and ambitions properly include higher education.”39 Arthur Porter in his Memorandum of 1965 stated that world opinion hailed the UEA as “a most imaginative experiment in educational federation across national frontiers.” He continued: “But it must not be forgotten that planning
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for higher education co-operatively by independent countries is new and untried. There are no precedents or examples to draw upon.” By this time it had become evident that “the vested interests in sovereignty had – as Nyerere feared they would – become entrenched.”

The first triennium period of the UEA was characterised by inter-territorial tensions. Each of the three national governments pursued its national agenda and showed disregard for regional plans concerning the development of higher education. One of the many areas in which nationalist sentiments played themselves out was with regard to staffing the inter-territorial constituent colleges. Kenya, similar to Tanganyika, demonstrated the same nationalist sentiments with regard to staffing. Ogot in his autobiography discusses how national consciousness impacted upon University College, Nairobi. He recalls that authorities at University College, Nairobi approached him in January 1964, soon after Kenya’s independence celebrations on 12 December 1963, asking him to seriously consider the possibility of transferring from Makerere University College to University College, Nairobi, just like Tanganyika’s politicians had approached Chagula whose case was discussed earlier. Ogot recalls that when he decided to move to the University College of Nairobi in 1964, he was moving to a College that had been driven from its very inception by territorial ambitions. He remembers that there was political pressure on Kenyan lecturers working at Makerere to come home to build ‘their’ university. First to move was Dr S.H. Ominde, who applied for the post of Professor of Geography and was appointed to the Chair of Geography in 1964, thus becoming the first African Professor at the University of Nairobi.

The University Development Committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, de Bunsen; the three Ministers of Education from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania; the three College Principals; three members nominated by the Senate; the Honorary Treasurer of the University; and the University Registrar who served as Secretary, was tasked to coordinate development plans of all three constituent colleges of the University of East Africa. Ogot has sad memories about the University Development Committee and blames nationalism and independence for the frustrations the Committee was subjected to after diligently executing its duties. He recalls that in theory, this was a high-powered committee that had heavy responsibilities thrust upon it by the three East African States. In reality, this was a thankless task because the East African governments “ignored the University Development plan that had been painfully worked out.” Makerere wanted to expand its medical training facilities, while Nairobi decided to start a new Medical School. It became clear that whilst the University had acted as a brake upon development at Makerere, it had been powerless to restrain duplication of professional facilities.

Nationalism and independence sabotaged the University Development Plan in many ways. Initially, it had been agreed that only the University College, Dar es Salaam would offer law courses and that only Makerere University College would offer courses in Agriculture on a regional basis. But Kenya started a School of Law in Nairobi and an Agricultural College in Egerton while Tanzania developed an Agricultural College at Morogoro and a Medical Training School in Dar es Salaam. Uganda sought to raise the standard of education in Engineering at
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Kyambogo Technical College to university level despite the fact that such educational facilities were already available in Nairobi.\footnote{There were certain instances where the duplication of educational facilities by different territories was implemented on pragmatic grounds. For example, some students from Tanzania did not meet the requirements set by the University of East Africa. Tanzania felt justified to train these students for lower level positions at local institutions. But this was only an exceptional case; overall, duplication was inspired by national interests.}

Ogot attributes the accelerated tendency towards the duplication of professional facilities to the growing desire on the part of the East African governments to have their own national universities. In his view, the motivating factor behind all this was the growing realisation that university programmes had to be related to national needs, which differed from country to country.

Chapter 5 of this book demonstrated that inequality between the three East African Colleges did not augur well for the overall development of higher education in that region. Nationalist sentiments widened the gulf between the three constituent colleges and sustained the already existing inequalities. For example, Uganda was better resourced and thus planned to proceed with her plans to develop Makerere into a fully-fledged university regardless of whether Kenya and Tanganyika would manage to establish theirs. During the first triennium of the University, de Bunsen prepared a Memorandum, which he circulated to the Constituent Colleges and the three national governments in November 1964 so that it would be discussed at the next University Council meeting in March 1965. In that Memorandum de Bunsen asked the institutions:

(a) whether they thought the powers of the University should be strengthened or modified; and

(b) how long they thought the University should continue.\footnote{Bernard de Bunsen, Memorandum on the basis of future development planning, Presented to the First Meeting of the University’s Planning Commission, 4 November 1964. UON Archives, UEA. PUEA/1A/49.}

The governments and the colleges in Kenya and Tanzania indicated that they were in favor of continued co-operation in higher education post-1967. They proposed that the University should be strengthened instead of being dissolved. Makerere University College wished to see planning powers transferred to the colleges so that the University could only award degrees and maintain academic standards. There was no immediate response from the Uganda government and this put the University planning process in the state of paralysis. Donors showed their reluctance to commit themselves to continued financial support to the University whose future hung in the balance.

During the next meeting of the University Council held in Nairobi on 20 May 1965, Dr Luyimbazi-Zake presented a Memorandum stating that the UEA had up to that time worked to the disadvantage of Makerere by retarding the College’s development while promoting development at the other two colleges. The Memorandum continued: “we cannot avoid the fact that each of the three constituent colleges of the University will have to be an autonomous University on its own sooner or later.”\footnote{J.S.L. Zake, Uganda Government: Views on the Future of the University of East Africa, Memorandum laid before the University Council, 20 May 1965, UON Archives, UEA. PUEA/1A/49.} Dr Luyimbazi-Zake buttressed this submission by arguing that there was a vast difference on the needs and the priorities of the three territories. He then intimated that any attempt by the University to veto governmental projects would
interfere in the independent development of the territorial government concerned and that this would be tantamount to a limitation of political sovereignty of the respective countries. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake reminded those who argued that the University should be sustained mainly for political reasons that the basic function of any university was to serve the community in which it belonged, and that in the East African case that community was the nation state. In his view, if the University failed to meet the needs of East Africa, which comprised its immediate community, then there was no reason to sustain its life. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake summarised his views, stating that he considered it highly desirable that each country should be free to develop its own programme according to the desires and aspirations of its own people. For him, it was entirely wrong to leave the powers of determining the country’s development to some agency like the Development Committee of the University Council over which that country had no complete control. He concluded: “In effect I suggest that each country should be free to devise the machinery for training its manpower in the way it chooses and at the rate it likes.” He then proposed that the University of East Africa should dissolve so that each country could be free to train its manpower needs in the way it thought best, openly and without hindrance or fears of stepping on anybody’s toe.

Eliufoo’s rejoinder to this Memorandum stated that the Tanzanian government was totally opposed to the proposal to dissolve the Federal University but would not block the withdrawal of Makerere University College if that was what the Uganda government had resolved to do. However, Eliufoo argued that the problem with Dr Luyimbazi-Zake’s proposal was that Makerere University College had for a very long time benefited significantly from regional funds. He reminded Dr Luyimbazi-Zake that Makerere University College had received funding from the British government on the understanding that the University College was a regional institution. Therefore, argued Eliufoo, by nationalising Makerere University College the Uganda government was seeking unilaterally to seize some four million sterling pounds of capital belonging to East Africa as a region. He reminded his audience that over £260,000 had been paid by the Tanzanian Government to Makerere College and that the Tanzanian Government expected that the Uganda Government would recognise that she was obliged to propose a settlement in compensation for the proposed seizure.

Eliufoo confirmed Tanzania’s resolution that the University should continue. Mr Mutiso, the representative of Kenya’s Minister of Education did the same on behalf of the Kenya government, adding that “the University of East Africa was the only one aspect of inter-territorial co-operation and if any radical change was proposed, Kenya would reserve the right to view such a proposal in relation to other East African links.” Mr Gichuru, one of Kenya’s representatives in the University Council, maintained that should dissolution be implemented, that would be very unfortunate because progress lay in development not in dissolution. Kenya’s overall position was that the question of the University could not be considered in isolation, arguing that if the University were to be dissolved, the EACSO would have to be dissolved too. It was only Dr
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Luyimbazi-Zake who did not confirm Uganda’s position, stating that he preferred not to make any judgment on this issue because his Head of State had the matter in his hand.

As the University Council meeting continued, Chagula and Lule from the University College, Dar es Salaam and Makerere, respectively, concurred with each other that the Council had to be flexible and listen to the concerns of other parties which did not seem to embrace the idea of sustaining the life of the University. Porter from Nairobi expressed his disappointment about Uganda’s failure to make her position known, arguing that unless Uganda came out of the cocoon, rumor would feed on rumor. After the issue had been exhausted, the University Council made three recommendations directed to the three Heads of States and Governments:

(a) that while it was recognised that, ultimately, there would probably be three independent universities in the East African countries, the University of East Africa should continue in existence beyond 1967, but that there be an immediate review of its academic and planning functions, with the object of effecting modifications for their continuing operations;

(b) that the immediate review should be conducted by a Working Party, to be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Council plus a representative of each Government; and

(c) that the Report of the Working Party should come to the University Council.50

Here, again, Dr Luyimbazi-Zake dissented, stating that the Uganda government was not bound by this resolution and that it reserved its position, especially in view of the fact that this matter was already being discussed by the three Heads of States and Governments. Southall writes: “Thus at the end of the meeting the position was substantially the same; the future of the University was undecided and the matter lay with the heads of government. Even so, the omens were good, for many had predicted the announcement of Uganda’s withdrawal.”51 Until the final decision was made on this issue, the administrators at the University could do nothing in terms of planning.

De Bunsen’s comments about the actions of the Uganda government give the impression that Ugandan politicians used a secret weapon to ambush the University so that they could then upgrade Makerere into a fully-fledged university. De Bunsen argued that Kenya and Tanzania had made their positions clear that they wanted the University to continue past the first triennium. Uganda’s delaying tactics and indecision were freezing potential financial assistance to the Federal University on the other hand. In de Bunsen’s view, this made staffing increasingly difficult; the University could not employ new staff not knowing whether there would be funds to pay their salaries and whether the University would be there in the first place. De Bunsen, addressing students at a seminar held in Kampala, stated that there had been much speculation on whether Uganda wished to withdraw Makerere from the University in 1967 and subsequently set up her university independent of Kenya and Tanzania. He regretted that conflicting statements were coming from different sources yet no official statement was forthcoming from the Uganda government. De Bunsen pleaded with all three Heads of States
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and Governments to consider all factors and make their final decisions urgently because “no one is going to give money if there is uncertainty as to whether the body to which they are going to give it will be alive in two years time.”

The question of the UEA was debated at length in Uganda’s National Assembly on 5 and 6 July 1965. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake during his contribution to the discussion argued that the anticipated split of the regional University was practical, constructive and progressive. He expounded his view by arguing that there was as much a need to expand educational facilities in East Africa as there was a need to maintain the quality of education offered in the region. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake announced that his Education Ministry had drawn up plans to change the entire educational system in Uganda from primary level upwards. Commenting on the accusation leveled against the Uganda government for its indecision, he argued that the accusation was unfair and that it was based on incorrect information. He then referred to a paper he had prepared in March 1965 in which he outlined the sequence of events that had led to Uganda’s dissatisfaction about the University. One such dissatisfaction was that the structure of the University of East Africa was weak. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake launched a scathing attack on de Bunsen, saying that he was not telling the truth when he said Uganda was undecided about the future of the University, “unless of course we are to be led to the conclusion that to disagree with the Vice-Chancellor is to be undecided.” Dr Luyimbazi-Zake told the House that he had made it clear to his counterparts in Kenya and Tanganyika that it would be in the interest of each of the three East African countries to have independent universities instead of sustaining the life of a Federal University when it was already evident that sooner or later each territory would need its national university.

E.M.K. Mulira, a Member of Uganda National Assembly, supported Dr Luyimbazi-Zake’s position, and argues: “Therefore, when the Minister proposed to have three universities I am with him in this, in any case, as he told us, they had already agreed that in future there would be three universities.”

The Uganda government was only able to make its position known in November 1965. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake made confirmation to the University administration that the Uganda government was committed to the University’s continued existence at least until mid-1970 when the second triennium would come to an end. There were speculations about what would happen after the end of the second triennium. However, Southall opines: “Although there had been no official acknowledgement that Uganda would pull Makerere out of the federal University in 1970, it was widely accepted that this would be the case. Naturally, the other two countries thus started thinking in terms of nationalising their own colleges.” Uganda’s indecision had already inspired certain individuals in Kenya and Tanganyika to call for the nationalisation of the University Colleges. Kenya in her Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 affirmed that national needs would determine the expansion of higher education in the Republic, stating that the plans for
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Nairobi University College “must be fully integrated with the Government Development Plan if the University College is to contribute effectively in solving our manpower problem.”

Another area where nationalist sentiments manifested was with regard to overseas education. As mentioned in Chapter 5, Uganda seemed to be too generous with her bright students, sending them to institutions abroad under the pretext that donors insisted on having such students and ignoring the fact that Kenya and Tanzania were also sponsored in part by overseas institutions but ensured that they kept most of their students in one of the three East African University Colleges as per mutual agreement. Uganda said one thing and did the other. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake argued that the Uganda government was determined to recall Ugandan students from abroad to enroll in the UEA instead of staying abroad to do courses that were available locally. In practice, not only did the Uganda government send its best students abroad against the wishes of Kenya and Tanganyika, it also admitted the country’s other best engineering students to its Technical College for courses leading to a Diploma in Engineering. This was in contravention of the regional agreement stipulating that no institution in East Africa would register students who qualified to join one of the three constituent colleges of the University of East Africa. When confronted by Kenya and Tanzania to explain this action, Ugandan authorities argued that they did not want to start the College with poor candidates because that would set a wrong precedent and keep the academic standards at the Technical College low. Another Ugandan assertion was that the students themselves indicated that they wanted to focus on the practical side of their professional training.

What was clear at this time was that Uganda put her national interests before those of the region. The University’s Academic Board and the Executive Committee of the Senate conceded that East African students needed overseas experience but maintained that this had to be considered at postgraduate level, not at undergraduate level as Uganda was doing. Even at postgraduate level, the Academic Board intimated to the Senate that in fields such as Agriculture and Tropical Medicine, “useful and meaningful postgraduate research can and should be done in East Africa.” The conference on the role of the UEA, referred to earlier, argued: “Where facilities are available or can be developed in East Africa, our students should be trained initially within our borders.”

It is clear from the discussion in this section that the first triennium of the University of East Africa was characterized by more inter-territorial tensions caused by nationalism and independence. These tensions continued during the second triennium.

Independence and the University of East Africa, 1967-1970

National sentiments continued to haunt the University of East Africa during the second triennium period beginning late in 1967. In Uganda, the spirit of nationalism inspired politicians and scholars such as Dr Luyimbazi-Zake to strive for the dissolution of the UEA. Tanzania on the other hand resolved to address national issues while at the same time striving to sustain the life of the University from which she stood to benefit. The University College, Dar es Salaam opened...
the faculties of Medicine and Agriculture in 1968 and 1969 respectively by incorporating the old Dar es Salaam School of Medicine and Morogoro Agricultural College. But because the Tanzanian government had not yet given up hope that the life of the Federal University could still be salvaged, it decided that students trained as rural practitioners should be given diplomas instead of degrees so that those who aspired to acquire degrees and satisfied the entrance requirements could still pursue their education at the Federal University. But by this time it was already a given that the University would not last long. When Stoddard’s Working Party conducted their investigation in 1968, Chagula submitted a statement, intimating that no rigid arrangement could be made to compel three independent universities and countries to follow comparable or unified standards in regard to any of the items listed in the Terms of Reference. In his view, co-operation among the universities through their own Association had to lead to the maintenance of a common approach in those things where such approach was to their common benefit. Where divergence was necessary, universities had to be free to adopt different policies and to explain these differences to their fellow partners in the association.60

The Report of the Stoddard Working Party studied the nature of the relationship between the three constituent colleges of the UEA and argued that there comes a time in academic affairs when separation is desired, preferred and promoted than unification. This feeling led the Working Party to the conclusion that there was no reason to sustain the life of the University after the end of the second triennium, a view that was later confirmed by the East African Authority. For commentators like Edward Mhina from Tanzania the decision to dissolve the University was taken on pragmatic grounds. He argued: “Now that each of the three East African university colleges is able to offer most of the wide range of degree subjects required in modern East Africa, it is expected that they will become separate national universities in 1970.”61 This trajectory confirmed a Memorandum submitted to the Working Party of 1968 by Mr R.B. Ntshekanabo from Uganda’s Ministry of Public Service in which he anticipated that expansion of education in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika would lead to each state establishing its university.62

The question may be phrased as follows: Why did the achievement of political independence by the East African territories spell the demise of the Federal University? There are two possible answers to this question. Firstly, the manpower requirements of each of the three East African independent states were not the same, due in part to the different policies adopted after independence. Secondly, the national university was perceived as being the pride of the independent nation. These reasons are explored below.

The national university and manpower requirements

The manpower requirements of each of the three East African governments played a significant role in the dissolution of the Federal University. East Africa needed trained manpower long before the 1960s but at the time the responsibility of training such manpower fell largely on
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the shoulders of the colonial authorities. The achievement of political independence shifted this responsibility to the African governments. This section demonstrates how different manpower needs of the independent East African territories predetermined the future of the Federal University.

Soon after independence, each of the three territorial governments resolved to engage in the systematic analysis of its individual manpower requirements as part of overall development planning so that it could relate its educational planning to the national manpower needs. Each state had its own political and development aspirations and thus chose a different development policy. Tanzania adopted *ujamaa* or village-based African socialism; Uganda later moved towards the same direction of centralized planning, although not as vigorously as Tanzania; Kenya on the other hand opted for a capitalist approach to development. President Obote’s brand of socialism was “different from Tanzania’s unique kind, and at variance with Kenya’s less polarized ideological approach.” The implementation of these divergent policies revealed the differences that existed between the three territories. Ajayi, Goma and Johnson write: “In spite of common boundaries, utilities, and shared colonial legacy, internal pressures and policy orientations in each of the territories generated divergent developments which fractured the will for the concept of community.”

In 1965, President Kenyatta had argued that education in Kenya had to be forged into an instrument for the achievement of Kenya’s national policies. If the Kenyan government felt that it needed more doctors, engineers, or technicians, it would ensure that its educational policies at all levels were geared towards achieving this goal without being hindered by regional policies. Southall writes: “There can be no doubt that the Faculty at Makerere which was most envied by Kenya and Tanzania was that of Medicine. The provision of better health services was one of the most pressing needs recognized by the new African governments.” As mentioned in Chapter 5, Uganda proposed that entrance requirements be reduced so that she could send more students to the University so as to meet her manpower needs. Kenya and Tanganyika opposed the view on the grounds that it would lower University’s academic standards. This incident played its role in strengthening the case for the establishment of national universities.

In 1966, Tanzania took a decision to introduce compulsory National Service in an attempt to bridge the gap between the educated elite and the masses. The kind of manpower envisioned by President Nyerere’s government was one that would not be divorced from the society, a view premised on the socialist principles, which valued the community, not the individual within that community. The students did not like the idea and subsequently decided to go on strike, a decision that resulted to the dismissal of over 300 students from the University College, Dar es Salaam on 22 October 1966. From that date, “the University College, Dar es Salaam, started re-examining itself critically” so that it could be ready to provide a labor force that would suit a socialist state.
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Meanwhile, the Tanzanian government worked relentlessly drawing up its new national policies that would also guide the University College, Dar es Salaam in its operation. President Nyerere published two documents during the first quarter of 1967: the Arusha Declaration in February and a policy paper entitled Education for Self-Reliance in the following month. The Tanzanian government organised a Conference on the Role of the University College, Dar es Salaam, in a Socialist Tanzania, which was held in Dar es Salaam from 11 to 13 March 1967. Rashidi M. Kawawa, Second Vice-President, in his speech stated: “Since this Conference was first planned its task has been made easier by two important developments. The first is the Arusha Declaration, which gave a clear definition of socialism for Tanzania, and outlined some of the policies which will be followed in order to build this kind of society. The second is the policy paper on education which has been published by the President this past week. This calls for a new direction, and new emphasis in the education system of our country.”

The Final Plenary Session of the Conference resolved thus:

(i) The conference recommends that it is the responsibility of the college to impart political education, and that a course in political education which would be compulsory for Tanzanians and optional for non-Tanzanians should be started by the college;

(ii) In the course on political education, the emphasis should be on the teaching of Tanzanian socialism as seen against the African and international background. The course should be both theoretical and practical so that it could be linked with social and community service on the part of the students; and

(iii) In addition the conference recommends that the course on political theory and history etc. should place emphasis on Tanzanian and East African philosophy and history.

Tanzania’s educational policies acknowledged the fact that Kenya and Uganda were sovereign states. Students from Kenya and Uganda would not be compelled to take courses in political education. While students from outside Tanzania chose their courses at will, those from within Tanzania were compelled by the state to do political education. The corollary thereof was that students studying at the same University College were subjected to different rules. Gradually, this situation put into question the very notion of a Federal University. There was a realisation that the establishment of national universities would allow different countries to train their students to study what national governments considered relevant to their national policies.

The political environments in which each of the three colleges was placed and the varying roles which the three governments laid down for a university in society made any co-operation within a Federal University increasingly difficult. For example, not all the recommendations of the Dar es Salaam Conference could be implemented at once given the inter-territoriality of the University of East Africa. Chagula expressed his view thus: “A number of the recommendations made at the conference require simple administrative action within the College and others
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will require the decisions of either the Academic Board and the College Council or both the Academic Board and the College Council. 72 He noted that others, if it was desirable that they should be pursued further, would require the approval of the Senate of the University of East Africa and the Council of the University of East Africa before they could be implemented.

President Nyerere argued in his policy paper that education “must encourage the growth of the socialist values we aspire to.” 73 He intimated that education must encourage the development of a proud, independent, and free citizenry which relies upon itself for its own development and that it “must ensure that the educated know themselves to be an integral part of the nation and recognize the responsibility to give greater service the greater opportunities they have had.” 74 President Nyerere’s vision about the role of education was not universal; it only applied to the socialist state Tanzania had become. Kenya and Uganda had their own plans.

Sir James Cook, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Africa, noted in his introductory address to the conference on the UEA held in Nairobi in October 1967 that the first triennium of the University was already witnessing some duplication of professional schools such as medicine and agriculture because the manpower needs of each country could no longer be satisfied by conventional agreements made by the three territories prior to independence. President Nyerere in one of his addresses asked: “What kind of society do we want to create? What can we realistically expect to achieve with our limited resources? How can we fashion our education system so as to maximize its contribution to these ends? Whom shall we educate, for what and how?” 75

The UEA could not respond to all the needs of each country. Although all three territories were the custodians of the University, they felt that national universities would be in closer touch with national aspirations than the Federal University. This new spirit of nationalism put the life of the University in danger and played a pivotal role in the University’s eventual collapse.

The seminar on the role of the University referred to earlier resolved that whether a country gave loans or grants to its prospective university students “depended very much on the social philosophy in that particular country,” 76 thus conceding that national needs between the three East African countries were different. The same line of thought was sustained with regard to recruiting the expatriate staff. The seminar maintained: “Whatever is done to improve the selection, the details concerning the orientation courses should be worked out by each individual East African country.” 77

Eliufoo’s statement to the conference noted that Tanzania was following an established and clearly stated policy of achieving self-sufficiency in high-level manpower by 1980. He added: “We are acting on this policy by regulating the numbers of those to whom opportunities for higher education are given in accordance with calculated manpower targets … So far as the University of East Africa is concerned, we shall offer bursaries, to as many of our students in
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each faculty or department as are necessary to enable us to achieve our manpower targets.”78 Tanzania’s manpower needs were not necessarily Uganda and/or Kenya’s needs. In cases where the needs were similar between countries, there were differences in terms of the number of students needed for certain positions. As the University failed to satisfy the needs of the national government, the latter established its own educational facilities. Eliufoo stated that in accordance with the view above, his Government had come to the conclusion that a medical faculty should be established at the University College at Dar es Salaam, “because only in that way can the country hope to achieve its national goals in the field of public health.”79 In the same vein, the introduction of degree courses in agriculture was seen as a clear necessity, in view of the preponderance of agriculture in the economy.

While acknowledging the fact that government involvement in overall university planning could interfere with the university’s autonomy and the students’ independence to choose the subjects to be studied, Eliufoo argued that in more recent times, “universities the world over have been asked to accept ever greater responsibilities for the execution of government policies.”80 His argument was in line with the decision of the conference that the University of East Africa should play an administrative role, leaving the drawing up of educational policies in the hands of each national government. As the three East African territories drew up and implemented their individual national policies, the UEA became dispensable. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake in his address maintained that Ugandans had been responsible for the development of Makerere University College and expected the College to respond to the needs of Uganda, as University College, Nairobi, and University College, Dar es Salaam had to respond to their own respective needs. In his view, national governments looked to the University of East Africa to conduct relevant researches either on their own or in company with Government officers in the appropriate sectors in the economic and social fields.81

Chagula analysed the definition of ‘university autonomy’ given by the Administrative Board of the International Association of Universities in Tokyo during its meeting in September 1965 and argued that certain elements of the definition were not applicable in the East African situation. In his view, the idea that ‘The university should be responsible for the selection of its own students’ lacked universal application and did not suit the East African situation where “well over ninety percent of the students admitted into the University of East Africa are state sponsored.”82 When the Working Party on Higher Education presented its Report in January 1969, it stated: “Each national Government is implementing plans to meet economic and social needs. The university, as the major source of the manpower required to implement and fulfil such programmes, must respond to the aspirations of the country it serves and accordingly must work closely with the national Government to that end.”83 The University had to respond
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This section has demonstrated that the forces of nationalism and independence retarded the idea of a Federal University. The manpower requirements of the three independent national governments were different; these differences later necessitated the dissolution of the University so that each government could work closer with its national university in drawing up and implementing national policies. The overall assumption was that national universities administered locally would be closer to the people they were expected to serve and produce the kind of manpower that was urgently needed.

The national university as the pride of the nation

All African countries aspired to have national universities when they achieved political independence from metropolitan countries. This was because national universities, like national governments, were perceived to be the pride of the nation. Ogot and Welbourn argue that a national university is politically desirable because it is a symbol of status and a center of thought about national needs.84 One Report argued that in terms of world-wide example it is natural for a sovereign state, either as a whole or through its political individuals (e.g. the separate states in the United States of America) to maintain one or more publicly supported institutions of higher education. In like manner, “the history of developing nations bears witness to the power of this marriage between University and State.”85 Such beliefs inspired East African politicians to call for the dissolution of the regional University so that they could establish national universities.

Stoddard’s Working Party, listened to evidence given by Education Ministers from the three national governments in East Africa, the faculty from the constituent colleges of the UEA and their graduates and arrived at a unanimous conclusion that the desire to create autonomous universities in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania was both understandable and commendable because it would allow each state to plan its own education system without having to first convince the other two national governments about the significance of the idea being contemplated at the time. Ajayi, Goma and Johnson maintain that attempts to create regional universities serving a number of independent countries “generally failed as each country wished to have and control its own university, virtually as part of the symbols indicating sovereignty.”86

Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika were all custodians of the Federal University but the University was considered far removed from each state – including the Ugandan state where the University’s Head Offices were physically located. Independent East Africa was not a nation, but three putative separate nation-states each of which aspired to have a national university that would solely be under its control. Another reason for this determination by East African politicians to establish national universities is to encapsulate Paul Zeleza’s submission that education in general and universities in particular “constitute one of the most critical cultural
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institutions.” As independent states, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania wanted to promote their respective national cultures and looked to national universities to assist them in this regard.

Therefore, even if the UEA met the manpower requirements of each state, it would still have been impossible to convince East African constituencies, especially politicians, to denounce their call for the establishment of national universities. As argued above, the idea of a national university was deemed important not only because it produced the necessary manpower but also because it was perceived as the pride of the nation. President Nyerere, speaking during the Opening Ceremony at The University College, Dar es Salaam in 1961, argued: “An independent country depending on charity for all its higher educational opportunities is in great psychological danger.” President Nyerere alluded to the fact that having a national university that is run by policies drawn up locally provides a psychological relief in that if the policy fails, it can be modified without seeking approval from somewhere else. This trajectory contributed to the dissolution of the Federal University of East Africa.

Nationalism and independence confirmed

The fact that nationalism and independence were two of the key causal factors in the eventual demise of the UEA was given substance by the developments that took place when the University was dissolved in 1970. This section takes a very quick look at those developments.

The achievement of political independence by the East African territories between 1961 and 1963 marked the end of the first form of colonial domination. When the University of East Africa was established, it was anticipated that it would guarantee two forms of liberation: academic and economic. Its failure to address the national needs of the East African territories inspired different constituencies to call for its dissolution. Therefore, the establishment of the University of Dar es Salaam, the University of Nairobi and Makerere University on 1 July 1970 completed the independence of the three East African territories and marked the victory for nationalism.

Mkude and Cooksey in their article on Tanzania write: “In 1970, it was decided to dissolve the University of East Africa in order to allow each country to control and give shape to its own university in accordance with its national interests.” This submission is given substance by the fact that President Nyerere became the Chancellor of the University of Dar es Salaam while Presidents Kenyatta and Obote became the Chancellors of the national universities of Nairobi and Makerere respectively.

Hyder wrote: “Let us make 1970 not only the year of the birth of the University of Nairobi but the beginning of a dynamic decade of mutual understanding and identification between the University, the Government and the public in the promotion of national development.” The University of Nairobi was now expected to consider the aspirations of only one government, not three, as had been the case before. The Act that set up the University of Nairobi confined itself
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to national aspirations. In paragraph 5(1) of the Act the objects and functions of the University of Nairobi were stated as follows:

(a) to provide facilities for university education, including technological and professional education, and for research, either directly or through the medium of connected colleges, schools or institutes;

(b) to assist in the preservation, transmission and increase of knowledge and in the stimulation of the intellectual life and cultural development of Kenya;

(c) to conduct examination for, and to grant degrees, diplomas, certificates and other awards of the university;

(d) to co-operate with the Government in the planned development of higher education, in particular, to examine and approve proposals for new faculties, new departments, new degree courses, new subjects of study submitted to it by any constituent college or other post-secondary institution; and

(e) to determine who may teach and what may be taught and how it may be taught in the university.91

Dr Karanja, Principal of the University of Nairobi, in his dinner speech delivered at Kabete, Kenya, in August 1970, stated: “We now have our own independent national university and it is our responsibility to shape and plan its future, taking into account the needs of this country and the aspirations of its people.92 His government would henceforth focus on producing technical and professional manpower needed to promote and control all aspects of national development.

The relationship between the state and the university became evident in all three territories soon after the establishment of national universities. For example, the Uganda government moved some of its ‘trusted’ politicians to take new positions at Makerere University. President Obote was now the University’s Chancellor. Frank Kalimuzo, Secretary to the Cabinet, was appointed as the University’s Vice-Chancellor. President Obote announced that Kalimuzo had been ‘loaned’ to the new national University by the government. Yusuf Lule, who had served as Principal of the now defunct Makerere University College in Uganda, ‘would be called to serve somewhere else’. This political appointment did not go unnoticed. Hugh Dinwiddy recalled: “Without warning, Mr Lule had been replaced as Principal by Mr Kalimuzo, Permanent Secretary in President Obote’s Office, as Vice-Chancellor.”93 Uganda had achieved her political independence on 9 October 1962. 1 July 1970 marked the second date of independence of another kind and “signified the fact that Makerere would now be truly a Ugandan institution.”94 In a way, the two dates completed Uganda’s independence. Dr Luyimbazi-Zake was upbeat when Makerere eventually became a national university and did not hide the fact that the establishment of this national university reminded him of 9 October 1962 when Uganda became
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independent. He added that the date “marks an end to that protracted period of tutelage and a beginning of a new and significant era which is in keeping with the national status of an independent state.” Moreover, he concurred with the view that Makerere would now be ‘truly a Ugandan institution’ and concluded his speech by assuring Ugandans that everything had been done to ensure that Makerere University became a fully-fledged university. Parliament had already passed legislation for the implementation of all fundamental changes and the President had signed the Bill to give a new legal status and personality to Makerere.

According to Dr Luyimbazi-Zake, the new status given to the former University Colleges opened up new avenues of communication and interchange of ideas and experience. In his view, the time was opportune for the East African territories to guide their national universities towards the direction of their own choice.

Mamdani’s analysis of post-colonial Africa leads to the conclusion that independent African states found it inevitable to establish a working relationship between the state and the university. Mamdani espouses the view that the post-independence state implemented the demand for higher education not simply as a response to broad social pressures, but also out of the recognition that it would be difficult to effect the Africanisation of the civil service and the parastatal sector without having a pool of ‘trained’ cadres. He continues: “Seen as vital in fulfilling the manpower needs of the independent state, universities came to be considered a necessary ingredient in the developmental logic of the period.” The joy expressed by different East African constituencies when the national universities were formally established in July 1970 was in line with this general feeling that national universities were considered a significant part of the overall planning of the post-colonial state in Africa.

Conclusion

The thrust of the argument in this chapter is that nationalism and independence in East Africa played a profound role in the eventual collapse of the Federal University. The discussion above has demonstrated that while the rise of nationalism in Africa in general and in East Africa in particular united Africans against colonial domination territorial nationalism in the post-independence era caused a schism between different territories. The chronological analysis of inter-territorial tensions in East Africa demonstrates that all three territories played their role in the eventual collapse of the University of East Africa. However, as demonstrated above, Uganda was more instrumental in the demise of the University than Kenya and Tanzania. Part of the reason is that Makerere University College was at an advanced stage of development compared to the other two sister colleges. Secondly, President Obote and Dr Luyimbazi-Zake were supposed to convince Ugandans to support the Federal University. Instead, they were the ones who played a leading role in espousing the view that the University of East Africa was doing Uganda a disservice and therefore had to be dissolved.

The present chapter has demonstrated that the delaying tactics by President Obote and Dr Luyimbazi-Zake throughout 1965 were directly responsible for subsequent events that

---

95 *Uganda Argus*, 1 July 1970.

culminated to the eventual collapse of the UEA. Uganda’s indecision froze donor funds. By the time the Uganda government acquiesced in the decision to keep Makerere in the University during the second triennium period the damage had already been done. Even if Stoddard’s Working Party had recommended that the University should continue, it would have been almost impossible to stimulate the spirit of East African brotherhood after a long period of mud-slinging.

As shown above, the manpower requirements of each territory and the national economic policies were different. Above all, the national university was perceived as the pride of the nation. Thus, even if the three East African territories did not have different manpower requirements and did not pursue divergent economic policies, the fact that both national universities and national governments were considered to be the pride of the nation would have been enough to justify the dissolution of the University.

The Federal University of East Africa existed for only seven years (June 1963 to June 1970) and then collapsed. However, what is important about this institution is not that its life was ephemeral but the fact that it ever existed in the first place. Given the fact that the University was constituted at the same time that the three East African territories were already planning for their political liberation, it was a miracle that the university was established in the first place. After the Second World War the African leadership looked forward to ousting their colonial masters and setting up their own governments. Thus the narrow version of nationalism was bound to take center stage compared to regional nationalism. It is in this context that East Africans should be commended for having established the Federal University in the first place. The concluding chapter of this book explores the relevance of the present study in contemporary African politics.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Summary and conclusions: Learning from experience

Summary

This book has explored a list of factors that constituted the germ for the establishment of the Federal University of East Africa, as well as those that led to its subsequent demise only a few years later. The purpose of this present chapter is twofold. First, it provides a synthesis of the issues addressed in the preceding chapters regarding the political history of higher education in East Africa. Second, it demonstrates the significance of this study in the development of higher education in contemporary Africa.

As shown above, the development of higher education in East Africa has a long history. Although the Federal University of East Africa was only established in 1963, its very long history goes back to the inter-war period when a combination of factors (both endogenous and exogenous) necessitated the development of African education in the British colonies, including those in East Africa. The publication in March 1925 of the Report of the Ormsby-Gore Commission marked the beginning of the process of formulating a British policy on African education. In East Africa, this process started taking a clearer shape in the early 1930s following the conference of the Directors of Education held in Zanzibar in 1932 and the publication of the Currie Report on the development of higher education in Anglophone Africa in December 1933. The actual process of establishing the Federal University was then set in motion by the publication of the Report of the De la Warr Commission in 1937. Therefore, the year 1937 remains a significant signpost in the history of the development of higher education in East Africa.

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 cast the East African scenario into the broader framework of British imperial policy. Between 1940 and 1945, the development of higher education in East Africa was discussed concurrently with the development of higher education in the British territories in general as preparation for the post-war era. From 1946 to 1963 the inter-territorial University Colleges in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika developed as part of the Asquith scheme for higher education in the British Empire. But as shown in this book, by the early 1960s various East African constituencies had already embraced the idea of establishing a Federal University.

There are basically two overriding themes in this book. First, the establishment and subsequent dissolution of the Federal University of East Africa was caused mainly by political factors. Second, agency in the development of higher education in East Africa cannot be attributed to any single constituency; there were local and global causes. The British government, the colonial governments based in East Africa and East African constituencies all contributed to the establishment of the UEA. Each constituency had specific reasons for embracing the idea of a Federal University. Their actions were either preemptive or were responses to both local
and global political developments. The British government promoted the idea of a Federal University so as to quench the thirst for higher education among young East Africans and thus insulate them from possible political agitation to which they were likely to be exposed if they travelled abroad.

Therefore, to the British government the Federal University was a weapon to which it reverted in order to sustain British domination and hegemony while insulating the would-be graduates from Britain’s global political buffets. On the other hand, East African politicians, scholars and students, embraced the idea of a Federal University due in part to economic reasons, but mainly because of the belief that “success in forming the ‘federal’ university might encourage the political federation of the three countries which was envisaged at the time.” Therefore, to the British authorities the University was a guarantor of continued control over East Africa, while to the East Africans it was a sign of freedom. In both instances there was a political motivation for embracing the idea.

This study has demonstrated that the history of the UEA was characterised by tensions. Initially the British government was upbeat about the prospects of establishing a regional University for political reasons. Local Governors and Directors of Education in East Africa considered the possible negative impact of providing higher educational facilities to Africans and delayed the process of setting up the envisioned University. They were particularly concerned about the creation of an elite group that might be vocal on a wide range of issues regarding the welfare of East African people and possibly end up challenging their overall British authority. Cowan O’Connell and Scanlon summarise these tensions by stating that the colonial administrators were less enthusiastic about the founding of African universities than were the metropolitan educational commissions. The former were uneasy about finding funds for expensive institutions and most of them were skeptical that a university differed from theirs could be established. Lastly, “Many of them also were not enthusiastic about coping with multitudes of African graduates, who might cause them difficulties and would eventually claim their jobs.” It was at the insistence of the metropolitan government in London that these local authorities eventually acquiesced in the plan to establish the Federal University.

Another locus of the tensions was between British authorities and East African constituencies. Initially, young East Africans aspired to travel abroad in pursuit of their higher education while British Governors sought to confine them to East Africa and, in the case of Uganda, even denied them passports to travel abroad. British officials “consoled themselves with the thought that students would be less likely to pick up heady ideas at colonial universities than they would at the Sorbonne or the London School of Economics.” Where East African students were allowed to travel abroad they were directed to universities that were thought to be less likely to have a negative influence on them, such as Indian universities and the University of Fort Hare in South Africa.

97 There was a realisation that East African economies were weak and would not allow each territory to have a national university. There was consensus between the territories that a federal University could be used as a temporal solution; it would be dissolved once each territory was economically strong to stand on its own.
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What is evident in this book is that during the 1920s, establishing a Federal University was not the primary objective among East African constituencies such as the Young Baganda Association. Their immediate goal was to obtain higher education wherever it was available, including places like the Tuskegee Institute in the southern United States of America. But such institutions were deemed ‘dangerous’ by British authorities in London and in East Africa. During the 1960s, East African constituencies, particularly the political leadership, took a vanguard position in championing the cause for the establishment of the Federal University because they hoped that such an institution would accelerate and, later, consolidate their political independence from Britain by being a service institution to the newly established national governments.

Porter once argued: “Indeed, all education involves crises. From the simplest to the highest levels, education is a series of thresholds, a series of crises.” 101 The present study has demonstrated that higher education in East Africa was not immune to this reality. The University of East Africa had its own fair share of the problems, one of which was finding an identity for itself as an institution. As discussed in Chapter 4, the University of East Africa was a multi-faced institution that reflected both local and international features of a University. Some commentators argued that while it was necessary for the University to remain relevant to the local needs, it could not divorce itself from the international community. 102 Others took an essentialist position, insisting that as an independent institution the University of East Africa had to reflect an East African outlook lock, stock and barrel. They argued that this should be reflected in the student population, faculty, administrators, curriculum, syllabus, and teaching methods. In their view, an independent African University could not replicate Western conceptions of a university while ignoring the local reality obtaining in the African continent. Alex Kwapong, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana in his study of universities in developing countries of Africa noted that experience strongly confirms the view that adaptability and responsiveness to local needs can only be effectively undertaken by local people who understand local problems and context, who are sensitive to local pressures and who have, at the same time, the basic expertise and qualifications requisite for the solution of the particular problems in question. Outsiders “can only help, but the basic decisions, and their implementation, have to be undertaken by local experts.” 103

The same trajectory inspired different East African constituencies to embark on the Africanization project at the Federal University. Wilbert Chagula in his Foundation Lecture delivered in 1967 emphasised the need for the East African Africanisation of staff at the University of East Africa, adding that senior administrative staff who were East Africans had a responsibility to advise the expatriate staff on matters regarding the relationship between each constituent college and the national government as well as the general public. In his view, university autonomy and academic freedom were relative concepts that could not be applied to the University of East Africa blindly. Chagula argued that the University of East Africa needed local staff members who would consider the local situation in East Africa when applying these Western concepts.
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Furley and Watson write: “Dr Chagula was really warning that until the colleges were older, more familiar, and trusted, more East Africanised, some of the university freedoms accepted elsewhere, especially in the West, would have to take second place to government expectations and hopes regarding the role their colleges should play – and it would be true to say that all three colleges were aware of this fact."\textsuperscript{104}

But as argued in this book, ‘Africanisation’ and ‘localisation’ were discussed concurrently, thus leading to tensions between different constituencies as to which of the two should take precedence over the other. The persistent fear by some East African constituencies and expatriates that Africanisation would culminate in the decline of the revered academic standards in the constituent colleges contributed to the slow progress in Africanisation as discussed in Chapter 4.

Chapters 5 and 6 have demonstrated that it is difficult to provide a linear narrative about the history of higher education in East Africa and about the Federal University, whereby one part would show the rise and the other part show the fall. This is precisely because the walls started falling apart as they were being put together. Chapter 5 has demonstrated that while it cannot be repudiated that problems such as the increase in the student population hit the University late in its life, most of the problems were already intrinsic during the early stages and even when the University was inaugurated in 1963.

Chapter 6 has demonstrated that the spirit of nationalism and independence had a dual effect in East Africa, one positive, and the other negative. First, the independence euphoria that swept through East Africa between 1960 and 1963 united East Africa against British domination. East African constituencies argued that the Federal University should be established and that it should be put under the direct control of East Africans because they were more conversant with the needs of their region than the British. However, soon after the achievement of political independence, nationalism exposed the already latent inter-territorial tensions and jealousies in East Africa. The three territorial governments agitated for the establishment of national universities that would be run by local administrators who were deemed to have a better understanding of national needs. More importantly, the national university was perceived as the pride of an independent nation as much as the University of East Africa had been perceived as the pride of an independent East Africa.

It follows from this trajectory that although the establishment of the University of East Africa was justifiable on economic and political grounds, its fate was predetermined from the outset due to both natural and human factors. For example, when the University was instituted in 1963, the constituent colleges were based in three independent countries, each of which had its own national aspirations. Gradually this became unsettling and it was later felt that the fulfillment of these national aspirations depended largely on the establishment of a national university (-ies) in each territory.

When the University of Tanzania was officially inaugurated on 29 August 1970, President Nyerere, the University’s Chancellor, stated \textit{inter alia} that the University of Dar es Salaam “must
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be our University – relevant to the present and future society of Tanzania.” President Nyerere added that the University of Dar es Salaam had to perform its duties in the framework and for the purpose of serving the needs of Tanzania’s development towards socialism. As discussed in Chapter 6, Tanzania’s attempts to use the University College, Dar es Salaam for the promotion of its version of socialism contributed to the eventual dissolution of the Federal University. But once the University College in Tanzania became a national university the government could proceed with its plans to regularize the relationship between the Tanzanian state and the national university without thinking about how such an arrangement would affect Kenya and Uganda. The establishment of the University of East Africa had been hailed a giant stride in the promotion of regional integration in higher education in East Africa. The University’s dissolution in 1970 after years of muck-raking marked a new epoch in the development of higher education in that region and consolidated the changed focus from regional integration to regional co-operation between separate national universities that had already started in the late 1960s.

It is evident from this study that establishing and sustaining the University of East Africa was a difficult assignment, hence the decision to dissolve it in 1970. But even the dissolution of the University turned out to be a long drawn-out and a very complex process due in part to the same factors that had necessitated its dismemberment in the first place. For example, the three constituent colleges located in separate countries had been constituted under separate legislations:

(i) Makerere University College was operating under the provisions of the Makerere College Act of 1949 as amended by subsequent legislation in 1954, 1957, 1961, 1963 and 1964;

(ii) University College, Nairobi was governed by the Acts passed in 1963 and in 1964; and

(iii) the University College, Dar es Salaam was governed by an Act passed in 1963, amended in 1967.

All the above-mentioned Acts had been passed before the official inauguration of the first East African Community on 1 December 1967. Therefore the powers and obligations conferred by these Acts could neither be removed nor transferred by an Act of the National Assembly of each country; they needed joint legislation. Each National Assembly had to pass an Act establishing a national university. The Central Legislative Assembly would then pass its own Act dissolving the University College. Also, the same Act would transfer the University College’s assets and liabilities to the new national university. Most importantly, the University of East Africa had been established by the University of East Africa Act of 1962, passed by the now defunct East African Common Services Organization. For the University of East Africa to be officially dissolved the East African Community had to pass an Act repealing the one passed by EACSO in 1962. Stoddard’s Working Party of 1969 was mindful of the legal implications of the recommendation that the University of East Africa should be dissolved on 30 June 1970 and stated that such recommendation would require the repeal of the University of East Africa Act, 1962 by the East African Legislative Assembly. Concurrently with the legislation to dissolve


106 The first East African Community existed for ten years from 1967 to 1977. The current one was instituted in 2001.
the University there had to be legislation to establish the Inter-University Committee for East Africa and for the transfer to it of the residual powers and obligations of the University of East Africa. These were logistical requirements.

Inequality had been one of the vexing problems for the University of East Africa, as a result of which the spirit of regional co-operation in higher education in East Africa wore very thin. Vestiges of this problem became evident when the University was dissolved. The University of Dar es Salaam was still in the process of establishing itself and, therefore, could not afford to completely stand on its own. Educational resources at the University of Dar es Salaam were insufficient, forcing the Tanzanian government to insist that its students should still be allowed to travel to Makerere University and the University of Nairobi to join those professional departments not yet established in Tanzania. Furthermore, the Tanzanian government had not yet resolved the problem of compulsory National Service, a problem that did not affect Uganda and Kenya. Furley and Watson write: “The other two constituent colleges of the University at Nairobi and Makerere had much longer histories behind them. When the UEA broke up in 1970 they developed along lines already well laid down and broadly acceptable to academics, students and the public.”

Delivering a speech a few months after the dissolution of the Federal University, Mr Rashidi Kawawa, Tanzania’s Vice-President, conceded that the national University of Dar es Salaam was not ready yet to be completely independent. He expressed hope that there would be continued regional co-operation in the development of higher education in East Africa despite the demise of the regional University. Kawawa argued: “This change does not mean an end to co-operation between the institutions of higher education in East Africa. Co-operation between the three universities will continue, and in many matters we hope it will increase.” With these optimistic words he and the rest of East Africa bid the Federal University of East Africa farewell.

**The East African experience: Lessons for the future**

There are lessons to be learnt for the future by education policy makers in contemporary Africa from this East African experience with higher education. As the dictum asserts, those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. The fact that the Federal University of East Africa ever existed when similar attempts in West Africa were not successful, and the fact that the University was dissolved while a similar institution in the West Indies has survived to-date makes it a fascinating case study. As Africans embark on the revitalisation and reconfiguration of higher education in the continent, they have two possible options at their disposal: to use this experience as a source of reference and anticipate certain problems, or to ignore it altogether, to their own peril. In 1824, Leopold Von Ranke, the famous German historian, argued: “history has been assigned the office of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future ages.” The significance of this study is not only its historical context but also its

relevance to the current and future development of higher education in Africa. The reasons that led to the demise of the Federal University of East Africa have been identified. Some may still be insurmountable today as they were about four decades ago but others could be easily avoided by current education planners. East Africa as a region, South Africa as a country and Africa as a continent have a lot to learn from the East African experience.

Lessons for East Africa

East Africa is the first part of Africa that stands to benefit from its own experience with the development of higher education. In the 1960s, East African constituencies perceived the University of East Africa primarily as part of a regional integration project just like the East African Community but with specific emphasis on higher education. In 2001, East African politicians revived the East African Community. So, the question becomes: should the current East African leaders revive the University of East Africa as part of the regional integration project? Before deciding on this issue these leaders would have to study the history of the University of East Africa very closely and identify the factors that led to its demise. They would have to consider *inter alia*: the student population in East Africa today, the political will in each country to work together with others, the financial year of each national government and how that would affect the university calendar, the current manpower needs of each country, the question of the site and the distribution of faculty, administrative and support staff. As demonstrated in Chapters 5 and 6, these were contentious subjects that caused tensions within the University. The fact that the Federal University was not revived simultaneously with the new East African Community seems to be an acknowledgement of the fact that regional integration in higher education is more complex than economic integration.

If sustaining the federal University in the 1960s was problematic due in part to the increase in the student population, the situation would be worse today. For example, Kenya’s public universities cannot absorb all the qualifying candidates due to lack of space as well as teaching and learning facilities. A regional university would be unable to absorb the surplus number of students from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Also, tensions between regional and territorial (national) aspirations would emerge. In 1965, Dr. Luyimbazi-Zake argued that his Ugandan government was restructuring its education system from primary school to the tertiary level. This could not be accommodated in the regional educational plan. When the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government took the reigns in Kenya it announced that it would scrap the 8.4.4 education system. This change in policy was bound to necessitate major changes at all levels of education in Kenya, thus automatically ruling out any possibility of resuscitating the Federal University since educational changes in Kenya would not necessarily be replicated in Uganda or Tanzania. In 1967, Legum in his study on Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania argued that the future of East Africa depended to a very large extent on whether or not these countries could succeed in working together. He continued: "But if the pressures towards closer association are strong, so are the forces working in the opposite direction."

---

111 Under this system of education pupils spend a total of eight years at primary school, four years at high school and then proceed to the tertiary (university) level where they spend four more years before they get their first degree. To be sure, some degrees take longer to complete but this is the general structure.

In the 1960s, Presidents Kenyatta, Obote and Nyerere viewed regional integration in East Africa as part of the Pan-African project and perceived the University of East Africa in this broader context. University administrators shared the same view. During the Council Meeting of the University of East Africa convened on 8 March 1968, Sir James Cook, the Vice-Chancellor, stated that he had written letters to Haile Selassie I University and to the Universities of Malawi and Zambia on the need for regional co-operation. However, he did not make any follow-up because some doubt had been expressed in certain quarters as to whether the pursuit of regional co-operation was worthwhile following the establishment of the Association of African Universities (AAU) in 1967.113 Cook then asked for the Council’s opinion on this issue. But as far as he was concerned – a view shared by Arthur Porter from the Nairobi College – the existence of the AAU did not in any way preclude regional efforts of co-operation because they both had the same goal of uniting African universities. Another Council member, Makerere Principal, Yusuf Lule, stated that as far as he was concerned, the purpose of the AAU was to foster closer co-operation among African universities. However, those universities that were physically closer together could work out programmes on a regional basis.114 If the current leaders in East Africa decide to revive the Federal University in response to the renewed spirit of African unity they would have to ruminate about such debates and then act accordingly.

Another major factor East African leaders would have to take into consideration is the economic inequality that exists between the three sovereign states. When plans were underway for the establishment of the Federal University, Uganda was the richest of all British East African possessions with a budget surplus in the range of £1.5 million.115 In fact, Governor Mitchell capitalised on Uganda’s economic advantage and argued that his territory could bear the entire cost of developing Makerere if the other two governments were unwilling to co-operate. As shown in Chapter 5, this inequality became one of the causal factors in the demise of the Federal University. Economic inequalities still exist in East Africa today and have a potential to cause the same inter-territorial tensions witnessed in the early 1960s. Estimates for 2002 released in 2003 show the GDP purchasing power of the three East African territories as follows: Kenya – $32 billion, Uganda – $31 billion and Tanzania – $22.5 billion. Tanzania is still being described as “one of the poorest countries in the world.”116

Moreover, East African leaders would have to think about funding. The preceding chapters have shown that the University of East Africa relied mainly on foreign aid for its survival. A lot has changed since the 1960s. Britain no longer feels obliged to cater for the needs of her former colonies and their various institutions. Furthermore, there are more universities in Africa today than there were in the 1960s. Therefore, a new federal university in East Africa today would not enjoy the same benevolence enjoyed by the UEA in the 1960s. Hyslop in his letter to the Prime Minister of Kenya in 1963 anticipated this problem and stated that there was no doubt that overseas Foundations and Governments were particularly attracted by the idea of a University of East Africa and that this institution was in a better position to obtain the necessary aid than would each of the Colleges alone. He continued: “There are, of course, many other calls on

113 For details see: Founding Conference of the Association of African Universities. UON Archives. UEA Academic Board, PUE/3/33.
114 Minutes of the University of East Africa’s Council Meeting held in Nairobi on 08 March 1968. UON Archives. Minutes of the University Council. PUEA/1A/49.
115 Nwauwa, Imperialism, Academe & Nationalism, 86.
benefactors and I would urge that advantage be taken of a set of circumstances which are at present particularly favourable but which might be less so in the near future in view of other competing claims.”

There is also the political factor which should not be left out of the equation. Chapter 4 of this book has demonstrated that African constituencies in the 1960s resolved to Africanise the University of East Africa in all areas. East Africa is arguably more politically complex today than it was about four decades ago. Should the University be revived, East Africans would probably insist that it should be predominantly African. The question becomes: What would encourage Britain to fund a federal university in which it had no say? Chapter 2 of this book on the politics behind the establishment of the University of East Africa could help East African leaders in making a decision on whether or not to revive the regional University. What is feasible under the current situation is regional co-operation as opposed to regional integration. Bernard Onyango, Registrar at the University of East Africa, acknowledged the need for regional co-operation between universities, arguing that the principle of co-operation among Universities was no longer a matter for debate. He intimated that just as nations were finding it more and more essential to associate in pursuit of mutual good, “so Universities are more and more realizing the necessity to cultivate ways of mutual assistance by co-operative endeavours in various fields of their activities.”

Contemporary education policy makers in East Africa could benefit immensely from regional co-operation in higher education than from regional integration. To be sure, the two concepts are closely related but they do not in any way mean one and the same thing. They should, therefore be construed and treated as such if they are to bear any meaning and if they are to assist us in the analysis contained in this manuscript.

**Lessons for South Africa**

The Department of Education in post-apartheid South Africa has a lot to learn from the East African experience with higher education as it re-organises the country’s higher education system. In the words of Emmanuel Ngara, South Africa “has to appreciate that it is part of Africa, and – that it has experiences and knowledge to share but that it has much also to learn from other societies.” This section explores how South Africa could use the East African experience for its own benefit. South Africa’s first democratic elections in 1994 ended the country’s isolation from the rest of the world. It would be a big mistake for the South African Ministry of Education to ignore the experiences of other African countries with higher education and repeat the mistakes those countries made. For South Africa, being a late-comer in democracy is a blessing in disguise. However, failure by the Education Ministry to learn from fellow Africans could easily put the country’s higher education system in a worse position than the one experienced in East Africa in the 1960s.

117 J.M. Hyslop to the Prime Minister of Kenya, 1 August 1963. KNA KA/2/17.
The end of apartheid in South Africa left institutions of learning at all levels divided according to race and ethnicity. The first Minister of Education in the post-apartheid era, Professor Sbusiso Bengu, focused mainly on restructuring primary and high school education although he also initiated some changes in the higher education sector. The second Education Minister, Professor Kader Asmal, put more emphasis on higher education and embarked on the process of reducing the number of tertiary institutions from 36 to 21. However, the line between short-term and long-term goals was not clearly drawn in the Minister’s plan. It is in this area that the East African experience becomes relevant. The De la Warr Commission had advised East Africans that while educational changes were necessary, “a short-sighted policy may well lead to a worse position in a decade or two from now.” When Asmal began with his restructuring programme he rushed into changes, thus making himself vulnerable to attacks especially by politicians, scholars and students.

The student population is one factor that needs serious thinking in South Africa, bearing in mind the East African experience. When the University of East Africa was established, the student population was small but this situation did not last long; by the second triennium the University could no longer accommodate all qualifying students. The South African population is more than 45 million and the student population at all levels of education is on the increase. While the decision to reduce the number of tertiary institutions is justifiable given the duplication that took place under the apartheid regime, an over-reduction of the number of tertiary institutions could soon backfire. When the University of East Africa was dissolved in 1970, the University of Nairobi became the only national university in Kenya. But the sudden increase in the student population resulted into Kenya having a total of six national universities in three decades. Even this number (together with private universities) cannot absorb all the candidates. Speaking during the launch of the University Institute of Open Learning late in 2002, Professor George Eshiwani, then Vice-Chancellor of Kenyatta University in Kenya, intimated that Kenya needed at least 30 universities, one for every one million people with 10,000 students. Eshiwani regretted that the country’s six national universities could only absorb between 25 and 30 percent of the eligible students. This experience should serve as a warning to the Education Ministry in South Africa where the student population is much higher than in East Africa in comparative terms.

Race and inequality were some of the major problems affecting the University of East Africa; South Africa is not immune to these factors. In fact, the racial factor is more pronounced in South Africa than it was in East Africa. In March 2001, Asmal appointed the National Working Group to advise on the restructuring of higher education in South Africa. Soon after the contents of the Group’s Report were made public, commentators used race and inequality as some of the organising themes, stating: “Most predominantly black institutions will be merged” and “The historically white institutions … are largely unaffected.” This was despite Asmal’s

121 For a detailed discussion on the debates surrounding this issue see the present author’s forthcoming chapter “Going Beyond the Call: A Critical Appraisal of Higher Education Policies in Post-Apartheid South Africa from 1994-2004”, to be published by CODESRA.
122 Daily Nation, 12 December 2002.
123 http://www.sabcnews.com/south_africa/education/0,1009,35357,00.html.
assurances that "no institution will be left untouched."\textsuperscript{125} To reduce the number of problems regarding the restructuring programme, South Africa should read the face of history accurately and act accordingly.

One of the accusations leveled against East African leaders was that they imposed different forms of regional integration from the top. Asmal repeated the same mistake in South Africa when he started implementing the merger of tertiary institutions, prompting some newspaper editors to write headlines such as ‘Asmal Consulted Nobody But Himself’. Dr Barney Pityana, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of South Africa (now New Unisa\textsuperscript{126}) accused Asmal of lack of consultation about the merger of the University of South Africa with Technikon SA and the long distance learning wing of Vista University, arguing: “Nowhere in the world would such a tradition-filled institution, investment and history be dealt with like this: without consultation, without checking what the feelings of people are, without cost benefit analysis, without understanding that a whole history is just being wiped out just like that.”\textsuperscript{127} The Pan Africanist Congress, one of South Africa’s vocal political parties, accused Asmal of racist conduct, stating: “We wish to advise Asmal to Approach the Unisa question with more caution rather than using typical Verwoerd [the architect of apartheid] methods.”\textsuperscript{128} Had the Minister been exposed to the East African experience he would have anticipated some of these confrontations and probably avoid them.

Administration is another area in which the East African experience is relevant for South Africa since the newly merged institutions are, in a way, administered like the federal University of East Africa and therefore have similar problems. One problem is the distance between campuses. Dr Pityana in an interview conceded that administering an institution based in more than one campus is a daunting task. His comment on Unisa was as follows: “As you can imagine, with a huge institution like this that is set in two campuses in Florida and Pretoria, to actually hold that institution meaningfully as one with all this distance in between is a major administration nightmare.”\textsuperscript{129}

But South Africa is lucky to have a source of reference. Although the three University Colleges in East Africa were located in three independent countries while South African institutions are based in nine provinces within one country, most of the problems are similar. Some are still insurmountable today as they were about four decades ago but others can be avoided by using the East African experience as a source of reference. To be sure, some modifications would be necessary in certain instances but studying the East African experience is a worthwhile project. Professor Z.K. Mathews, one of South Africa’s eminent scholars, acknowledged the need for learning from other people’s experiences even if circumstances are different. He maintained that it would be idle to expect that problems in Africa will assume the same forms as elsewhere. Nor need we expect that solutions which have proved useful elsewhere will necessarily provide an answer here. He made a disclaimer that he was not suggesting that Africa cannot benefit

\textsuperscript{125} South African Press Association News, 29 May 2002. See also: \textit{Bua News} (South Africa), 30 May 2002.

\textsuperscript{126} New Unisa is a combination of three previously separate institutions that offered long distance education: University of South Africa (UNISA), Technikon SA and Vista University.


\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Business Day} (South Africa), 14 January 2002.

from the experience of the rest of the world. On the contrary, “in the modern world in which the isolation of people from one another has largely become a thing of the past, it would be difficult if not impossible for us to avoid being influenced by the experiences of others.”¹³⁰ He argued that in the main, such influence might even be beneficial.

The ball is in the South African Education Ministry’s courtyard. It can play it either way but should always be mindful of the possible implications of its actions and/or decisions regarding the way forward. Any bad start could have serious repercussions.

**Lessons for the African continent**

Over the years, African leaders have tacitly conceded that history is the best teacher. The failure of classic integration schemes inspired the first generation of African leaders to opt for looser forms of regional co-operation in a variety of specific areas.¹³¹ This change of focus from *integration* to *co-operation* was prompted by the realisation that while integration has many problems, Africans still needed one another in order to survive. Mazrui’s response to the question: “Can Africa defend itself against global apartheid?” was that: “The answer is yes, and one solution is towards greater African cooperation and solidarity, the resurrection of regional cooperation.”¹³² Lalage Bown addressed the concept ‘co-operation’ with specific reference to higher education, arguing that inter-university relationship should not only be Afro-European but should also take place within Africa as a continent.¹³³

The concepts African *unity* and African *co-operation* are generally used loosely and interchangeably in contemporary Africa. The question becomes: should Africa establish a continental University as part of African unity? The East African experience rules out this possibility. If Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania struggled so hard merely to sustain a Federal University, Africa’s fifty-three states would find it even harder to do so. What Africa needs is *co-operation* between different universities under the auspices of the Association of African Universities, which was inaugurated in Morocco on 12 December 1967. In 1969 the objectives of the AAU were stated, thus:

(i) To promote interchange, contact and co-operation among university institutions in Africa;

(ii) To collect, classify and disseminate information on higher education and research, especially in Africa;

(iii) To promote co-operation among African institutions in curriculum development and determination of equivalence of degrees;


(iv) To encourage increased contact between its members and the international academic world;

(v) To study and make known the educational and related needs of African university institutions;

(vi) To encourage the development and wider use of African languages; and

(vii) To organise, encourage and support seminars and conferences between African university teachers and others.\(^{134}\)

It is the same kind of co-operation that was emphasised by East Africans in the late 1960s when it became obvious that regional integration in higher education was not feasible. Contemporary Africa could do the same. Co-operation only limits but does not totally eradicate problems between nation-states. Morag Bell holds the view that since independence, the ability of African states to act collectively against foreign domination has proved problematic. Political immaturity and internal disunity have frustrated attempts at national integration and supra-national co-operation. Geographical contiguity has proved an inadequate reason for co-operation. Ideological differences between adjacent states have presented problems of maintaining unity while even in the case of states with similar ideologies “national interests have frequently intervened.”\(^{135}\)

As mentioned above, experience is the best teacher. Good experiences are the source of hope and inspiration. But sometimes it is bad experiences and failures that have a more pedagogical role. People learn from the mistakes of their predecessors and do things differently. In most instances, this bears positive results. The political history of the Federal University has both experiences and thus presents to Africans a lot to ruminate about, particularly in the field of higher education. This is the pedagogical role of history. It would be foolhardy for the African leadership to let this lesson slip away. Should this happen, future generations will curse our graves.
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Political independence in Africa during the early 1960s and mid-1970s inspired Africans to fight for independence in other spheres of life, including education. In East Africa, the development of higher education which reached its apogee in 1963 with the establishment of the Federal University of East Africa happened within the broader political context of the time. Having succeeded in bringing the British colonial government to its knees, the East African political and academic leadership vowed to Africanize the higher education sector epitomized by the Federal University. They called for the Africanization of academic and administrative staff, the curriculum, as well as teaching and research methods. But the development of higher education in East Africa happened both as part of British hegemony in the region and as a result of African agitation for higher education. Britain wanted to insulate Africans from potential politicisation if they travelled abroad. East Africans on the other hand needed higher education facilities that would produce manpower needed to consolidate political independence and ensure economic independence from Britain. In both instances, the motivating factor behind the development of higher education was political.

The spirit of nationalism which swept through East Africa united the region against the British. Once political independence was achieved, national interests prevailed over regional interests. In the process, the development of higher education was negatively affected. Therefore, the demise of the Federal University in 1970 did not come as a surprise. The university was a still born entity. It was accompanied by many challenges from its inception to its eventual collapse in 1970. This confirms the view that “education and politics are inextricably intertwined.”