

Aparna Basu, 1982, Essays in
the history of Indian education

New Delhi: Concept

CHAPTER 4

Colonial Educational Policies :
A Comparative Approach

IN COUNTRIES under colonial rule, the metropolitan power shaped and guided the educational policy and the educational institutions promoted the needs of the coloniser, ignoring for the most part the aspirations of the colonised. While colonial educational policies had certain common characteristics, they differed from one colonial power to another and the same power had often differing policies in different countries and in the same country at different times. While there were some similarities between the educational policies of the British in India, the French in Vietnam, the Spanish in the Philippines or the Dutch in Indonesia, there were fundamental differences also. Again, British policy in India in the eighteenth century was different from that in the nineteenth or twentieth century. The Dutch followed one kind of policy for the first four hundred years of their rule in Indonesia and inaugurated a new policy from the beginning of the twentieth century. British policy in India was different from that in Malaysia or in the African colonies. These policy differences and shifts were related to economic, social and ideological changes in the metropolitan powers as well as in the colonies. The indigenous educational structures could not be ignored and these varied from one country to another. Burma and Ceylon were part of India till 1935. While primary education made little headway in India, it was quite widespread in the two former countries. This, no doubt, had something to do with the indigenous Buddhist system of education and the network

of monastic schools in Ceylon and Burma in the pre-colonial era. The British in India expected the hereditary aristocracy to take to English education and special colleges were started for the sons of chiefs and princes. But it was the traditionally literate castes and sons of traders and money-lenders who took advantage of the new education. The policy measures failed and the consequences of others were often different from what was anticipated, because the response was determined by indigenous factors.

We shall try to focus on four main questions—Why did colonial powers introduce education? What was the type of education introduced? What groups took advantage of the new schools and colleges and why? Answers to these questions will be attempted with reference to the Philippines, India, Vietnam and Indonesia.

The earliest colonial intruders from Europe into Asia were the Spanish and Portuguese. Unlike the Protestant powers—Britain and the Netherlands—these two Catholic countries had a planned education policy from the beginning. When Pope Alexander VI in 1493 adjudicated on the rival claims of Spain and Portugal to undiscovered heathen continents and islands, he made it a condition that they should exert all diligence to convert their subjects to Christianity and instruct them in the Catholic faith. They both took this injunction seriously, the Portuguese in Paraguay and Moluccas, the Spanish in the Philippines. The State recognised the supremacy of the Church and since there was a union of spiritual and temporal, government deemed ecclesiastical empire as important a goal as profit. Spanish colonial motives, unlike the British or the Dutch or French, were not strictly commercial. The English East India Company did not permit missionaries to enter India for the first two hundred years.

Conversion to Christianity was one important motive of Catholic expansion and this required education of the people. Monks of various orders with the help of the government created a network of elementary schools where religious as well as secular subjects were taught. Primary education in Catholic schools was mostly memorisation of the catechism in the local dialect. But the use of Latin and Spanish words enriched the local language. The need to supplement oral

lessons with written words led to the beginning of the printing press. Philippines was under Spanish rule for three hundred years from 1565 onwards and the Filipinos were among the earliest to get European education. In Manila where the Filipinos had most contact with the Spaniards, education flourished. But in regions where there was little or no contact, education was neglected. In 1863 the Spanish government issued a decree on Primary Education which stated that education should be free for all children and compulsory for those between 7 and 13.¹ Each village was to have 1 school for boys and 1 for girls. Spanish was to be taught in all schools. But like other Spanish reform decrees, this one was also incompletely executed. Nevertheless by 1898, when Spanish rule came to an end, there were nearly 200,000 children in schools or 3 per cent of the population.

Secondary schools and colleges were started as seminaries for training priests and teachers and in 1648 the Dominican University of Santa Toma was established. Its curriculum was copied for the Dominican School in Mexico. The Jesuit Colayio de San Jose and the Colegio de Santa Potenciana for girls were also started around this time. The bulk of the students in these institutions were Spanish but Filipinos were also admitted. Education in the Philippines till the late nineteenth century was offered by only Catholic institutions.²

The Americans who took over from the Spanish in 1898, placed an equal importance on education but for different reasons. America's proclaimed aim was to prepare Philippines for self-government. Once the "oriental pearl" of Spain, Manila became America's display window of Western democracy. Mass education was considered a necessary prerequisite for democracy and in 1900 the Taft Commission was directed to establish an educational system throughout the island. In 1901 an Act was passed by which free public schools were established. By 1922, public school enrolment was past the million mark; the school population had expanded 500 per cent in a generation; expenditure on education had risen to nearly half of government expenditure at all levels. At first all the teachers and administrators were Americans. Later as teacher training normal schools were established, they were replaced by Filipinos.³

Under American rule Philippines became the supplier of agricultural products to the United States, while in turn it became one of the best markets for American goods. American manufactures flooded the country, at first luxury goods, later necessities. The demand for such goods continued to grow and could be satisfied only by export of agricultural products. Hence great emphasis was placed on farm schools which would help in increasing agricultural production.

After the 1920s, the vocational school movement was encouraged and the high school curriculum contained 15 to 20 per cent vocational subjects. Industrial and craft schools were encouraged where basket making, lace-weaving, furniture-making, etc. were taught. The programme was initially successful and skilled artisans emerged from these institutions. But there were few job openings for them. The students learnt to make shoes or baskets but the market was saturated with American goods. This naturally discouraged interest in technical education and explains the ordinary Filipino's preference for ordinary education which was a preparation for white collar jobs. Financial sacrifices by poor and middle families to enable their children to go to schools and colleges and obtain a degree were phenomenal. Colonial education reports in the 1920s continually lament the lack of understanding and concern regarding the money spent on agricultural and vocational schools.

Philippines, like most colonial countries, had a dual system of education, private schools serving the urban elite and public schools for the masses. The farm and craft schools were meant for the latter, who were, however, increasingly pressing for an academic curricula.⁴

Manila's English medium schools opened their doors to the non-Europeans, so that a distinction began to appear between the privileged few who had access to the foreign medium, city schools and the majority of the people in the rural areas, who scarcely knew any English. Both the Spanish and the American systems encouraged the growth of an urban educated middle class. Literacy was widespread in the Philippines. It nearly doubled between 1903 and 1939,⁵ yet it is difficult to characterise the system as egalitarian.

The East India Company in India was not initially interested

in promoting any system of education. This is not surprising since its primary interest was trade and profit. But as its Empire in India expanded, the need arose for administrators. The Company in these years faced serious financial difficulties and was compelled to economise. One of the main items of expenditure was the high salary of English officers and one way of economising was to employ Indian subordinates. Employment of Indians required their being able to read, write and speak English.

As Britain became the workshop of the world, India was important to her no longer as a supplier of cheap textiles or indigo but as a market for British goods. English educated Indians were expected to develop a taste for the products of Lancashire and Sheffield. As Macaulay said, he would prefer that Indians were ruled by their own kings "but wearing our broadcloth and eating with our cutlery", that they should not be "too ignorant or too poor to value and buy English manufactures".⁶

It was also hoped that English education would provide a positive bond between rulers and ruled and lead to the permanence and stability of the British Raj.⁷ Liberals and utilitarians were convinced of the superiority of Western culture and were anxious that at least a small group of Indians imbibe it.

For the evangelicals and other missionaries English education was important for dispelling "darkness and superstition" and for spreading the true light of Christianity.⁸ It was they who pressurised Parliament in 1813 that the Company's Charter should contain a clause setting aside a lakh of rupees for education.⁹

Thus the decision to introduce English education in 1835 was the result of a combination of complex administrative, economic, cultural, political and religious motives.

The government decided to concentrate on higher education of the upper classes. In England at this time there was no notion that it was government's duty to promote mass education. Besides, limited funds and inadequate staff made it difficult for the Company to embark on any programme of mass education. What the British wanted was a small class of English educated Indians to act, in Macaulay's words, as "interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a

class of persons Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect".¹⁰ It was hoped that knowledge would filter down from this class to the masses.

Concentration, since 1835, on the urbanized upper and middle classes led to the neglect of mass education. The education system became top-heavy and lop-sided. The percentage of enrolled to educable population at the primary stage was 31 per cent in India on the eve of World War II as against 100 per cent in most advanced countries.¹¹ In 1951, 83.4 per cent of Indians had no schooling and 92.1 per cent of girls had never been to schools.¹² Literacy at the time of independence was about 15 per cent. This was one of the greatest drawbacks India inherited from colonial times.

Education in the colonial era was not only quantitatively inadequate, it had also qualitative defects. It had a predominantly literary bias. In schools there was little provision for vocational training, and in colleges the number of students enrolled in the humanities was far greater than that in the sciences or professional courses. The exclusion of technical subjects in the curriculum and the small number of institutions offering such courses was closely tied to the employment policy of the government. All higher appointments in the engineering service, railway service, irrigation department, ordnance factories, posts and telegraphs and in fact in all superior services—were reserved for Europeans. In the private sector, except in Bombay, modern industries were owned by Europeans, who when they required men with technical knowledge, always preferred their own countrymen. The employment opportunities for qualified and highly trained Indians were very few.

As regards content, there was an over-emphasis on the study of languages and humanities. Familiarity with English as a spoken and written language was indispensable to success in professional life. So much time in a school boy's life was spent on mastering a foreign language that often the main purpose of education was missed. Despite this, what most students picked up was a smattering of English and a tendency towards repetition of half-understood sentences. This encouraged memorizing and did not train a student to think for

himself. Lessons were imparted in a mechanical way, learned by heart and reproduced in examinations by students. Examinations, in fact, dominated high schools and universities.

From the closing years of the nineteenth century there was a growing awareness among British officials of the political dangers of English education. It was felt that familiarity with Western ideas was breeding political discontent. Also, that there were not enough jobs for the educated and unemployment was another reason for sedition. Half-hearted attempts were made by Curzon and his successors to check the expansion of higher education and bring the system under stricter government control.¹³ Committees were appointed to screen textbooks¹⁴ and occasionally teachers were dismissed or not appointed on political grounds.¹⁵ But the private sector in Indian education was so vast that it was difficult for government to exercise effective control.

Government expenditure on education was low both in terms of the national income and in terms of the total government budget.¹⁶ Of this small sum, a disproportionate amount was spent on higher education.

Why did Indians go to the new schools and colleges? Primarily for economic self-betterment. Knowledge of English was necessary for traders and businessmen, such as the Parsis in Bombay, who collaborated with the East India Company and private British business houses for commercial reasons. Passing an examination and obtaining a degree was the passport for entering government service or professions such as law, medicine or journalism. English education was also a means of social mobility. Men from lower castes could raise their social status by acquiring Western education.

Who were the Indians who went to the new schools and colleges? While in theory, education was available to all, certain regions, communities and castes had availed of it more than others. The first impact of English education was felt by the three Presidencies because Britain's was a sea empire and these were the first areas to be annexed. Literacy varied enormously between provinces.¹⁷ But English education was not equally diffused in all parts of a Presidency or among all communities and castes. Everywhere it was more widespread among men than women, in cities than in villages and among

the higher castes. The first group to respond to it were the traditionally literate castes, such as the Brahmins in Madras and Maharashtra, the Kayasthas, Baidyas and Brahmins in Bengal or the Kayasthas and Sayeeds in U.P. Usually the higher castes stood at the top of the education ladder and the scheduled castes and tribes at the bottom.¹⁸ However, a great deal depended on occupation and in many cases, middle castes engaged in trade were more literate than others which had a higher social ranking. In Gujarat, for instance, the Vanis who were usually traders, were quite advanced in literacy,¹⁹ so also the Agarwals, Khattris and Aroras in Punjab and U.P. Where Muslims were more urbanised and pursued non-agricultural occupations they were educationally more advanced than the Muslims of East Bengal and West Punjab who were poor peasants. Of all the religious communities, education was most widespread among Parsis followed by Jews and Jains.²⁰

The motive for the French establishing an extensive school system in Vietnam was different from that of either the British in India or the Spanish or the Americans in the Philippines. Manpower needs here were not important, nor was religious conversion, nor the desire to make Vietnam a showpiece for Asian democracy. On the eve of the French intervention, the traditional system of education, patterned on that of ancient China, included at the village level an estimated 20,000 one-teacher private schools, supplemented by state-supported provincial and district schools. At the summit of the system was the National College (*Quoe Tu Giam*) for royal princes and mandarins. One reason why the French gave importance to education was because teachers in the indigenous schools had played an important part in organising anti-French resistance. Many scholars relinquished government posts and retired to the villages and organised resistance to foreign rule. *Van Than* or the scholars' resistance was led by a mandarin Dr. Phan Dinn.²¹ Scholars and teachers were, therefore, regarded as dangerous to colonial rule.

The French were equally apprehensive of the Vietnamese having access to modern Western learning. In northern Vietnam "free schools" were started, the most important of which was the Dong Kinh Free School in Hanoi which opened in 1907. It had over a thousand students and its curriculum

included Chinese, Vietnamese, French and science. The French suppressed these schools and sent their organisers to jail.²² The Vietnamese retaliated by mobilising peasants to congregate in front of the offices of the French provincial *residents* demanding tax reduction and educational reforms. These mass demonstrations in Quang Nam provinces ended in bloodshed, many scholars being executed. In other provinces there were arrests. French authorities viewed with alarm the *Dong-De* (Eastward Movement), which sponsored Vietnamese to study at military academies in Japan. In 1905 the French made expulsion of Vietnamese students from Japan a condition for its loan to that country.²³

French schools had been established in a number of cities for the children of French residents. There were only fourteen secondary schools in the whole of Vietnam, including some excellent French *lycées*. Initially the Vietnamese elite had been suspicious of these schools and refused to send their children to them, but gradually, they became aware of the advantages of Western knowledge and began to send their children to these modern schools. Seats in these French schools were limited and by the early twentieth century children of Vietnamese civil servants, entrepreneurs, landed gentry and traditional elite began to outnumber the children of French residents. The latter naturally resented this and bitterly complained that the Vietnamese were usurping their rights to elite status by crowding French schools. They argued that the Vietnamese who had received French education would demand equality in access to government jobs and ultimately equality in making political decisions. They urged the Government to establish separate schools for the Vietnamese that would place them out of the competitive race for education as well as all the privileges that came from having received it.

Vietnamese traditional education and its role in anti-French resistance, initiatives to develop independent modern Vietnamese education and the growing Vietnamese competition with French *colons* for French education all provided the motive force for the emergence of a new educational policy and the development of a colonial school system.

The assumption behind the new education system introduced by the French colonial government for the Vietnamese was

that they were meant to be humble farmers and artisans who were to be taught rice-farming and certain crafts which they already knew and were not too keen to learn. Education had a vocational orientation but towards the traditional occupations. These French-Annamite schools were the only means by which the Vietnamese could educate themselves. In 1924 the government passed a law that required all educational institutions to fulfil certain conditions—adherence to the government curriculum, hiring only government trained teachers, permitting government inspection, etc. Vietnamese was the medium of instruction for the first three years. This language reform ensured that the Vietnamese would be at a disadvantage in entering French schools. Later two more years were added to Vietnamese education so that Vietnamese boys would be too old to join French schools by the time they completed their primary or secondary education. The government also made systematic attempts to cut off Western knowledge from Vietnamese students. It took measures to conceal as well as it could, all the democratic ideas set forth in the works of Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu. In the history books, chapters dealing with the French Revolution of 1789 were glossed over. The Franco-Annamite schools were not replicas of schools in France, nor even a diluted version but a distinct system devised for Vietnam.

Colonial schools were developed as substitutes for indigenous Vietnamese education and to preempt any independent Western or modern education being imparted. . . . If traditional education had not been the major mobilizing link in anti-French resistance and had it not retained, despite its failure, a potential to mobilize villages against colonial rule, education might not have become such a serious government concern. At the same time "modern" schools were politically suspect. A single university at Hanoi was founded in 1917 but was subsequently closed on several occasions because of students' political agitation. The colonial administration spent more than 15 per cent of its budget on education because it regarded education as a subject of crucial importance to colonial rule.

Traditionally, the Indonesians acquired their education in the *pesantren* (Islamic school) which emphasised religious

instruction.²⁴ Except for haphazard support of missionary schools, the United Dutch East India Company did not provide support for indigenous education. The Kingdom of the Netherlands, which assumed control over Indonesia in 1816 continued this policy until the late 1840s when it established a public elementary school in 1849 and a teacher training college in 1852. In 1854, the same year as Wood's famous Despatch on Indian Education, the Dutch government acknowledged its duty to provide schools for the "natives" but financial constraints delayed implementation. A Department of Education was set up in 1867 and the number of public schools for Indonesians increased somewhat rapidly after 1870. In 1864, the *Europeesche Lagre School* (Dutch elementary school) was opened to "qualified Indonesians". By 1900 1,870 Indonesians were studying in these schools.²⁵

Two new types of elementary schools were opened for Indonesians in 1893. The *Eerste Klasse* (First class) schools were for children of the aristocracy and well-to-do; the *Tweede Klasse* (Second class) schools were for the ordinary people. These schools did not expand mainly because of lack of funds and qualified teachers. A new experiment was tried in 1907 with the founding of the *Volksschool* (village school) which offered a three-year course, and for the first time introduced a western type of elementary education to the masses.²⁶

Thus like other colonial countries, Indonesia also had a dual educational system. For children in rural areas there was the *Volksschool* and the *Vervolgschool* (continuation school for three years) where the medium was Malay or a local language. The *Tweede Klasse* were for the common people in the cities. Pupils from these could proceed to commercial, technical or vocational schools where instruction was through the vernacular. For the children of Dutch settlers there were the Dutch Elementary Schools which were opened to Indonesians in 1864.²⁷

The ethical policy adopted by the Dutch colonial rulers around 1900 stressed the need for the moral and educational upliftment of the Indonesian people. The government also felt the need for Dutch speaking personnel. There was pressure from the Chinese and the Indonesians for greater facilities for education in Dutch. The Chinese made the government

establish the Dutch-Chinese School in 1908. This school served as the prototype for the Dutch-Indonesian School which replaced the *Eerste Klasse* school. Instruction here was in the local language in the lower classes but shifted to Dutch later on. Students who passed out of these schools could proceed to Dutch high schools.²⁸

At the secondary level the education system was identical for everyone. But the high schools which were similar to those in the Netherlands had rather high standards and hence a heavy failure rate. An alternative type of high schools were started specifically for the Chinese and the Indonesians where courses were easier and some foreign languages optional. But the older schools still attracted more pupils because of the prestige attached to them and because they led to better job opportunities.

University education was introduced very late in Indonesia. A College of Engineering was founded in 1920 in Bandung. A Law College and a Medical College were established in Batavia in 1924 and 1927 respectively. There were only a handful of graduates when Indonesia attained independence.

Schools which offered instruction through Dutch were popular, the motive being almost entirely socio-economic, since knowledge of the language of the rulers was the gateway to jobs in the modern sector of the economy and in the government. The number of such jobs was limited and the Dutch educated Indonesians soon outnumbered the employment available. Yet the attraction for this type of education continued. As in India, so here also the government feared the creation of a discontented intellectual proletariat. But in Indonesia, unlike in India, the top of the educational pyramid was very narrow. The rate of dropouts in high schools was very high because of high standards, the difficulty of studying through a foreign medium and high fees.

The majority of Indonesian pupils were children of wage earners, the bulk of whom were government servants. The parents of Chinese students were, on the other hand, usually self-employed in trade and industry. Education through the Dutch language was primarily sought by those who from birth had been raised in an atmosphere of officialdom. Those who received such an education seldom returned to the villages or

to the traditional occupations. They were absorbed in the new occupations in the cities.

The colonial situations thus varied and no one educational model can fit all. The motives for introducing education were not everywhere identical. In India administrative considerations were predominant; but in Vietnam manpower needs were not important and the French interest in education sprang mainly from political motives. In the Philippines, for the Spanish, religious conversion was the *raison d'être* for introducing education, while the English East India Company opposed the entry of Christian missionaries into India. The Americans were keen on spreading literacy in the Philippines for human resource development, while the British South African Company in Southern Rhodesia did not want to promote education as it would create a literate and skilled labour force which would compete with the semi-educated and semi-skilled European labourers.²⁹ In the Philippines, Americans encouraged mass education with a view to pave the way for democracy, the French wanted to keep ideas of democracy and self-government as far away from the Vietnamese as possible. In every case, however, colonial education policy reflected the needs of the colonial power.

Motives largely determined the type of education that was introduced in the different colonies. If the colonial power wanted clerks one type of education was introduced, if they wanted skilled labour, another type was favoured and yet another if the need was for plantation labour. In India, higher education was emphasized but this was not so in the Philippines or Vietnam, in Indonesia or Malaysia.³⁰ In many African colonies and in South East Asia, the British discouraged higher education after their Indian experience.³¹ In Southern Rhodesia, the University was established only in 1955, and that too because of pressure from poor white settlers who could not afford to send their children to England.³² When the Belgian Congo gained independence in 1960, there were only a handful of college graduates.

In India, education was academic with a literary bias but in the Philippines and Vietnam vocational schools were encouraged. In many African colonies, the local people were trained as artisans and farmers to ensure that their education would

in no way enable them to compete with Europeans. By vocational education the colonial powers meant work and craft schools. The latter would teach carpentry, weaving, pottery, smithy work, etc. Nowhere was higher technical education encouraged as the policy was to keep colonised countries industrially under-developed.

The language of the colonial power was introduced as a medium of instruction in all colonies. There was, however, a slight withdrawal from the initial emphasis on the foreign medium when it was found that knowledge of English or French familiarised the local population with ideas of liberty or made them potential competitors for superior jobs reserved for Europeans. There were attempts to de-emphasise English in India.³³ Similar efforts were made by the French in Vietnam. In Malaysia also the British made attempts to popularise Malay vernacular education.³⁴

Nowhere were these attempts successful because a knowledge of the language of the rulers, be it English, French or Dutch, was necessary for employment and was the official language in which government business was conducted. In most colonial countries there developed a dual system of education—one for the elite and the other for the masses. The privileged groups went to the foreign medium schools and colleges which in turn enabled them to join the professions or the bureaucracy.

Everywhere the foreign medium schools and colleges were located in the cities. As regards the income groups and occupations of the parents of students, it was mainly government servants, professional people, landowners and traders who sent their children to these new educational institutions. In India, there was a close connection between the membership of the new educated groups and membership of high castes. In Vietnam it was sons of mandarins and landlords who were the first to absorb Western knowledge in the Franco-Annamite schools and later at Hanoi University.³⁵ People in the colonies joined the new educational institutions because this was a means for entering government service and professions such as law, medicine, teaching or journalism. Education also helped upward social mobility.

In all colonial countries there soon appeared fairly well

educated groups consisting of teachers, lawyers, journalists, writers and civil servants. Western education provided one important style in which opposition to colonial rule developed in most countries of Asia and Africa. The language of the rulers became the medium between men drawn from different parts of the country, and also the language of dialogue between them and the government. The connection between Western education and the rise of non-European nationalisms is palpable when these movements are examined on a world scale.

Russia, Japan, China, the African countries, the Islamic world, South and South-East Asia have all had at the starting point of the process of modernization a fairly numerous and differentiated educated elite.²⁶ The early years of the twentieth century saw the emergence of nationalism in many Asian and African countries. It was in the Imperial Lycee of Galatsary in Istambul, in the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, in the Universities of Hanoi and Manila, Calcutta and Cairo, that the first signs of discontent appeared. Mustafa Kemal, Murad Bey, Jamal-ud-Afghani, Jose Burges, Rizal, Gandhi and Nehru all belonged to a Western educated intelligentsia.

It is when colonial educational processes are placed in a historical and comparative perspective that their true significance becomes apparent. They were closely connected with the first tentative moves to adjust or remove the control of European powers. In this sense a study of colonial education explains the rise of movements which were to end the expansion of Europe.

But in a larger sense the importance of this educational process goes beyond the mere political changes which were to lead to the transfer of power. Over and above the growing challenge which education was able to throw out to Western rule lies its role in modernizing the countries of Asia and Africa. While a Westernised elite emerged which pioneered social and political reform movements, education through a foreign medium helped to preserve and increase the gulf between this class and the masses. Their role as modernisers was restricted under conditions of colonial rule where the economy was static and not being modernised except in a very small sector. The impact of these modernising movements, therefore,

COLONIAL EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

was narrow and limited. Educational policies and systems in a colonial context were beset with various inherent contradictions.

REFERENCES

1. An English version of the decree is reproduced in Galong (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Philippines*.
2. Jose S. Arcilla, "Philippines Education: Some Observations from History" in *Philippines Studies*, Vol. 20, 1972.
3. G.M. Kahin (ed.), *Governments and Politics of South-East Asia*, New York, 1964, pp. 691-92.
4. D. Foley, "Colonialism and Schooling in the Philippines from 1898 to 1970" in G. Altbach and G.P. Kelly (ed), *Education and Colonialism*, New York, 1978.
5. Kahin, *op. cit.*, p. 691-2.
6. G.M. Young (ed.), *Speeches of Macaulay*, London, 1935, p. 135.
7. C. E. Trevelyan, *On the Education of the People of India*, London, 1838, pp. 189-90.
8. Charles Grant, "Observation on the State of Society Among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain . . .", written in 1792 this is printed in the Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Affairs of the East India Company. 18, 32, . . . , Appendix, I, pp. 82-87.
9. H. Sharp, (ed.), *Selections from Educational Records, Pt. I, 1781-1839*, Calcutta, 1920, p. 22.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
11. *Year Book of Education*, London, 1938, pp. 37-131.
12. *Progress of Education in the Asian Region: A Statistical Review*. UNESCO, Bangkok, 1969.
13. A. Basu, *The Growth of Education and Political Development in India*, O.U.P. 1974, pp. 6-12.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-42.
15. *Ibid.*, p.48.
16. A. Misra, *Educational Finance in India*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 550, 555, 568.
17. *Census of India, 1931*, Vol. I, pt. I, P. 326.
Literacy per mille aged 5 and over:
Cochin — 368
Travancore — 289
Bengal — 111
Bombay — 108
Madras — 108
U.P. — 55
Bihar & Orissa — 53
18. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

Literacy by caste, literates per mille.

Higher Castes	Baidya	—	782 (males)
	Nayar	—	603
	Kayastha	—	607
	Brahmin	—	437
Low Castes	Doms	—	16
	Dhed	—	16
	Bhil	—	11
Scheduled Caste	Chamar	—	10

19. *Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. II, Broach Bombay, 1877, p. 526, Vol. IV; Ahmedabad, Bombay, 1879, pp. 34-35.*
20. Literacy per 1,000 aged 5 and over was:
- | | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Parsis | — | 791 |
| Jews | — | 416 |
| Jains | — | 353 |
| Christians | — | 279 |
| Sikhs | — | 91 |
| Hindus | — | 84 |
| Muslims | — | 66. |
- Census of India, 1931, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 329.*
21. Helen B. Lamb, *Vietnam's Will To Live: Resistance to Foreign Aggression from Early Times Through the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1972.
22. Hoang Van Chi, *From Colonialism to Communism*, London, 1964, pp. 15-16, 36.
23. Gail P. Kelly, "Colonial Schools in Vietnam", in *Education and Colonialism* ed. by Altbach and Kelly, *op. cit.*
24. J.S. Furnivall, *Educational Progress in Southeast Asia*, New York, 1943, pp. 14-15.
25. Netherlands Indies, *Rapport Pauparisme-Commissie*, Vol. B, pp. 9, 64-65.
26. Netherlands Indies, *Hollandsch-Inlandsch Onderwijs-Commissie, Publicaties*, No.9, Part 2, pp. 15-16, 44-47.
27. Paul W. van der Veur, *Education and Social Change in Colonial Indonesia*, Papers in International Studies: Southeast Asia Series No. 12, Ohio University, p. 2.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
29. Rungeno Zvobgo, "Racism and Education in Southern Rhodesia" (1880-1965). Unpublished M. Phil. Dissertation, J.N.U., 1977, p. 28.
30. Raffles College, which formed the nucleus of the future university was established in Singapore only in 1929. Francis Wong Hoy Kee, *Education in Malaysia*, Kuala Lumpur, 1975, p. 83.
31. Lord Lugard, Ormsby Gore, Oldham were all anxious to avoid the growth of political consciousness which in India appeared to be a result of higher education. Cmd. 2374, "Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa". See Also Gunn, L.H. and Galfand, M. *Huggins of Rhodesia*, London, 1962, p. 134.

32. R. Zvobgo, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
33. Efforts were made during Lord Curzon's administration to encourage the vernaculars as medium at the primary stage but these were resented by educated Indians. A. Basu, *op. cit.* pp. 74-77.
34. Francis Wong Hoy Kee, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
35. Hoang Van Chi, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
36. J.S. Coleman, ed., *Education and Political Development*, Princeton, 1965. N. Biggerstaff, *The Earliest Modern Government Schools in China*, Cornell, 1961. Teng Ssu-yu J.K. Fairbanks, *China's Response To The West*, Harvard, 1954.
- A. Southall, ed., *Social Changes in Modern Africa*, London, 1961.
- J.S. Coleman, *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism*, California, 1958.
- L. Binder, *Iran; Political Development in a Changing Society, Modernizing the Middle East*, Illinois, 1956; V. Thompson and R. Adloff, *Cultural Institutions and Educational Policy in South East Asia*, New York, 1958. J.M. Van der Kroef. "Educational Development and Social Change in Indonesia," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVI, 1954. E.H. Reischer, *Nationalism and Education Since 1789*, New York, 1922.