KEYNOTE ADDRESS

by Dr. Arthur Porter,
Vice-Chancellor Designate,
University of Sierra Leone

Mr. Chairman, distinguished conference participants and guests:

I owe a double debt of gratitude to the Working Party set up by the Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee responsible for planning this Conference. First for the honour they have conferred on me by inviting me to address this Conference. Secondly, and even more touchingly, I am deeply grateful to them for their confidence and courtesy. For, a few weeks ago, when I found that the opening date of this Conference was between two other engagements I wanted to keep on the other side of the continent, I wrote to the Secretariat, explaining my plight and suggesting that I be released from the commitment. Their gracious reply did not reveal what their first reactions probably were to my letter. Instead, they were full of understanding and agreed to re-schedule the programme to make it possible for me to speak to you today. I cannot adequately thank them for this tolerance and magnanimity. I would also like to express my thanks to the Kenya Ministry of Education and to UNESCO for their permission to accept this invitation. I should also add that the invitation was personal, and my remarks therefore are personal and do not represent any official thinking.

I am sure a mid-Conference address must be pitched differently from an opening key-note speech. You have by now discussed the most important aspects of the Conference agenda and would have also touched on the remainder. This in some ways makes my task a little easier or even superfluous.

My credentials for addressing you today are only those of an outsider; I have only a brief encounter with the problems of the classroom as a teacher; on the other hand, I have been on the fringes as a university lecturer and administrator, and now as a planner. I ought also to say that whatever observation I make is based on experience of the education systems of the developing members of the Commonwealth, more particularly those in Africa. But, though based on such narrow and inadequate foundations, I think the observations do have a wider relevance for developed and developing nations alike.

If I had been speaking on the opening day of the Conference, I would have reminded you of the kind of education structures our governments inherited at independence and their hopes of what education can accomplish for their people.

During the colonial period, the aims of education were either missionary-oriented with the emphasis on the preparation of souls for that other Kingdom not made with hands, eternal in the heavens; or it was geared to serve the needs of the colonial government, which in effect meant a type and quality of education adequate for the production of the junior clerks and non-executive roles which the system required. No conscious attempt was made either by the churches or the colonial administrations to adapt the education to, or even to reconcile it with, the cultures in which they were operating.

Notwithstanding these inadequacies, the Africans themselves had come to accept unquestioningly the kind of education they received. While there were a few voices critical of the system (1), the general demand was for expansion and acceleration. Education was seen as the key to a whole range of powers - political, social and economic. Its monopoly in the hands of the colonial power was believed to be part of the secret of their ability to maintain their minority rule without requiring the consent of the governed. The reasoning therefore was that any people wishing to be the controllers of their own destiny must first remove this existing monopoly of knowledge.

No firm distinctions were made between what are now called investment education and consumer education. No philosophic or semantic questions were asked whether education is a product of or an agent of social change or economic development.

Education was not exclusively a matter of filling gaps in the leadership cadre; nor was it merely a matter of manpower considerations. It was almost a religion, a superstitious, if touching, faith in the magic or knowledge in itself and for its own sake. Education was going to be the panacea for all ills. It was going to be the "door effectual" through which the blessings of industry and civilization would permeate the whole continent.

In this mood, the new independent African governments were prepared to spend a great part of their national income on education. They were pledged to make the right of access to education the common property of all citizens, and, by extension, to democratise the right of access to progressively higher levels of instruction.

UNESCO responded to this situation by encouraging the new nations to raise their sights and actively seek the democratic aims of education. At international conferences under UNESCO's auspices, in Addis Ababa in 1961 and in Tananarive in 1962, educational targets were set up and discussed as if they were assured realities. At the Addis Ababa meeting, the African ministers of education set themselves three main tasks, each a measure of quantitative, not qualitative educational expansion: six years universal, compulsory and free education for all children by 1980; entry of 30 per cent of primary school children into secondary schools, and provision of higher education for up to 20 per cent of those who completed secondary education.

The record of our governments in education since independence has been both impressive and praiseworthy. Despite limited political and administrative capacity, inadequate personnel and insufficient finances, enrolment at the primary and secondary levels has more than doubled and in higher education, almost trebled.

At the same time, the expenditure on education has been absorbing an increasingly larger proportion of the money available for development, and it is being intensively realised that it is impossible to continue to increase this percentage available for education without affecting and limiting other much needed development.

In many parts of Africa this educational expansion has been and is accompanied by a population explosion, the annual growth rate in some countries being over 3 per cent. It is estimated that of the 30 million or so people living in the three East African countries of the Commonwealth, almost one half are under the age of fifteen. There is a danger that unless adequate resources are forthcoming or steps are taken to increase the yield from

available resources, the education offered will suffer both in quality and in the number of children it can reach.

Hope, enthusiasm and optimism in what education can accomplish have not diminished, but the realisation is growing that the resources which will be available will not be enough to meet the rising social demand for more education. There is also a growing concern both about the spiralling costs and the effectiveness and appropriateness of the system itself. In addition, the expansion of recent years has brought its own problems - problems of overtaxed teachers and over-stretched facilities, problems of wastage and what is now called the "school leaver" problem, that is, the lack of employment opportunities for an increasing number of children from the secondary as well as from the primary levels of the system.

In this situation, a number of alternatives seem open to the African governments. There are those - mostly our friends from outside Africa - who advocate a positive and deliberate slowing down of education growth to match employment opportunities. In a recent paper (2), two economists (E.O. Edwards and Michael Todaro) assert that further investment in education in many developing countries will increasingly be an investment in idle human resources because of growing unemployment and a rising average level of education among the unemployed. They argue that substantial outside support, even for lower levels of education where expansion can still be defended, may only serve to free national educational resources for the less economically justifiable expansion at the higher levels, and they go on to recommend to potential donors that such donors should do what is "socially wise rather than what seems to be politically expedient in the field of education."

I do not know what circulation or credibility this paper is receiving, but it is not without significance that Dr. Edwards is a Programme Adviser with the Ford Foundation and Dr. Todaro is an Assistant with the Rockefeller Foundation. However, their thesis is a very tempting one, especially if one looks at education purely in terms of economic returns.

Other educationists are suggesting a shift in emphasis from secondary and higher to primary and non-formal education.

Others, like René Dumont, assert that we have wrongly assessed our priorities and that Africa is off to a false start. It is argued that as the education of the period since independence has only partially met the goals which were set, a re-thinking of our priorities is mandatory. It is argued further that any additional inputs into the system should not be into the present system of education which, it is said, is geared for the urban sector which is not expanding fast enough; but that any further investment in education should now be applied to the condition of rural, or traditional, Africa.

Economists, sociologists, educationists, all now talk of the "rural transformation" of Africa. As a phrase, rural transformation has shot into instant popularity; it is the most fashionable topic of sociological conversation and political rhetoric. It is reflected in national development plans. It is an implicit warning that we must first encompass the agricultural revolution before we can have the industrial revolution.

Now it must be conceded that there is a lot of truth and of cold realism in all these judgements on the contemporary African scene. One of the healthy signs of our times is that all our countries are beginning to take

a new hard look at their educational systems. An ideal situation would be to put an embargo on all development of education along existing lines while this appraisal is under way and to start again on new lines with a new mandate. But alas, this is unrealistic and impossible. Our countries, like other developing countries in Asia and in the Caribbean, must grapple with the problems of change and development while bowing to the pressures for expansion along the old lines.

Nonetheless, the past decade has witnessed significant improvements: the administrative and teaching staffs have been progressively localised, curricula have been made more relevant and vocational courses have been increasingly introduced, to name but a few.

On the other hand, it is very unlikely that the social demand for education will appreciably diminish in the foreseeable future. A significant decrease will only occur when it is widely recognized and accepted that there are other avenues to gainful employment or making money than through the formal school. And, in the absence of a strong declared social philosophy, as for example, the Arusha Declaration of Tanzania, Governments will find it very difficult to "control" the current social demand for education.

Few politicians are prepared to risk their constituents' support by advocating unpopular constraints on educational expansion. And, where constraints have been imposed on the aided system, this has, in many instances, opened another outlet, the "safety valve" of unaided education, resulting in the growth of private schools or self-help schools.

People in our respective countries are willing to see their governments spend more on education than on their health, and they themselves are prepared to make incredible sacrifices in order to ensure that their children get some kind of education. Many economists reject the view that people in developing countries do this because of their intrinsic belief in the value of education and their fundamental civic right to it. Incidentally, many of the economists of this school of thought come from developed countries, and while they are prepared to accept this thesis for their own countries, they find the doctrine of education as a basic human right too difficult to accept for Africa and other developing countries. Education beyond literacy which is not geared to employment opportunities, argue Edwards and Todaro in the paper already referred to, is a luxury and is socially unjustifiable, and they go on to conclude that many developing countries are already over-investing in formal education.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to spend much longer on this introduction; I am sure I have already overtaxed your patience. But in 1950 when public expenditure on education for the whole world amounted to 34 thousand million dollars, expenditure in the developing countries, which make up two-thirds of the world, was no more than one and a half thousand millions, or less than 5 per cent of the total. There has been, it is true, a marked improvement and the percentage now has more than doubled reaching 10 per

cent by 1968. But nevertheless, the differences is enormous. Mr. René Maheu, UNESCO's Director-General, addressing the International Conference on the World Crisis in Education in 1967 said:

> "If there is a flagrant injustice, it is the difference between the educational opportunities open to children in rich countries and those in poor. School enrolments in the under-developed countries represent only 28 per cent at primary level, 20 per cent at secondary level, and slightly more than 1 per cent at higher educational level, of the enrolments in the developed countries. This is not because the leaders and peoples of these countries are doing nothing about the situation. Far from it."

He went on to comment:

> "The grave inequalities in the condition of mankind that are apparent throughout the world cannot continue indefinitely, and still less worsen - as is the case at present - without jeopardizing our common weal, which is peace. And of all inequalities none is more shocking, more intolerable to men's feelings and consciences than inequality of access by children to the light of the mind."

We subscribe fully to the view, Mr. Chairman, that the educational system of any country must be related to its economic structure. But having said this, we also want to say that the nature of the educational system of a country cannot be linked solely to the immediate needs of that country as seen by economists and manpower planners. We know from history that the discovery of new minerals, new technological advances liberating new sources of energy, the construction of new and feeder roads, the opening of new markets - each of these can invalidate the most careful calculations based only on economic considerations.

Let me cite one or two examples. All of us have heard of Sony radios; a number of us may indeed own sets made in Japan by Sony. But the Sony Corporation was once a purely American company. It set up business in war-devastated Japan about 25 years ago and, with the aid of educated Japanese manpower, developed the modern transistor which has had such an enormous influence on the radio and electronics industries all over the world. Sony of Japan have, in fact, overtaken and outgrown Sony of America. There is no reason why a similar development should not take place in Africa. And a task for our economists, to which they should address themselves with much

more zeal, is to see that the economy expands so that more employment opportunities can be created. Around Kibwezi, half-way between Nairobi and Mombasa, a horticultural industry is developing, with all its implications for education, which I am sure will make a tremendous difference to the surrounding area.

It must also be reiterated that the burden of development cannot and must not rest on the educational institutions alone. Nevertheless, our educational institutions do carry a heavy responsibility for ensuring that our development is both smooth and orderly. Our immediate problem is to adapt the present educational system so that it becomes more appropriate, more efficient and less expensive. To make the system more appropriate, we are concerned primarily with the content of the education offered, including the development of new programmes. Efficiency would cover the best use of available resources, including that most important of all the resources, the teacher component.

This Conference is devoted specifically to this, teacher education, the prime component and central figure in the education process. In our situations where other resources such as teaching aids, libraries and workshops are few, the quality of the learning will depend much more decisively on the capacity of the teaching force than on any other single component.

The central importance of the system of teacher education for maintaining or improving formal education is widely recognized. But have we equally accepted that teaching is a profession and that training is a necessary pre-condition for entry into it? If we sincerely attempt to answer this question, I think we will have to confess that our attitude has been ambivalent, cavalier, and at times flagrantly irresponsible. We of course pay lip-service to the concept of training, but there is a discernible gap between the rhetoric and the deed, between the promise and the performance.

In our public utterances we reject the theory that work with a child's mind is any less complex than the diagnosis and treatment of a physical malady or the preparation of a conveyance for a land transfer or the drawing up of a will. Yet, while in practice we will not allow an untrained person to practise as a doctor or an untrained person to practise as a lawyer, we insist on no comparable measures of fitness for persons practising as teachers.

The importance of primary education is neither a matter for speculation nor a matter of debate. It is the level which absorbs the largest percentage of the education budget, whether public or private; it is the level which provides the only kind of formal education which the majority of our people will know. Yet it is the level which survives and is being expanded only on the basis of a sizeable force of untrained people whether in terms of academic sophistication or of professional competence. Since it is far from clear how rapidly and how effectively non-formal education can serve as an alternative to formal education, it would seem to me that efficiency at this level of the system should be accorded greater priority than it has merited in the decade of the sixties.

In secondary education, we have inherited the tradition from Britain that the student with a good degree from one of the ancient universities can go straight into the classroom. Happily that tradition is on its way out in England, for I understand that from this year some training in teaching is required for all teachers in schools maintained by the State,

which with characteristic British logic, does not include the Public Schools. At the level of teaching in teacher training colleges and the universities, professional training of any kind is even rarer. One of the strangest and strongest traditions in teacher education is the one that holds, implicitly or explicitly, that those who teach students below the age of eighteen require special preparation for teaching, whereas those who teach students of eighteen years of age or older do not!

As teachers and concerned citizens, we must face the fact that there are still a number of influential people in each of our several countries who are sceptical as to whether teachers need any training at all. They can point to distinguished teachers who have shaped their lives who received no formal training whatsoever. There are others who regard the postgraduate diploma year as a a year of "subsidised laziness" because of what they allege is the flabbiness of the course after the rigours of the honours school. Others dub it the "mattress curriculum", something to fall back upon when other employment opportunities are in short supply. In this context, one is reminded of the aphorism of George Bernard Shaw: he who can, does; he who cannot, teaches.

As professionals it is our duty to convince our governments and our publics that born teachers are very rare and that adequate training must be made a pre-condition for everyone who aspires to teach.

One cannot be categorical about what should constitute adequate training. Countries differ in their political and social systems and in the variety of their cultural backgrounds and this would presuppose that there will be some diversity in the approach to their teacher education programme. Whatever the orientation and the content, the training is usually divided into two broad categories: academic training and professional training. In some countries, particularly at the graduate level, both are run concurrently; in others consecutively.

Whatever the approach, I think we must satisfy ourselves that the programme does equip the teacher to play his role as a catalyst in nation building. The academic courses must not, of course, be narrow; but they must be relevant. Similarly the professional courses must focus on the competencies required of teachers in the particular milieu and not on some theory of educational psychology based on and appropriate to some other culture.

But, whatever the context, I would submit that any teacher education programme must include courses on the problems of national development and the contributions of various professions in solving them. In our rural areas, for example, our schools are called upon to launch a child from a static and custom-bound environment into a new world of modern ideas, outlook, knowledge and gadgets. At the same time the teacher is cautioned not to alienate the child from his cultural heritage or from the practical developmental needs of his neighbourhood. In short, the teacher must be trained for his role both as an agent of cultural preservation as well as an agent for cultural innovation and transformation.

It is said that one of the often-heard complaints of the school teacher is that the public does not defer to his professional opinion as completely as it does to that of practioners of other professions. In a sense this is understandable and should not be the cause for concern,

because the relation between professionals and the public is different in education from what it is in any other context. Outside the State itself, no other social institution wields the power the school wields to modify the social order. It is because of this that education is primarily a public business and only secondarily a specialised vocation. It is also because of this, and its ramifications and influence on all the other sub-systems that make up our society, that I would urge that we involve, at some stage, all other interested parties on what teacher education should be in our changing societies. We should engage in a dialogue with the students and the parents, with administrators, and businessmen and women, with politicians and tax-payers. And we must not rest only with dialogue, for each of these several interested parties must also join in the decision-making process as to what should be recommended for inclusion in teacher education.

Also in discussing teacher education we must not limit our consideration to the teacher in the classroom or to the preparation of teachers for the training colleges. An important and crucial area of need is in the production of properly trained educational administrators and others who have responsibility for thinking about the means and ends of education for an entire school or school system rather than for a single classroom.

It is now accepted that institutional management is a recognized skill on its own, and many industries, except education, have moved from the handicraft stage where the master, assisted by his apprentice, can handle all aspects of the work. Hospitals in a number of countries are now run by people qualified to administer and operate such complex institutions and not by medical doctors qualified to treat patients. Yet in education we still train our teachers as subject specialists and then expect them to run efficient schools and school systems as head-masters, as curriculum co-ordinators, as planners, as bursars, without the least training in any of these competencies.

I am not advocating, Mr. Chairman, that we bring in administrators from the world of business to run our achools. A part of my thesis is that those who operate the system must know something about the system; in our case, about education. But on that foundation, it is of the utmost urgency that we begin to train, and in sufficient numbers, the varied kinds of skills that the system requires for its proper functioning. The developed countries are now aware of this need and have begun to produce educational experts in fields such as curriculum development, systems analysis, educational planning and so on. If we must keep abreast and preserve our independence we must begin to produce our own experts in all these fields - educators who know our background because they have lived through it, and understand our various and sometimes conflicting pressures. As Phil Coombs has so rightly put it:

> "The needed revolution in education must begin with educational management. . . An educational system, therefore, must call upon a wide assortment of its constituent parts ot produce the kinds of skills, knowledge, and management instruments required for its effective functioning. The managers of space programmes draw on and orchestrate knowledge from all the physical and biological sciences, and skills from all technologies, just to put one man within reach of the moon. How much more must education draw on all the sources of learning to equip itself with men and instruments capable of managing

school systems that can bring millions of young people to a place in the sun" (3).

I am sure a lot of attention has been given in the last week to these and other problems relating to our theme, Teacher Education in a Changing Society, and we look forward to your recommendations.

Additional to the above is the problem of how to keep the content of classroom education up to date with the rapidly advancing frontiers of knowledge. It is said that the quantity of human knowledge is doubling every ten years. Thus, unless adequate safeguards are provided, the knowledge imparted by the teacher could quickly become obsolete knowledge. And not only are developments and advances taking place at a much more rapid rate, but teachers are no longer the primary sources of information about them. Teachers must therefore be trained to be aware of this and be able to organize the new knowledge pressed on them by the modern information media.

But it is not only content that can become obsolete. The method of imparting knowledge can itself become out of date and unproductive. I am sure these matters have already received your earnest attention.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you will be concentrating in the remaining days of the Conference on the two other topics on your Agenda, namely, the Costs of Education and the Supply of Teachers and on Commonwealth Cooperation in the Field of Teacher Education.

Here I would like to cite - very briefly - two or so matters which bear on the question of costs and educational financing. Let us take for example the notion of a pupil-teacher ratio. We know from recent research that there is no fixed relationship between the size of a class and how much is learned; it has been demonstrated that other variables, such as the quality of the teacher, the supply of teaching materials, the health of the pupils, are more crucial. Sir Eric Ashby has traced the origin of this concept of an ideal pupil-teacher ratio, on which so much of our financial estimates are based, to a doctrine derived from the Talmud Baba Bathra which stipulated that:

> "One teacher is to have twenty-five pupils; if they be fifty, then two teachers must be appointed; if they be forty, the teacher has to have an assistant."

The Talmudic doctrine, an oral tradition to begin with, was laid down long before printed textbooks, blackboards, films, radio, television and other modern teaching aids were invented. Despite modern educational technology, the notion of an ideal teacher-pupil ratio still dominates our teaching practice and the principles of our budgeting.

We have, as is known, inherited a system of education which did not develop out of our own needs and aspirations. It is a system which is divided, as we also know, into three levels - primary, secondary, tertiary, sometimes referred to as post-secondary or higher. It is a system which assumes, if only implicitly, that primary is a preparation for secondary, and secondary for university and the relevant curricula are structured accordingly. It is system which assumes, again if only implicitly, that the period between the ages of five and twenty-two is the ideal period when a

country must concentrate its educational services on its people. It is a system based on a set calendar with each school as the unit of organisation. It is an expensive system, supported by a teaching force calculated on the premise of a questionable teacher-pupil ratio.

The traditional school year is probably based on the needs of medieval Europe when it was necessary to provide periods of recess from the classroom to both teachers and pupils alike so that they could assist with the sowing and harvesting and could be free to participate in the rituals associated with Christmas. School was regarded as a physical and geographical fixture where children within certain age groups went to be taught and at the end of each cycle, to take examinations. In time the school was bestowed a personality. It became the loving and kind mother, one's alma mater. Children were taught to be loyal to it, to develop an esprit de corps towards it; and, after they have passed through it into the world of work, to put themselves and their purses at its disposal.

Other institutions providing social services, say, for example, a post office or a shop, are not treated in this way. We go to them for the services they render without ascribing to them any halo of sentimentality.

Now let me hasten to add that I am not advocating that we treat our schools as we would treat a petrol station or a public lavatory. But I do want to suggest that if we try and release ourselves from this traditional concept of the school calendar, and begin to regard the school as a social facility, albeit the most important, we will find that this traditional concept of set terms and set holidays is an obstacle to rapid expansion of our educational opportunities and a built-in expense factor.

Currently a number of school buildings are used by two schools at a time under a morning and an afternoon shift pattern. This, however, does not solve the problem of the long holidays when buildings, and to some extent, teachers, are comparatively inactive. I would like to make a plea to our educational administrators and our teachers that they help us to devise a more flexible programme in which the unit will be the class and not the school. It should, I think, be possible to construct time-tables where two sets of teachers can service three sets of classes; and where, by reducing the annual holiday period for both teachers and pupils, a given set of buildings can be used to accommodate three times the number or classes now possible under the present system.

The implicit assumption that education is acquired between the ages of five and twenty-two and is thereafter finished is also under attack at the present time for two reasons. Firstly it is now being realised that education is a life-long process in which the individual continuously integrates new knowledge and new experience into what might be called his educated swareness. This implies the need for providing a variety of facilities for adult education with a consequent demand for teachers trained to teach, at various levels, those who have already completed their formal school, college or university education. Secondly, on the narrow professional front, the rapid changes in technology and the tremendous increase in knowledge that are characteristic of the modern world, together with the vast strides being taken by educational technology, mean that both the academic equipment and the professional skills of the teacher, as already stated, will rapidly become outdated. What appears to be required here is the realisation that teachers require refresher courses of various kinds,

probably, as UNESCO has suggested, at five-yearly intervals, to up-date both their knowledge and their teaching skills. Again, therefore, we must escape from the implicit constraints of the earlier inherited system if we are effectively to meet the challenges of the developing situation in our countries.

In saying all this, I am not unmindful of the impressive research work of recent years that has gone on, and is going on, into the learning process. Nor am I unmindful of the efforts in schools, teacher training colleges and within Governments to improve quality as well as quantity in education. But more is required, and external assistance will be needed to support local initiatives which give promise of introducing radical changes in the system. In the past, Commonwealth assistance has been concentrated in the provision of technical personnel and financial support for capital development. Assistance will continue to be required at these levels, but perhaps of more importance in this decade is assistance in those crucial areas where attempts are being made to come to grips with the fundamental problems of the inherited system and in the exchange of ideas.

Where problems common to the developing and the developed members of the Commonwealth have been identified, joint research projects should be initiated with each supporting the other in the quest for solutions. The maturity now exists in the institutions in our developing countries to enable us to participate as full partners and leaders in professional dialogues and investigations. While we agree that every nation must be the master of its own destiny, it is also clear tha in the field of education, as in many others, no nation can afford to be an island unto itself. For developed and developing alike, a sharing of resources and pooling together of experience can only result in the enrichment of all.

It is not without significance that this Conference is being held here in Nairobi. Perhaps no other country of the Commonwealth can show faster growth rates in her educational development in the first decade of independence than Kenya has demonstrated. But the tasks ahead are still formidable. It is hoped that this Conference will make a major contribution in recommending guidelines and procedures for enhancing the training we give our teachers for the variety of the tasks that they are going to face. It is hoped that we will go beyond the stage of resolutions and that out of this Conference will emerge action programmes for the betterment and enrichment of teacher education.

Above all, we must never allow ourselves to forget that beyond our reports there are those members of our populations waiting for knowledge and for assistance, and that the ultimate aim of our profession must be to serve them as best as we can.

Notes

(1) "Whilst acknowledging the immense debt of gratitude due to Europeans, educated Africans are beginning to long to slip away from their European leading strings, and they are proving themselves perfectly capable of discharging all their duties as citizens and as Christians without foreign aid." Quotation from "Missionary History of Sierra Leone", published 1874, by the Rev. Henry Seddall.

"I do not deny that the creeds brought to us from Europe rest on certain deep convictions which are present to the consciousness of the people among whom they arose, and

who now hold them, and I believe that they cover great truths; but I cannot see that these European formularies immodified should be imposed upon Africa. . . . To make these creeds, in all their details, authoritative in Africa, the intellectual and spiritual growth of the people must be checked or distorted by the introduction of the bitterness of theological rancour and the harshness of conflicting sects." Quotation from Professor Blyden's letter, December 1872, to Governor of Sierra Leone, Mr. Pope Hennessy.

(2) Paper presented at Conference of Heads of Donor Agencies on Education and Development Reconsidered, Bellagio, May 1972.

(3) Quotation from P.H. Coombs, The World Educational Crisis, OUP, New York, 1968, p. 124.