Learning Abroad

Learning Abroad:
A History of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan

By

Hilary Perraton

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

PUBLISHING

Learning Abroad: A History of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan,
by Hilary Perraton

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-0600-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-0600-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Nuffield Foundation, the British Academy with the Association of Commonwealth Universities, and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of the government of Canada, who together funded the research reported here. I am also grateful for the support of the von Hügel Institute of St Edmund's College, Cambridge where it was based.

Without the encouragement of my wife, Jean, the book would have been much more difficult to write, without her company my life immeasurably less rich. Many others have provided help, support, critique, and advice. First among these are the research colleagues who worked with me: Suzanne Lawrence, appointed by the government of Canada as the George Curtis Memorial Commonwealth Fellow to work on the project, who did all the hard work in Cambridge; Helen Connell, Candice Harrison-Train, Surinder Jodhka, Charles Levi, Reehana Raza and Pat Stafford, who wrote country studies, and Monica Darnbrough who looked at the British programme of medical awards. I have a particular debt to those who welcomed and supported the idea of the project from its early stages; they include David Bridges, Trudy Harpham, John Kirkland, Don McKinnon and Rémi Tremblay. Colleagues at the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission and the Association of Commonwealth Universities helped with information and with their interest; an incomplete list includes Rachel Day, Sabina Ebbols, Jonathan Jenkins, Jocelyn Law, Natasha Lockhun, Anna O'Flynn, Tim Shaw, Julie Stackhouse and Tim Unwin. Nick Mulhern, the ACU librarian, consistently went the extra league in a way that marks his profession and I have also benefited from the help of librarians and archivists at the National Archives, Senate House Library of the University of London, the Institute of Education, and the Cambridge University Library. The book would not exist without the comments of all those whom we interviewed and with whom we corresponded. I am also grateful for help, at home and abroad, and in various ways, from others who include in particular Charlotte Creed, Kate Crofts, Pat Gouldstone, Peter Hetherington, Jennifer Humphries, Gail Larose, Brian Long, Woodville Marshall, Kees Maxey, Jasbir Singh, Malcolm Skilbeck, Edgar Temple, and Peter Williams. All those mentioned are, of course, absolved from responsibility for errors which are all my own.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACU	Association of Commonwealth Universities
agm	agendum
AUBC	Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CASF	Commonwealth Academic Staff Fellowship
CASS	Commonwealth Academic Staff Scholarship
CBIE	Canadian Bureau for International Education
CEM	Report of Commonwealth Education Meeting/Conference of Education Ministers
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CRO	Commonwealth Relations Office
CSC	Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the UK
CSCAR	Annual report of Commonwealth Scholarship Commission
CSCM	Minutes of Commonwealth Scholarship Commission
CSFP	Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan
CSFPAR	Annual report of CSFP
DfID	Department for International Development
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FRS	Fellow of the Royal Society
LAC	Library and Archives Canada
LP	Logan papers
NA	National Archives
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
ODM	Ministry of Overseas Development
ODNB	*Oxford dictionary of national biography*
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PDC	Parliamentary debates—House of Commons
PDL	Parliamentary debates—House of Lords
PhD	Doctor of philosophy
Rev	Ten-year review
SCSM	Report of Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility
UDI	Unilateral Declaration of Independence
UTA	University of Toronto Archives
WW	*Who's Who; Who was Who*

INTRODUCTION

In 1960, 297 young men and 38 young women left home to study abroad under the newly launched Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. Most of them went to Britain, Canada or Australia, smaller numbers to Hong Kong, Malaya, New Zealand, South Africa and the Central African Federation; they included a future Sri Lankan astronomer, a South African judge, a West Indian pro-vice-chancellor, and future professors by the dozen. Some 25,000 have since followed their examples. Many went on to academic careers; a smaller number have become ministers and prime ministers; others have attained fame or notoriety in journalism and the arts; some became political prisoners, some poets; a few have combined several of these achievements. This book tells their story.

The scholarship plan (CSFP) was set up in the afterglow of empire and at the dawn of the new Commonwealth. A meeting of Commonwealth trade ministers, held in Montreal in 1958, and a Commonwealth education conference in Oxford a year later, agreed that a reciprocal programme of scholarships would bind Commonwealth countries so that "their people should be able to share as widely as possible in the advantages of education". This was described as "the first occasion on which a concerted effort at mutual help has been made by all the Commonwealth countries in collaboration". The aim was to make awards to "men and women of high intellectual promise who may be expected to make a significant contribution to life in their own countries on their return from study overseas".[1]

The idea was a simple one. Under a vaguely defined, but much vaunted, Commonwealth umbrella, individual Commonwealth countries would offer scholarships to young people, or fellowships to people in mid-career, from other Commonwealth countries. Most of the scholars were to be postgraduates with undergraduate awards generally reserved for countries with no home university. The country offering awards would pay all the costs for the scholars it was hosting, including transport, subsistence and university fees. The country nominating scholars was to identify short lists of applicants and send these to the awarding countries which would make the final selection—a responsibility they closely guarded. There was no central mechanism so that, while the plan was multilateral in its scope, and its intentions, it was bilateral in its operation. Each awarding country decided how many scholars or fellows it wanted to invite from each other

Commonwealth country. A Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee in London kept the statistics, until it handed the job over to the newly established Commonwealth Secretariat in 1967. It had nothing to do with policy which remained with individual governments.

Each country set up its own arrangements to administer the plan. This was done at arm's length from government in the four rich Commonwealth countries. Britain set up a Commonwealth Scholarship Commission while Australia, Canada and New Zealand appointed committees, mainly of university representatives, to choose scholars and fellows and to guide or determine policy. In most other countries the ministry of education took on the job of selecting nominees and, for countries offering them, of placing scholars for their own awards.

The plan began with a flourish. By 1965 some eighteen Commonwealth countries had given awards and just over 1,000 scholars and fellows were holding them. Since then Britain, Canada and India have offered the largest number of awards, followed by Australia and New Zealand. Most scholars have travelled from the south to the north, but about a quarter of the total have travelled between the four industrialised countries.[2] Smaller numbers have travelled, within the south, between Commonwealth developing countries, or from the north to the south. The plan grew in scale till the mid-1990s, even as the Commonwealth changed and as the costs of international study increased in response to widespread inflation in the 1970s and policy changes on university funding in the 1980s. The number of award holders reached a peak in the 1990s after which totals declined and the number of countries offering awards fell to six. In the present century numbers have risen again, encouraging Commonwealth education ministers to agree new targets for the plan's expansion, despite a withdrawal by Australia and proposals to cut funding in turn by Canada and Britain.

The plan has always had its critics and sceptics who have brought three main charges against it. The first is that it has been dominated by the north and contributed to the brain drain, enabling the best scholars to study and then to stay in the north. A series of studies attempting to discover how far scholars returned home demonstrates the seriousness with which the charge has been taken. Second, it has been accused of elitism and irrelevance, of meeting the needs of an elite, or easing access to one, rather than addressing greater national needs. In the early years of the plan, for example, rich countries insisted on giving postgraduate awards when many in the south wanted lower-level scholarships. Third, bias has been suspected or identified. Accusations of bias have been made against nominating countries and their agencies, and of favouring those drawn from existing elites,

with selection influenced by cronyism, class, region or ethnicity. More generally, the plan has never achieved gender balance, and has been steadily criticised for this, as the proportion of women given awards has slowly risen from less than 12 to more than 40 per cent.

Against these criticisms, and against major changes in the Commonwealth and its university systems, the plan's survival as an oddly uncoordinated set of bilateral programmes, with a shared name and even purpose, provoke three questions about its history: what is it for, how has it changed, and what has it achieved? Their answers, the theme of this book, illuminate the politics of the Commonwealth, as well as the sociology and educational history of individual member countries.

The next chapter examines how the plan was set up and describes the various programmes of scholarships and fellowships that have been offered, by Commonwealth member countries, as it has evolved. Chapter 2 then looks at the development of the plan, and the resolution of tensions within it, in the context of Commonwealth universities and of international student mobility. The next three chapters set out the history of the plan within its political environment, examining the plan's purposes as well as its achievements . As Britain has been the largest player, chapters 3 and 4 do this by examining the British record, and the nature and work of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission, in the light of British policy towards the Commonwealth, towards aid, and towards its own universities. Chapter 5 looks in the same way at the Commonwealth itself and at the changing policies of the other rich Commonwealth countries, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, exploring the interplay between national and Commonwealth priorities. Chapter 6 moves south to examine policies in the developing Commonwealth and at the role and achievements of the plan in university development. Case studies of two regions, India and the eastern Caribbean, and of one unusual mode of scholarships, using distance learning, illuminate the record. Study abroad is likely to be a formative experience, important for its process as well as its structure and paper trail of qualifications: these are the themes of chapter 7 which asks who the scholars and fellows were, and examines what they studied, and what it was like to do so, as they went on their travels. Chapter 8 then follows them home, or explores why they did not go home, in asking about the effects of international study on their careers, a necessary part of any assessment. That general assessment is then made in the concluding chapter 9.

CHAPTER ONE

LAUNCH: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING

The story begins in Canada. To general surprise John Diefenbaker, a lawyer from the prairies of Saskatchewan, won the 1957 election, becoming the first conservative Canadian prime minister in twenty-two years. He was lucky in his timing; Canada's economy was to flourish in the last years of the 1950s, encouraging the false hope that it had emerged from a lacklustre cycle. To sustain the prosperity Diefenbaker needed to find a role for a country of only 20 million in a world dominated by markets of 100 million or more.[1]

With America an unsettling giant to the south, Britain still the custodian of sterling and of much of the empire across the Atlantic, and the Common Market an unknown quantity six months away, the Commonwealth had economic as well as political appeal. Joe Garner, then British high commissioner in Ottawa and later to chair the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission, saw this time as,

> the apogee of the Commonwealth idea. The [Commonwealth Prime Ministers'] meeting in the summer of 1957 was held in circumstances of easy familiarity and some enthusiasm, engendered by the apocalyptic appearance of Diefenbaker, breathless from his surprise electoral triumph in Canada. Eager to exploit the full potentiality of Commonwealth collaboration, Diefenbaker invited a special Conference to meet in Montreal in 1958 which registered a high point in post-war cooperation. Not only Ghana (now a full member) but also many Colonial Territories attended and the Conference looked forward hopefully to a steady expansion of Commonwealth membership.[2]

The Commonwealth trade and economic conference had grand ambitions. Diefenbaker hoped that some variant of imperial preference could preserve a Commonwealth trading block and protect Canadian sales of wheat. He took to the conference a series of economic proposals, all of which the British treasury disliked. Three of them, more Canadian technical assistance, aid to the West Indies, and expansion of the Colombo plan, were dismissed as "chicken feed". The fourth, about setting up a Com-

monwealth development bank was worse, involving the investment of more British than Canadian funds so that "we pay the price for the success of their conference".[3] The lack of agreement meant that the conference's long-term achievements were different and more modest. One was to agree on an international coaxial-cable network, which had been considered by a Commonwealth telecommunications conference, and crept on to the agenda even though the British thought it not worth discussing.[4] Another was to conceive of a Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. The British went along with this idea; education was safer and cheaper than Diefenbaker's grander plans. The scholarship plan was to be approved by trade ministers in Montreal and established the following year, this time by a Commonwealth educational conference.

In Britain, Harold Macmillan's government was enjoying a similar interlude of prosperity which was to lead him to an election victory in October 1959 on the prospectus that "you've never had it so good". The Commonwealth was demanding his attention too, as twenty-four colonies and protectorates were to leave British rule between Ghana in 1957 and Aden ten years later. Cabinet meetings, with a secretary of state for Commonwealth affairs alongside the foreign secretary and colonial secretary, regularly considered Commonwealth matters. Macmillan had a patrician air, with his cleverness concealed behind drooping eyelids, and his complexity revealed by his balanced references to his crofter grandfather and his links to the Duke of Devonshire. As prime minister he was willing to preside over the dismantling of the British empire, which Churchill had foresworn, and was persuaded by his colonial secretary, Iain Macleod, to do so at breathtaking speed and with unexpected skill. Macleod had sharpened his skills of calculation as a professional bridge player and gambler in the 1930s and of negotiation at the ministry of labour in the 1950s. He later claimed that, "the change of policy that I introduced in October 1959 was, on the surface, merely a change of timing. In reality, of course, it was a true change of policy, but I telescoped events rather than created new ones".[5]

Like Diefenbaker, Macmillan started out with an attachment to the Commonwealth though he stopped enjoying its meetings when they shifted from being a "small and pleasant country-house party" to a "sort of miniature United Nations".[6] Relations with America needed to recover from the Suez crisis. Europe did not seem that important. The Commonwealth still did. In the cold war of the late 1950s, it was seen, despite India's neutrality, as ideologically part of the west. "Indeed this was the major function of the Commonwealth fifteen years after the war: keeping out of the 'Communist clutches' a large part of 'the world's more backward

populations'".[7] The cold war seeped into educational politics: George Curtis, a Canadian academic who was floating the idea of a scholarship plan in 1958, argued for expanding postgraduate education as a response to Russia's launch of the first-ever satellite, sputnik.[8]

Britain's position in the world, or at least her self-importance, flowed from her imperial past and it was confidently and naively expected that these would be sustained by the creation of an independent Commonwealth. It was not to be. Hoping to retain the cosiness of Commonwealth meetings, attended by a handful of countries, the British tried to find a formula for a two-tier Commonwealth. The formula could not be made to fit Cyprus which, with a population of less than 600,000, joined the Commonwealth on its independence in 1960. Macmillan grumbled that this precedent would change its nature: "was it to be the R.A.C. or Boodles?" If Cyprus was admitted "all the other tiddlers would demand this treatment".[9] Worse was to come as:

> It was splendid when India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Ghana, Malaya and Nigeria joined the Commonwealth, hitherto a white man's club. But far from the Commonwealth proving to be a buttress in its post-colonial era, as was confidently expected, it turned out to be instead a new, unplanned, and quite major area in which Britain found itself pilloried.[10]

But this is to anticipate. In 1959, as the brides of the Commonwealth were shopping for their gowns, their beauty was admired from the right, because of their imperial past, and from the left, because of their radiant and independent future. It was a good time for a party and a wedding present.

Setting up the plan

The Earl of Halifax, as chancellor of the university, hosted the party held in Oxford in July 1959. Labelled the first Commonwealth education conference in Commonwealth mythology, which conveniently forgets imperial educational conferences in the 1920s, it brought together delegates from the eleven Commonwealth member countries and representatives—a subtle difference—from the colonial empire, from Aden through Northern Borneo and Sarawak, to Zanzibar. They were mainly educators, and nearly all men. The conference received from the Montreal trade ministers the proposal for a scholarship plan to which Britain and Canada were already committed. It had taken time and diplomacy to widen support for it. Early discussions suggested there was only lukewarm interest in a plan concentrating on university exchanges. Australia and New Zealand had different priorities that included training for the civil service. India did not want it

limited to university staff; it too wanted awards for civil servants and more and better teachers. Malaya's priorities were for temporary staff for new universities, teacher trainers, and scientists. The Canadians at this point wanted to use some of their funds to send Canadians abroad: nobody else seemed to like this idea.[11] Despite the various reservations, by the summer of 1959 Britain had pledged 500 awards, Canada 250, Australia 100 and India 50.[12]

The origins of the proposal are contested with at least four Canadian academics having or laying a claim to its paternity. Sidney Smith, the foreign minister and former president of Toronto University, launched the idea in Montreal. He talked about university exchange in an address to a Commonwealth universities' congress on 1 September 1958 but in such general terms that his audience did not realise there was a specific proposal for activity.[13] Within two weeks he made the same proposal to the trade conference in much more specific terms. In an interview in 2005 George Curtis, who had been dean of law at the University of British Columbia, talked about his discussions with other academics and with civil servants and claimed, of the plan, "it was thought up by me in 1958". His claim may be weakened by his mistaken recollection that it had got into the Montreal report because of a casual remark by one of the Canadian civil servants to Sir Henry Lintott of the British delegation; Lintott had in fact been at the centre of extensive earlier discussions (see chapter 3). Curtis went on to chair the 1959 conference committee that shaped the plan.[14] His own vice-chancellor, Norman Mackenzie, had staked his claim in 1959, explaining that "it was he who produced the Canadian plan and sold it to 'his ex-fellow Vice-Chancellor' Sidney Smith". As he went on to complain about the presence of 500 undergraduates from Trinidad in his own university, his commitment to student mobility looks thinner than Curtis's.[15] Tom Symons, who was to become the founding vice-chancellor of Trent University, has a stronger claim. He was a friend and adviser to Sidney Smith and at his request drafted a brief for him in May 1958. It contained many of the features that were to find their way into the plan: bilateral exchanges, support from both governments and universities, open competition for "excellence in any field", its value as a means of strengthening universities and its potential for fostering "knowledge and understanding of the Commonwealth itself".[16] After fifty years paternity may not matter. The various claims demonstrate both early enthusiasm for the plan and the fact that the promotion of international university exchange was then a shared part of academic discourse.

Smith, Symons and Curtis had similar views of the plan's purpose. Both Curtis and Symons had benefited from scholarships as postgraduate

students, which had taken them to Europe and sent them back with a common commitment to internationalism. In his speech to Commonwealth universities Smith spoke of the role of Commonwealth universities in the "acquisition of common attitudes by students and potential leaders from dissimilar and diverse origins" and went on to argue:

> that the free flow and exchange of ideas has been and will continue to be one of the strongest bonds among the Commonwealth's members. To encourage and facilitate this flow even further, I believe that a programme of exchange of Commonwealth university and staff, particularly at the graduate level, should be promoted. Such a programme should reflect the pattern already established; rather than the one-way traffic of an earlier time, our exchanges must be multilateral in character.[17]

Symons and Smith had earlier agreed how important it was to "enlarge the concept of the numbers and range of student exchange and that every country and every society had a big stake in this". Symons recalled Smith arguing that "what we need … is something that will involve many countries, many continents and many cultures, and the best vehicle to have is the Commonwealth".[18]

These were the ideas that were carried from Montreal to Oxford. Alongside a British pledge to support teacher training in the developing Commonwealth, the conference endorsed the Montreal recommendations, arguing that:

> The Commonwealth is a new experiment in human relationship. It is founded on a belief in the worth and dignity of the human individual and a recognition of the value of freedom and cooperative action. The end of all our Commonwealth endeavour is the good life—material and spiritual—and the happiness of the 600 million individuals who are its citizens.
>
> The good life and happiness can be attained only through education in the deeper and wider sense. Freedom from want demands the application of technical skills of ever-increasing complexity. The stability of our democratic way of life requires maturity of judgment in the citizen that can come only from a good general education. The increasing pace of development and the growing interdependence of modern society call for the highest intellectual and moral qualities. Above all it is through a sound and balanced education that the individual must seek the fulfilment of his personality and the enrichment of his life.[19]

The aim was to establish 1,000 scholarships with the British providing half and the Canadians a quarter of the total and the rest made up by Australia, India, Pakistan, New Zealand, Malaya, Ghana, the Central African Federation, Ceylon and East Africa. It had to be multilateral:

> It is of special importance that the CSFP should pay great attention to the needs of the economically less developed countries, where educational facilities and opportunities are at present less amply provided. But educational interchange between all the countries of the Commonwealth is essential if we are to get the best out of the Plan and to share to the full the benefits of the special experience and facilities which our countries possess. Each has something to learn from the others; each has something to give. If the Plan is to achieve its purpose, we must bring the widest possible variety of cultural exchange between all parts of the Commonwealth and so facilitate the development of a multilateral trade in ideas.[20]

With this in mind, the Oxford conference identified five principles for the plan, which have remained as a formal commitment ever since:

> the Plan should be additional to, and distinct from, any other plan in operation;
>
> the Plan should be based on mutual cooperation and the sharing of educational experience among all the nations of the Commonwealth;
>
> the Plan should be sufficiently flexible, to take account of the diverse and changing needs of Commonwealth countries;
>
> while the Plan will be Commonwealth-wide, it should be operated on the basis of a series of bilateral agreements to allow for the necessary flexibility;
>
> awards should be designed to recognise and promote the highest standards of intellectual achievement.[21]

Scholarship programmes may have one or more distinct raisons d'être. Some have aimed for educational redistribution, seeking the most disadvantaged students. (This was never a purpose of CSFP and there is no evidence that any of the agencies involved with it wanted the job of means testing applicants for awards.) Some have been overtly political, hoping to influence scholars and their attitudes throughout their working life. Some have been concerned with the interests of the institution or country from which scholars are drawn, others with those of the institution to which they are going. Some have been limited, concentrating on particular disciplines or institutions, others open to all comers. The Oxford principles did not explore any of these and left further policy decisions to individual Commonwealth countries.

The statements of high purpose also left undecided who should run the plan. As the Commonwealth Secretariat was still seven years in the future there were no Commonwealth mechanisms to implement conference recommendations. Smith had worried about the danger of setting up a large bureaucracy for the plan and instead welcomed a suggestion of Symons' "using the phrase of the president of Harvard … 'Each tub on its own bottom'; good philosophy I think".[22] Following that precept, practical arrangements were to rest with individual member states. Each member country would fund the awards it was offering, would determine how many there should be, and how it should identify and nominate scholars for awards offered by other countries. "Special agencies should be set up in the various Commonwealth countries to select scholars for their own awards and to nominate scholars for awards to other countries".[23] Most countries arranged for the ministry of education to be the nominating agency which selected the first, long-list, of applicants to be forwarded to the awarding country in the two-stage selection process. Canada gave the job to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and created a committee of academics to guide policy. Australia and New Zealand set up advisory committees of university teachers. Britain set up a free-standing scholarship commission. This followed the precedent of the Marshall commission, set up in 1953 to manage scholarships commemorating the Marshall Plan, and was perhaps the only possibility: government did not want the plan to belong to the universities, which ruled out a university agency, while the ministry of education at that time had minimal responsibilities in higher education. By 1960 the first scholars were on their way, by plane or ship. The largest cohort came to Britain where the scholarship commission sent welcoming parties to Heathrow and Tilbury.

The Oxford conference agreed there might be two kinds of award. Most would be scholarships, generally for those working towards a degree. But the conference also agreed that "a limited number of awards should be made to senior scholars of established reputation and achievement. These we call Commonwealth Visiting Fellowships". Scholarships and fellowships have had differing histories.

Scholarships

The programme of scholarships developed on the lines agreed at Oxford though on a slightly reduced scale. In its first decade Britain usually awarded between 200 and 250 scholarships a year, Canada about a hundred, Australia thirty to forty, India about twenty and New Zealand about twelve. At any one time there were between 500 and 1,000 scholars and

fellows holding awards. From the outset Britain has been the largest player with its contribution to the plan managed by the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission. While numbers have changed, scholarships to individual students have continued to this day as the mainstay of the plan.

Alongside the general scholarships, a number of more specialist programmes have been established within the framework of the plan. In 1965 Britain hosted a Commonwealth medical conference in Edinburgh and, flushed with the apparent success of the scholarship plan, announced a set of medical awards to strengthen medical education, particularly, but not solely, in the developing Commonwealth. Alongside a new programme of medical fellowships, medical scholars were for doctors seeking a postgraduate qualification.[24] The programme ran till a government review of the commission's work in 1993 could find no strong case for medicine to be separated out from other disciplines. Britain was still in an expansionist mood in 1968 when, at a Commonwealth education conference in Lagos, it announced a set of awards targeted at universities. Again these were at two levels, Commonwealth Academic Staff Scholarships (CASS) and Commonwealth Academic Staff Fellowships (CASF). The scholarships were targeted at young university staff in developing-country universities who needed a PhD. Candidates were nominated directly by universities, rather than through the nominating agencies which, by this time, were mainly ministries of education. As set out in table 1.1, Britain usually funded up to thirty medical scholars and thirty to sixty CASS scholars each year.

No new scholarship programmes were to be introduced for another thirty years until in 1998 Canada launched a small programme of distance-learning scholarships. The programme ran for four years and allowed seventy-seven students in the Caribbean to follow Canadian undergraduate degrees in computer science, teacher education and tourism management. For the most part they studied at a distance but all came to Canada for one semester of full-time study. Britain followed this Canadian lead and launched a distance-learning programme in 2002, like Canada seeking to base this on partnerships between home and overseas universities. Although launched with a "new initiative" label and dubbed experimental, the distance-learning programme seemed by 2008 to have become a regular part of the commission's work. In contrast there has been no successor to the Canadian programme.[25]

Throughout the history of the plan Britain, Canada, Australia and India have been the largest awarding countries. New Zealand and Trinidad have consistently offered awards, as did Hong Kong till it left the Commonwealth in 1997. Others have come and gone. South Africa, Pakistan and Nigeria all offered awards until they left the Commonwealth—Pakistan has

Table 1.1 New awards of scholarships, by awarding country

	Average number of new awards made per annum				
	1960s	**1970s**	**1980s**	**1990s**	**2000s[a]**
Britain – general scholars	199	179	216	206	196
academic scholars	n/a	36	63	57	29
medical scholars	30	29	19	12	
distance learning scholars					161
split-site scholars					24
Canada	92	81	116	88	57
Australia	35	32	38	13	2
India	19	25	20	22	28
New Zealand	9	10	14	14	14
Nigeria	4	5	3	2	
Hong Kong	2	3	4	2	
Malaysia	3	2	1		9
Sri Lanka	2	3	2	<1	
Ghana	<1	3		0	<1
Trinidad		<1	1	1	2
Pakistan	3				
Jamaica	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Brunei				3	4
Malta	<1	<1	<1		<1
South Africa	<1				<1
Mauritius					<1
Botswana					<1
Sierra Leone	<1		<1		
East Africa	1		<1		
Zimbabwe	2				
Total	404	409	500	420	523

Source: CSFPAR, CEM, various dates, ACU database
Note. Years not reported are not included in averages
a. Generally for awards to 2005 but taking account only of years specialised programmes were running.

done it more than once—but only South Africa began offering awards again after its return. The small states of the Commonwealth have offered a small number of awards on a sporadic basis. Despite Trinidad's example, Jamaica has followed suit sometimes, Barbados never. Before a handful of new awards from Botswana, Ghana, Mauritius and South Africa, Africa had almost fallen away as an awarding continent whereas, in the first decades, Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Uganda were all making awards.

The total number of scholars rose from the early 1960s and remained at about same level through much of the 1970s and 1980s, despite changes in member states, in the Commonwealth, and in the pattern of funding for higher education. Industrialised Commonwealth countries began to charge full-cost fees for overseas students in the 1980s but budgets generally were adjusted to match (see chapter 4). At the 1984 conference of Commonwealth education ministers Canada offered to increase her awards from 300 to 500 and thirteen countries pledged to offer awards for the first time or increase the number on offer. While these did not all materialise—education ministers propose but finance ministers dispose—the total effect was an increase in the size of the plan which reached a new high of 1,594 people holding awards in 1986 and was to reach a peak of 1,809 in 1993.

Despite this, there were warning signs by 1990 when ministers noted that there had been a decline in the uptake of awards in the last three years.[26] Numbers fell in the 1990s. Britain cut its funding to the commission; Australian national policy increasingly put its links with Asia ahead of those with the Commonwealth; Canada reduced the number of awards; Nigeria was suspended from the Commonwealth and Hong Kong left. In the mid-1990s both the Australian and the New Zealand governments decided to stop awarding Commonwealth scholarships, although they continued in New Zealand under university auspices. Canada and Britain were next to falter in their support for the scheme. In August 2006 the Canadian government halted recruitment of scholars for the next year but reversed the policy in time for Christmas. Two years later, the British foreign secretary announced that his department was cutting off funding for scholarships to the industrialised Commonwealth, though awards to developing countries were to continue. Again there was a partial reversal with the government department responsible for universities agreeing to fund a reduced number of awards at doctoral level (see chapter 4). Against this pattern of reverses, ministers of education agreed new targets for the plan at their meeting in Cape Town in 2006, while the number of countries offering awards rose to fourteen from its low point of six.

Fellowships

Alongside their scholarships, five countries set up fellowship programmes of various kinds, set out in table 1.2.

Australia ran a programme of visiting professorships from 1962 until 1986 and visiting fellowships from 1962 to 1995. The visiting professors came for a year with the programme meeting their travel costs and others being absorbed by the universities; visiting fellows generally came for three months. They seem to have attracted people of the distinction argued for in 1959: the composer Peter Maxwell Davies went to Australia in 1965 and the doyen of British educators Alec Clegg, chief education officer for the West Riding county council, in 1970.[27] Budget cuts ended the professorial programme in 1986 with a claim that it was no longer working effectively. Canada introduced fellowships in 1964, initially with three research fellowships and five visiting fellowships, for "persons prominent in various fields of education including universities, colleges, primary and secondary schools and technical institutions".[28] Awards were held at a variety of institutions, including local departments of education as well as universities, and were usually for two to four months. A year after these awards Canada introduced a programme of research fellowships which ran from 1965 to 1997. Fellows were to carry out their own research, though some found themselves teaching, for a period of up to one academic year, with the aim that the award would benefit both Canada and the nominating country. Up to the early 1990s, about three-quarters of the awards went to the old Commonwealth.

New Zealand offered two programmes from 1960 to 1988: prestige fellowships brought academics to tour the New Zealand universities and carry out research; the original awards were for up to a year but the period was reduced to a maximum of two months in 1972/3. Over the same period, it offered a small number of administrative awards annually for educational administrators who came for up to a year. In principle up to three awards were available each year but in practice there appear to have been only eleven administrators in twenty-five years.

Education was also the theme of awards in India and in Central Africa. India introduced awards for visiting fellows in 1962 to encourage the sharing of ideas on educational development and methodology. Awards were originally for three to six months, later cut to a standard three. They ran till 1978, and were resumed in 1984, but only for a couple of years. Between 1960 and 1964 the ill-fated Central African Federation offered one fellowship to a senior inspector of schools in England, to look at the secondary school system and another to Howard Sheath, the head of the external

Table 1.2 Fellowship programmes

Country and type of fellowship	Dates	Purpose	Numbers
Australia			
Visiting fellowships	1960-96	For persons prominent in education	Usually 4 p.a.
Visiting professorships	1964-86	Research and teaching	Usually 2-3 p.a.
Britain			
Fellowships	1960-80	To support research	2-7 awards p.a.
Medical and senior medical fellowships	1965-95	Capacity building in overseas medical schools	Usually 40-60 p.a.
Academic Fellowships	1968-	To strengthen developing-country universities	50 p.a.
Professional fellowships	2003-	Short-term awards for mid-career professionals	60-70 p.a.
Canada			
Visiting fellowships	1960-97	Various fields in education	About 4 p.a.
Research fellowships	1965-97	Bring scholars of established reputation for research with mutual benefits	Usually 3 – 7 p.a.
India			
Visiting fellowships later short-term visits by senior educationalists	1962-78, 1988-89	Encourage exchange of experience among senior educators	31 awards in total
New Zealand			
Prestige fellowships	1960-88	Bring scholars of eminence to research and lecture	About 3 awards p.a.in total in both categories
Administrative awards	1960-88	For administrators in education expected to occupy key role	
Zimbabwe/Central African Federation	1960-64	To support education in the Federation	2 in total

studies programme from the University of New England in Australia. Sheath served as a member of the Lockwood Commission which planned the post-federation University of Zambia whose department of correspondence studies was modelled on University of New England practice.[29]

Britain has offered four kinds of fellowship programme, two of which have survived. The first category of fellows were for the "scholars of high distinction" referred to in the 1959 Oxford conference. Fellows came for a year, tended to bring their families with them, and usually cost more than scholars. They balanced, in different ways, their own interests and those of their host universities. One Canadian professor of English who spent a year in Oxford gave four lectures, completed a novel, and described it as an *annus mirabilis* that included twenty plays, three concerts, six ballets and nine operas. An Australian professor at the University of Sussex reported that, with his host, they had transformed the faculty; the latter confirmed that he had "engaged himself in the affairs of the … Faculty with quite extraordinary enthusiasm".[30] With reductions in the budget, and rising costs, the commission suspended them in 1980; the suspension became permanent. The last of the fellows, who travelled from Perth to Hull, reported gratefully and wistfully on their value in enabling "links to be forged between members of departments separated by many thousands of miles". He regretted their ending but with almost British restraint thought it would be discourteous to comment on this publicly.[31]

Medical fellowships were instituted alongside the medical scholarships launched in 1965 and were initially at three levels: visiting professors were expected to be playing a leading role in education within their own countries; senior medical fellows would hold chairs or be heads of department; medical fellowships were for clinicians with a postgraduate degree who needed a course to help their development as teachers and researchers.[32] They were available to both the industrialised and the developing Commonwealth. The programme was later simplified so that there was a single category of medical fellows. Usually between forty and sixty medical awards were offered each year between 1968 and 1995, with the largest numbers coming from India. Like the medical scholarships, these were swept away in the mid-1990s. In contrast the academic staff fellowships, introduced for mid-career university staff in 1968, have remained part of the commission's programmes although restrictions have been placed from time to time on the universities eligible to nominate candidates. In 2000 the commission introduced a new brand of professional awards for people in occupations other than higher education. Awards were in six areas: education, engineering, environment, governance, public health and technology. Professional fellows were nominated by, and attached to, an agency

within Britain with the idea of benefiting both host and fellow.[33] In 2003, for example, Wilson Tamakloe, of the Ghanaian Protection Agency spent three months attached to the Environment Agency in Britain to look at their information systems. He was able to apply what he had seen to coastal zone and oil spill management at home, and more broadly when he was promoted two years later. For its part the Environment Agency was sufficiently convinced of the interest and value of the scheme to continue bidding for fellowships in succeeding years. Similarly, Paul Chunga went from his job as an environmental health office Malawi to the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency and other Scottish bodies working in public health. Despite the differences between Scotland and Malawi he concluded that "The knowledge and skills gained in all fields are very relevant to the Malawian situation and they will be used to develop the environmental health profession in Malawi in order to raise the environmental health status of all Malawians".[34]

Fellowship schemes proved less robust than scholarships: university teachers have probably needed them less in the academic small world created by the rapid fall in the real costs of communication and travel.[35] Whereas scholarships were designed primarily to benefit the nominating country, the reverse seems to have been true of many fellowships. Conceived as a device for sharing experience throughout the Commonwealth they seem in practice, and with the important exception of the British academic and medical awards, to have been used to bring distinction into the institutions of the awarding country, with a high percentage of awards going to fellows from the north rather than the south.

The next chapter sets these stories in the context of Commonwealth universities and of international student mobility.