

Introduction

There is a long history of student mobility across land and sea to access higher education.¹ For the people of the islands of the South Pacific during much of the twentieth century, travelling overseas was the only option to access higher education. And for many of these students, a scholarship was the only way to access such opportunities. For more than 70 years, the Australian Government has been providing scholarships to Australian universities for aspiring students from across the Pacific and the rest of the world.

For much of that time, scholarships have been considered part of the Australian nation's obligation to provide aid to developing countries in its own region, including the Pacific. Despite changes in governments, aid and foreign policy approaches and the conditions in the recipient territories and nations, scholarships have persisted. This longevity, through changing national interests and shifting government priorities, through (and in spite of) reviews that have sought to reshape aid and scholarships, is remarkable. It is also instructive. This book explains what both the persistence and the longevity of international scholarships can tell us about Australian foreign and aid policy over the last 70 years, particularly in relationship to the Pacific region. This is particularly relevant today given the current Australian Government's focus on engagement with the Pacific.

There are three key themes running within this book. The first is the flexible but powerful notion of national interest, and in particular Australian national interest. The second is the decolonisation of territories and colonies in the South Pacific, and the related British Empire and Commonwealth,

1 Travel was often, although not exclusively, within the borders of empires. For example, there is travel around what Herrera refers to as the 'fluid borders that made up the Islamic Empire' from the ninth century. Linda Herrera, 'Higher Education in the Arab World', in *International Handbook of Higher Education*, ed. JJF Forest and PG Altbach, 409–21, Springer International Handbooks of Education, vol. 18 (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 410.

especially the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea. The final is the concept of incrementalism, of un-radical, iterative policy change in scholarships, and why that iterative change has occurred.

The concept of national interest is nebulous, difficult to pinpoint and changes over time. Political scientist Scott Burchill wrote that at the 'very basis of claims for the national interest is an assumption that a political community can speak with a common voice'.² What this book, and these scholarships, demonstrate is that this common voice is assumed, but not necessarily present in the community involved in the planning and implementation of international development scholarships. Political scientist Thomas Davis has noted that the relationship between effective development assistance and Australia's national interest should not be assumed.³ National interest is an umbrella term that can contain particular interests at different times. By understanding these scholarships through the prism of the 'national interest' that different departments and individuals were seeking to defend, one can see the differing interpretations, ideological and otherwise, of national interest. It is a contention of this book that this quality, the malleability of purpose and approach in framing the national interest, helps to explain the longevity of international development scholarships in the Australian foreign aid approach.

The bilateral relationships between Australia and Pacific nations, and earlier Pacific colonial administrations, are central to the book. In some cases, such as the administration prior to 1975 in what for simplicity will be referred to as the Territory of Papua and New Guinea (TPNG), this relationship is intragovernmental. This Pacific lens allows for an in-depth analysis of the colonial and decolonising relationships that the Australian Government had with these Pacific administrations and postcolonial governments. These relationships have changed since 1948, when the first awards were made, as one would expect. However, the presence and the role of scholarships have remained relatively constant.

Domestic policies, immigration policies and politics also played a significant role in the provision of these scholarships. This was particularly acute in relation to scholarships for TPNG, where the White Australia Policy affected

2 Scott Burchill, *The National Interest in International Relations Theory* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 13, doi.org/10.1057/9780230005778.

3 Thomas Davis, 'Does Australia have an International Development Assistance Policy? National Interest and Foreign Aid Policy Making', in *Proceedings, Second Oceanic Conference on International Studies* (Australia: University of Melbourne, 2006).

the ability of non-European students from the colony to travel to mainland Australia for study. However, it also affected the design of subsequent schemes as equal opportunity and racial discrimination legislation was introduced in Australia. This book argues national interest, and domestic policies, play such a dominant role in these international development scholarships that these programs are more a reflection of Australia, and its perception of itself as a nation in the Pacific, than they are reflective of the needs of Pacific Island nations.

This is also evident because, while the relationships between the Australian Government and Pacific Island governments are central to the implementation of scholarships, these relationships were seldom a priority for Australian governments. The spotlight of the Australian foreign policy community was rarely focused on the Pacific region, and when it was, it was often with colonial or paternalistic intentions, and usually with a security and military lens.

This is also true for scholarships. The Pacific has never been the driver of scholarship policy; it was more often a secondary consideration.⁴ In 1948 the Department of External Affairs (DEA) convinced the Chifley Cabinet of the value of a small scholarship, the South-East Asian Scholarship Scheme, to counter some of the negative perceptions of Australia being generated by the White Australia Policy. Decisions about where the six awards were to be allocated were fraught, and debate between DEA, the Prime Minister's Department and the Director of Education was intense. Each department, and each individual, brought to these debates their own ideas about what the goals of the scholarship program should be, and who ought to be its primary beneficiaries.

The South-East Asian Scholarship Scheme was offered, as the name suggests, firstly to nations from South-East Asia. It was later offered to Pacific nations, which did cause some confusion, with the *Pacific Islands Monthly* magazine noting in 1955 that the offer of scholarships under the scheme wasn't because 'someone in Australia had confused his geography'.⁵ This sense of confusion in nations and territories outside South-East Asia

4 In contemporary times, the lack of foreign policy focus on the Pacific has been matched by an ambivalence within the Australian tertiary education sector about engagement with the Pacific.

5 'Australian Scholarships for Fiji', *Pacific Islands Monthly*, 1 January 1955, 59.

led to a name change, to the Australian International Awards Scheme.⁶ There was also discussion in the 1960s of a 'Pacific Colombo Plan', drawing on a policy developed – the Colombo Plan – for South and South-East Asia. The scheme was never implemented for a number of reasons that will be discussed in a later chapter.

These brief examples help to illustrate that the Pacific region was rarely the centre of policy thinking. It is also clear that the leaders of the Pacific were aware of this status. In the early years covered by this research, it showed itself in requests for scholarships far exceeding the small number offered. In later decades it played out in expansions in non-Pacific scholarship programs and little focus on the 'smaller' scholarship programs in the Pacific. Australian governments, both conservative and Labor, have taken the Pacific for granted.⁷ Prime ministers and foreign ministers have not needed to ensure the Pacific nations share Australia's foreign policy goals, they have assumed it. The book will argue that this assumption of shared policy goals was a continuation of colonial patterns of thinking. These patterns of behaviour and thinking have been recognised in Senate Committee reports, by academics and Pacific governments, but the approach continued.

Australia's colonial approach to Pacific administrations and governments is clear and is part of a broader story of decolonisation in the Pacific. Australia was itself a colonial power in TPNG, and shared administrative responsibility with the United Kingdom and New Zealand for Nauru. Scholarships played a role in both the colonisation of the Pacific, and the decolonisation.

Early scholarships were often granted in an effort to support a colonial administration, with men (and it was nearly always men) sent to the metropolitan or colonial power for training to fulfil the civil administration roles required to maintain a colony. This 'hub and spoke' model of movement, from the periphery to the centre, was acute in colonial scholarship programs, but continued as the territories of the Pacific decolonised. The connections between colonialism and the broader field of development, where international development scholarships fit, are also worth noting. As Ferns

6 There is some question as to whether the Australian International Awards Scheme was a separate scheme or merely a renaming of the South-East Asian Scheme, but most of the archival evidence points to it being a change in name only.

7 Stephen Henningham noted that most Australians, including those in 'senior positions, have only a vague "picture postcard" image of the Pacific island states and territories'. Stephen Henningham, 'No Easy Answers: Australia and the Pacific Islands regions', *Parliamentary Research Service*, no. 5 (1995): iii.

notes in his 2017 thesis on Australian foreign aid, viewing decolonisation through the ‘development lens’ shows that the efforts of former colonisers and metropolitan powers were ‘in many cases a continuation of the colonial project’.⁸ This view is supported by Stephen Browne, who noted that aid programs were a ‘sequel to ... colonial obligations’.⁹ In most cases multiple motivations play a role in aid policy decision-making. As the Australian Government began to frame itself as a middle power, the growth in the planning and delivery of aid in the postwar period of rapid decolonisation was predominantly motivated by development and strategic concerns.¹⁰ The actions of the Australian Government in its own colonial territory, the TPNG, in the 1950s and 1960s demonstrated an unwillingness by many politicians and bureaucrats to grapple with the inevitability of decolonisation. Racist and paternalistic beliefs were fundamental to the policy decisions of the TPNG Administration.

The place of race and racism is inevitably tied up in this colonial discourse. It is also clear in the privileging of a Western-style education, which is fundamental to the provision of the scholarships discussed in this book. While this book does not linger on the effectiveness of scholarships in a conventional sense, it does discuss the role of scholarships in promoting the ‘ideals’ of Australia and its social and political structures. Effectiveness is a malleable concept, as this book will show. The idea that education would perform a civilising role in TPNG was fundamental to Australian education policy in the territories and is discussed in this work. Ideas of equity and access are also tied to race; exclusion and inclusion based on race was fundamental to the operation of a number of scholarships in the Pacific.

As noted earlier, the final broad theme that emerges from this book is that of iterative change. Since the South-East Asian Scholarship Scheme began in 1948, few governments or bureaucrats have been prepared to make substantial changes to scholarship schemes that are in place. The subsidy scheme of the 1970s and the Equity and Merit scheme of the late 1980s are notable exceptions, but in general small tinkering changes are the story of Australian Government scholarships. However, as noted above, this incrementalism does not diminish the important role that scholarships have played in foreign aid and foreign policy over the past 70 years.

8 Nicholas Ferns, ‘Beyond Colombo: Australian Colonial and Foreign Policy in the Age of International Development, 1945–1975’ (PhD thesis, Monash University, 2017), 8.

9 Stephen Browne, *Aid and Influence: Do Donors Help or Hinder?* (London: Earthscan, 2006), 19.

10 Ferns, ‘Beyond Colombo’; Daniel Oakman, *Facing Asia: A History of the Colombo Plan* (Canberra: Pandanus Books, 2004).

This book covers a significant period of time, and a large number of policies and schemes. The longevity of international development scholarships as a framework for development assistance, and diplomatic investment, do allow for this longer-term analysis. This book also aims to shift the conversation about the history of international development in Australia away from the Colombo Plan. While the Colombo Plan remains as a constant policy shadow, by moving the focus to the Pacific (where the Colombo Plan was not offered) we are able to see scholarships, aid and international education in a broader context.

Why is it important?

Despite the status of international education in Australia's current social and economic system, there remains little research into the history of international education, and the way the mobility it encourages has shaped Australia's relationships with its regional neighbours. Even less of this small amount of research has focused on the nations of the Pacific, despite Australia's various roles as coloniser, trustee and geographic neighbour. Both Australia and Pacific Island countries are the product of the colonialist project of Europe, settled by the British (Australia and New Zealand are understood as settler colonies; by contrast many Pacific Island territories were colonised for their resources or strategic importance), Germans, Dutch and French. But the trajectory of each of these nations after their 'independence' from colonial rule is different, and this history influences and shapes the relationship between the states – as cultural theorists Ien Ang and John Stratton note, 'colonial legacies in particular ... remain powerful determinants in the present-day trajectories of cultural flows'.¹¹ Understanding these coloniser–colony shared histories is important, and scholarships are an enduring element of that history.

While this is not an evaluation of the scholarships awarded by the Australian Government between 1948 and 2018, understanding the goals and motivations of scholarships is important to understanding how they have evolved, and the important role they have played in a period of decolonisation in the Pacific. Recognising the influence of education, and in particular, movement from a Pacific Island state to a metropolitan

11 Ien Ang and John Stratton, 'Asianing Australia: Notes Toward a Critical Transnationalism in Cultural Studies', *Cultural Studies* 10, no. 1 (1996): 28, doi.org/10.1080/09502389600490441.

nation such as Australia, helps to assess the contribution of scholarships in the decolonisation process across the Pacific. This work does not centre on the journeys and currents followed by Pacific Islanders, as is so clearly articulated in the work of Tracey Banivanua-Mar, who highlighted the role of transnational connections across the Pacific in the development of a process of active decolonisation.¹² By its nature, it is a history of the policies of the Australian Government, and not a student-tracing project. Nevertheless, as is clear from the foreword to this book by Nayahamui Rooney, the stories of the students who came to Australia do offer a different lens through which to view Australian foreign policy and the scholarship policies the students were subjected to. Therefore, each part of this book contains a small selection of stories of students who travelled to Australia from TPNG and the Pacific during the period being examined. These anecdotes have been found in the archives, in marketing material and other sources. The purpose of these vignettes is to provide the voice of those for whom these journeys were life-changing. As Banivanua-Mar wrote: ‘we have seen from West Papua to Samoa, to Tahiti and New Caledonia, [that] access to education and a counter-imperial literacy gave subject peoples an international voice’.¹³ The voice of students and alumni is important to this work, and is often lost in discussions of scholarship and international education policy. There is a fundamental asymmetry of power between the actors involved in scholarships, the privileging of certain forms of knowledge. This book does not argue that by including the voices of students and alumni this power imbalance will be corrected, but it does put these stories on record in ways that are not always present in other works. It is also of note that in general the histories of scholarships have often had, as historians Tamson Pietsch and Meng-Hsuan Chou noted, ‘a hagiographic focus on a small cohort of “familiar suspects”’¹⁴ rather than a broader view. These vignettes walk a line between these two extremes, the absence of a student voice and a hagiographic focus on individuals.

12 See Tracey Banivanua-Mar, *Decolonisation and the Pacific: Indigenous Globalisation and the Ends of Empire*, Critical Perspectives on Empire, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 2014) and Tracey Banivanua-Mar, ‘Shadowing Imperial Networks: Indigenous Mobility and Australia’s Pacific Past’, *Australian Historical Studies* 46, no. 3 (2015): 340–55, doi.org/10.1080/1031461X.2015.1076012, among other work.

13 Banivanua-Mar, *Decolonisation and the Pacific*, 221.

14 Tamson Pietsch and Meng-Hsuan Chou, ‘The Politics of Scholarly Exchange: Taking the Long View on the Rhodes Scholarships’, in *Global Exchanges: Exchange Programs, Scholarships and Transnational Circulations in the Modern World*, ed. Ludovic Tournès and Giles Scott-Smith, 33–49 (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2017), 36, doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvw04fqt.7.

Another crucial outcome of scholarships is the financial contribution to the host universities by the host government.¹⁵ This indirect funding plays a role in the regional Pacific scholarships discussed in this book, but is also important to consider in the context of Australian universities and institutions. This support comes in the form of fees (scholarships are most often ‘full-fee’ students – meaning the Australian Government is paying full fees on behalf of the student) and support to the community via the spending of stipend funds (on rent, food and other essential items). This is an important factor in the broad support for development scholarships by universities and other domestic stakeholders.

Even though scholarships are broadly understood to be a continuation of the colonial project, they remain popular across developing and developed nations. Understanding their historical form, their use and misuse, is relevant to contemporary conversations about scholarships. Using the prism of scholarships to view the intentions of the Australian Government in the Pacific also provides a different understanding of what role the Australian Government and the Australian bureaucracy saw for itself in the Pacific, and how Australia’s national interest could be protected or advanced. This is clear in the many decisions about scholarships to the Pacific that reflect domestic (Australian) considerations; it is often domestic imperatives that are the most visible in decision-making about international aid and scholarships. It is because scholarships have been so popular with recipient nations and domestic stakeholders, and allow governments to satisfy foreign and domestic imperatives, that they have remained in place. Their ‘success’ does not encourage radical change or action. Iterative changes have been sufficient to meet evolving needs.

Higher education and mobility

International students have been coming to study in Australia since the establishment of universities in the country, however it was not until the end of the Second World War that they appeared in any great numbers. Australia’s geographic position ensured that students from South-East Asia began arriving in large numbers, despite the hurdles put in place by the Department of Immigration (seeking to maintain the White Australia Policy). In 1951 the Australian Government agreed on some general rules

15 Anna Kent, ‘Australian Development Scholarships and their place within diplomacy, development and education’ (Masters thesis, The University of Melbourne, 2012).

around the entry of ‘non-European students’ into Australia for study. This policy codified a process that had been applied in an ad hoc manner up to that point, without seriously challenging the White Australia Policy.¹⁶ It also formalised the settings for the thousands of students who would come to Australia over the next decades as what is termed ‘private’ students. In most contexts this means those not sponsored by the Australian Government. Students would also come to Australia under other scholarship programs, for example the Colonial Development and Welfare Scholarships (CD&W) (UK), and sponsored by their own national governments. Private students, however, far outnumbered those sponsored by the Australian Government. In fact, the very first scholarship scheme, the South-East Asian Scholarship Scheme, provided fewer than six awards per year. The Colombo Plan, which began in the early 1950s, had a far greater number of awards, but nevertheless sponsored students were outnumbered five to one¹⁷ by their privately funded peers.

So great has been the increased international mobility of students since the Second World War that the number of globally mobile students (in higher education) was estimated, prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, to be 4.5 million in 2020.¹⁸ As Dassin, Marsh and Mawer explained, ‘countries and communities that were isolated from global educational systems only a few decades ago are now significant contributors to the movement of students and skilled professionals across borders’.¹⁹ China is the most prominent example of this phenomenon. International education is, in government circles at the very least, recognised as an important part of foreign policy; both the sending and receiving of students is consequential.²⁰

16 ‘Non-European Students | Policy Information’, F28/7/79, 1951, Fiji National Archives (FNA).

17 Oakman, *Facing Asia*, 179.

18 Joan Dassin, Robin Marsh and Matt Mawer, ‘Introduction: Pathways for Social Change?’, in *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change*, ed. Joan Dassin, Robin Marsh and Matt Mawer, 3–21 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 9, doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62734-2.

19 Dassin, Marsh and Mawer, ‘Introduction’, 9.

20 There is a growing body of research into the role of government scholarships and globally mobile students as a form of diplomacy or foreign policy. Other examples not discussed include Kongkea Chhoeun, ‘Australian and Chinese Scholarships to Cambodia: A Comparative Study’ (PhD Thesis, Australian National University, 2019); Lily Dong and David W Chapman, ‘China’s Scholarship Program as a Form of Foreign Assistance’, in *Crossing Borders in East Asian Higher Education*, ed. DW Chapman, WK Cummings, GA Postiglione, 145–66, CERC Studies in Comparative Education, vol. 27 (Dordrecht: Springer, 2010), 145–66, doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0446-6_7; Morgan McMaster, Alejandra Guevara, Lacey Roberts and Samantha Alvis, *USAID Higher Education: A Retrospective 1960–2020* (Washington DC: United States Agency for International Development, 2019); Caitlin Byrne and Rebecca Hall, ‘Realising Australia’s International Education as Public Diplomacy’, *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 67, no. 4 (2013): 419–38, doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2013.806019; Natalie Laifer and Nicholas Kitchen, ‘Making Soft Power Work: Theory and Practice in Australia’s International Education Policy’, *Politics and Policy* 45, no. 5 (2017): 813–40, doi.org/10.1111/polp.12219.

Scholarships form part of this great student mobility, albeit a small part. In scholarships we are able to see a microcosm of student mobility and government policy.

Understanding scholarships

This is a history of Australian Government scholarships. But that history cannot be told without an understanding of the history of scholarships more broadly. Scholarships have existed for centuries, but they proliferated in the postwar period, often related to Cold War influence operations.²¹ A typology of international scholarships written by Laura Perna and others in 2014 goes some way to breaking down their purposes, with four main ‘types’ of international scholarship programs. These are: development of basic skills, acquisition of advanced knowledge in developing nations, improvement of advanced knowledge in developed nations and promotion of short-term study abroad.²² Recent work by scholarship researchers Anne Campbell and Emelye Neff reviews the purposes behind a broad range of scholarships offered to students from the Global South. These rationales include human capital development, diplomacy, social change, sustainable development, the internationalisation of universities and access to higher education.²³ That there are multitudes of scholarships, each with multitudes of purposes, both stated and unstated, is clear from the work of Perna, Campbell and Neff. But despite this, international scholarships like those considered in this book are more alike than they are different.

Histories of scholarships often exist in their own worlds, that is as the history of a specific scholarship scheme.²⁴ This research deviates from that approach slightly, in that it covers a number of scholarship schemes over a period of

21 For example see Julie Hessler, ‘Third World Students at Soviet Universities in the Brezhnev Period’ (202–15) and Lonnie R Johnson, ‘The Fulbright Program and the Philosophy and Geography of US Exchange Programs Since World War II’ (173–87), both in Tournès and Scott-Smith, *Global Exchanges*.

22 Laura W Perna et al., ‘Promoting Human Capital Development: A Typology of International Scholarship Programs in Higher Education’, *Educational Researcher* 43, no. 2 (2014): 63–73, doi.org/10.3102/0013189X14521863.

23 Anne C Campbell and Emelye Neff, ‘A Systematic Review of International Higher Education Scholarships for Students from the Global South’, *Review of Educational Research* 90, no. 6 (2020) (online publication), doi.org/10.3102/0034654320947783.

24 For example, Tamson Pietsch, ‘Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880–1940’, *History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011): 723–39, doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2011.594096; Alice Garner and Diane Kirkby, *Academic Ambassadors, Pacific Allies: Australia, America and the Fulbright Program*, Key Studies in Diplomacy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9781526128973.001.0001; and Oakman, *Facing Asia*.

several decades. It also focuses on one geographic region, a region that has not received significant scholarly attention in the context of scholarships or international education. This focus on one donor with multiple programs and one geographic region with multiple countries sets this book apart from existing scholarship in this field.

One of the pre-eminent and most well-known scholarships, certainly across the Anglosphere, is the Rhodes Scholarship. Established in 1901 according to terms outlined in the Will of Cecil Rhodes, the scholarship was designed as ‘a scheme of travelling scholarships that he hoped would foster good imperial citizens’.²⁵ This scholarship quickly became a symbol for elite education and training, and is mentioned often in discussions about scholarship programs from that point on, as a goal of what scholarships could or should become, or what they do not wish to become (in terms of an elite/non-elite approach). What is less understood is the extent of the influence the scholarship program had on the development of other scholarship programs around the world. Pietsch and Chou point to the influence of the Rhodes Scholarship on the Fulbright Scholarship,²⁶ and another clear example demonstrating this point is the Morris Hedstrom Scholarship Scheme in Fiji. Morris Hedstrom Limited is a department store, long established as a trader in colonial Fiji (and still in business today). In 1944 the board of the company made a decision to create a scholarship program for Fijian students, ‘with a tenure of three years, for the persons wholly or partly of the Fijian race ... [which] will enable the fortunate youths who gain the prize to have an approved University course for a period of three years’²⁷ (at the time there was no university in Fiji). A request was made of the Governor of Fiji for a copy of the Rhodes Trust Deed. The Trust Deed was duly sent, and formed the basis of the Morris Hedstrom Scholarship.²⁸ Further research into these connections between scholarship programs is likely to find other connections, either as clear as the Rhodes – Morris Hedstrom link or more subtle connections.

Also important is the temporal aspect of these scholarships. While the Rhodes Scholarship began in 1901, the 1940s saw an explosion in the number of awards on offer, influenced both by postwar reconstruction and the emerging polarities of the Cold War. The Morris Hedstrom award was

25 Pietsch, ‘Many Rhodes’, 723.

26 Pietsch and Chou, ‘The Politics of Scholarly Exchange’, 35.

27 ‘Fiji Scholarship – Proposal by Morris Hedstrom | Newspaper Clipping from 26 July 1944’, F28/265, 1944, FNA.

28 ‘Morris Hedstrom Trust Deed Draft’, F28/265, FNA.

created in 1944, with an aim to support Fijians to ‘hold their own in post-war years’ and to encourage the ‘Government to make better provision for primary and secondary education of Fijian children ... to take advantage of the opportunity of completing their education’.²⁹ Leaving aside the rather unrealistic goal of influencing all levels of education via the provision of one scholarship per year, this scholarship was aimed at supporting the development of Fijians in an environment wherein they were being expected to become more independent in the postwar years. The CD&W Scholarships, funded by the UK, had a similar mandate: while part of a broader Colonial Development and Welfare Act, the scholarships were, by the late 1940s, a £1,000,000 effort to support colonies that were on a path to independence and were to be spread across the British Empire.³⁰ No doubt this scheme, in its breadth and ambition, influenced the Colombo Plan in 1950, and it is certain that it played a part in the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan developed later in the 1950s.

Why, then, was there such an increase in the number of scholarship programs offered, particularly by developed nations, during this period of accelerating decolonisation across the world? Was it because, as Mark Bray writes, most ‘departing colonial powers also sought structures in which to maintain political linkages in the post-colonial era’?³¹ Scholarships were used extensively as a tool of influence during the Cold War.³² In one Australian example, a Kenyan minister mentioned the existence of scholarships from ‘beyond the Iron Curtain’ to a group of Papua New Guinean men, causing the opening of a Confidential file and concern from Australian authorities.³³

Even as the Cold War was ending, scholarships remained a key element of the foreign aid budgets of developed countries around the world. Scholarships, and tertiary education more broadly, were not included in the Millennium Development Goals of the 2000s, but significant spending on

29 ‘Fiji Scholarship – Proposal by Morris Hedstrom | Newspaper Clipping from 26 July 1944’.

30 ‘C.D&W Scholarship – Applications and Recommendations’, 28/277/4, 1951, FNA.

31 M Bray, ‘Decolonisation and Education: New Paradigms for the Remnants of Empire’, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 24, no. 1 (1994): 38, doi.org/10.1080/0305792940240104.

32 Julie Hessler notes that one of the goals of the Soviet international education scheme was the ‘inculcation of socialist values and political empathy for the USSR’, in Hessler, ‘Third World Students at Soviet Universities in the Brezhnev Period’. Other examples include Paul A Kramer, ‘Is the World Our Campus? International Students and U.S. Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century’, *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 5 (2009): 775–806, doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2009.00829.x; Garner and Kirkby, *Academic Ambassadors, Pacific Allies*.

33 ‘Offer of Scholarships from Iron Curtain Countries to Papua and New Guinea’, A1209, 1965/6088, 1965, National Archives of Australia (NAA).

scholarships continued. As this book shows, enthusiasm for scholarships has rarely waned over the twentieth century, or into the twenty-first. And while scholarships are most certainly linked to broader theoretical and practical conversations about modernisation and development, no amount of critical review has dampened their appeal.

Scholarships and decolonisation

Education itself is intertwined with the processes of colonisation and decolonisation. For many states in the Pacific, the schooling structure that was left in place after the departure of the colonial power remained in place. This was, in part, a deliberate effort of the former colonising powers to ensure ongoing influence in the postcolonial period.³⁴ The lack of universal secondary schooling in many Pacific Island colonies and then countries, and the lack of universities in the region until the mid-1960s, ensured that despite their move towards self-government and independence, decolonising states remained reliant on donors, including Australia, for supporting education systems, and providing higher education options for a limited number of students. This continued to be the case across the second half of the twentieth century.³⁵ Fijian academic and politician Tupeni Baba mounts a convincing case against the policies of education that use Australian experts and Australian training to support Pacific education needs. He described some academics as buccaneers, winning lucrative contracts to deliver education and training in the Pacific.³⁶ Elsewhere Baba describes Australia's involvement in education in the Pacific as patronising³⁷ and neo-colonial.

34 Bray, 'Decolonisation and Education'. Bray also discusses these concepts in an earlier work, Mark Bray, 'Education and the Vestiges of Colonialism: Self-Determination, Neocolonialism and Dependency in the South Pacific', *Comparative Education* 29, no. 3 (1993): 333–48, doi.org/10.1080/0305006930290309. Evangelina Papoutsaki and Dick Rooney also discuss the concept of developing countries inheriting their coloniser's education system, and the adoption of Western models of higher education in their work. Evangelina Papoutsaki and Dick Rooney, 'Colonial Legacies and Neo-Colonial Practices in Papua New Guinean Higher Education', *Higher Education Research and Development* 25, no. 4 (2006): 421–33, doi.org/10.1080/07294360600947434.

35 Churches also played a significant role in the provision of education across the Pacific, including in Papua and New Guinea, with much schooling provided by Mission Schools across the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Churches were often involved in sponsoring students to travel to developed countries for tertiary or further study. Nevertheless, given the focus of this work on government-funded scholarships, church scholarships will not be addressed in any depth.

36 Tupeni L. Baba, 'Academic Buccaneering Australian Style: The Role of Australian Academics in the South Seas', *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies* 9, no. 1 (1987): 3–11.

37 Tupeni L. Baba, 'Australia's Involvement in Education in the Pacific: Partnership or Patronage?', *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies* 11, no. 2 (1989): 43–53.

The relationship between education systems and colonialism is a backdrop to this book, implicit in so many of the decisions that have been made by Australian and Pacific governments across decades, and intimately linked to concepts of race and citizenship that were part of Australia's colonial engagement with Papua New Guinea (PNG) and other Pacific territories.

Sources

A significant element of the literature for this book is government reports, policy statements, reviews and the like, often referred to as grey literature. These serve in part as primary source documents. In later chapters covering recent decades, grey literature, reports from the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) and other reviews, make up the bulk of the primary source material analysed. This is necessary because the archives for that period were not open at the time of writing. A number of reviews and reports remain within the closed archival collection. This is in part because a significant amount of the research conducted or commissioned by the Australian Government about scholarships is never released to the public. There have been notable exceptions, such as a 2011 Freedom of Information release that saw a large swathe of review reports and other documents released after a request by a *Canberra Times* journalist.³⁸ Markus Mannheim's 2011 article, based on the FOI request, pointed to the problems that were commonly discussed within AusAID, but not more widely. This includes the use of scholarships as patronage and the misgivings within AusAID about the development impact of the scholarships.³⁹

38 Markus Mannheim, 'Doubts Raised over Aid Scholarships', *The Canberra Times*, 27 April 2011; and 'FOI Disclosure Log – Australian Aid Related Requests (before 1 November 2013)', Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, www.dfat.gov.au/about-us/corporate/freedom-of-information/Pages/foi-disclosure-log-australian-aid-related-requests.aspx, accessed 22 May 2016.

39 These issues were particularly acute in Pacific Island nations – Jack Corbett and John Connell have discussed the issues of small island states in retaining citizens (and especially public servants) who have received high-level training via a scholarship. They also noted that this issue is more acute where 'recruitment to the public service may be linked to nepotism and patronage'. Jack Corbett and John Connell, 'All the World is a Stage: Global Governance, Human Resources, and the "Problem" of Smallness', *Pacific Review* 28, no. 3 (2015): 446, doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2015.1011214.

Outline

This book is arranged into five parts. Each part consists of two chapters, and a vignette with stories of the students who have come to Australia over the 70 years this book covers. Each part covers between 10 and 20 years, and the book is written chronologically. Each part covers the schemes or scholarships that were in place at the time, and addresses the themes and policies of the period.

Part One covers the period from 1948 to 1957, beginning with the stories of Cyril Chan and a group of students sent to high school in Charters Towers, Queensland, from the Territory of Papua and New Guinea (TPNG). The first chapter, 'Before the beginning', addresses the South-East Asian Scholarship Scheme, which was subsequently renamed the Australian International Awards Scheme, reflecting a recurring desire among bureaucrats and politicians to ensure that scholarship titles give adequate recognition to their benefactor. The second chapter discusses Australia's colonial obligations in TPNG, and is titled 'Administrative labyrinths'. This was a period of confusion within the bureaucracy about the responsibilities of education and scholarships for residents of TPNG. The labyrinths that students like Cyril Chan had to navigate in order to study in Australia have given this chapter its title. These chapters also analyse interdepartmental debates about responsibilities and power to make decisions. These were conflicts and contestations that persisted for decades.

Part Two covers the period from 1958 to 1970. Chapter Three, 'Uncertain decolonisation', begins with the Oxford Conference in 1959, and discusses the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (CSFP). The CSFP helped to demonstrate how governments around the world were using scholarships as a form of aid and postcolonial development support. This was a period when the geopolitical structures held in place by the British Empire fell away to become the Commonwealth. This new structure reflected, in part, a less hierarchical structure between the colonisers and the decolonising states. This influenced the way in which the CSFP developed and was supported by Australia and other Commonwealth nations.

Chapter Four, 'Gradual development' addresses the complexities and complications that students from PNG faced in accessing Australian Commonwealth Scholarships and other educational opportunities.

Part Three covers the period of sweeping change from 1971 to 1983. Chapter Five, 'Radical subsidies', analyses the significant change and reform that occurred in the 1970s, including the introduction of free tertiary education. These subsidies, which allowed for fee-free university education for both domestic and international students, had a profound impact on Australia's education sector, and the relationships between Australian governments and the newly decolonised (or still decolonising) states of the Pacific. This was the most substantial reform to the international education sector in Australia during the period discussed in this book. Chapter Six, 'Independence for Papua New Guinea', is devoted to what was also a period of radical change in TPNG, with independence in 1975. This chapter also discusses the ways in which Australia's colonial education policies intersected and conflicted with emerging international education policies.

Part Four covers the period from 1984 to 1996. Chapter Seven is titled 'Goldring, Jackson and the fight for the future of international education'. Subsidising higher education was expensive, so by the early 1980s the Fraser and then Hawke governments were reviewing their commitments. This chapter analyses the Goldring and Jackson reviews, two important government reviews that reported in 1984. These reviews set the framework for changes to the policy settings for education and aid in the coming decades. These two reports are the foundation on which much subsequent international education and international scholarship policy was based. The synthesis of these two reviews provided the Hawke Government with an opportunity to shape the future of international education in Australia, and set in train significant changes that have continued to affect the funding of higher education in Australia.

The second chapter in Part Four is Chapter Eight, 'Centring the power'. This chapter centres on the Equity and Merit Scholarship Scheme (EMSS), which was introduced in 1989. This scheme represented a substantial shift in scholarship design and ambition, and took the place of the subsidy scheme that had been so popular in the Asia-Pacific region. A key element of the EMSS was a change in the locus of control. Control over selection was shifted from the recipient government to the Australian Government, and course selection control was shifted to the student, upending decades of scholarship practice. This was challenging for recipient governments to accept, and their dissatisfaction with the scheme played a large role in its short lifespan.

The final part of the book, Part Five, covers the period from 1997 to 2018. Chapter Nine is titled 'Multiple objectives for scholarships and aid' and discusses the Australian Development Scholarships Scheme (ADS). This scheme was introduced in 1998. The late 1990s and 2000s were a time of political instability in the Pacific, and Australia's approach to scholarship provision clearly reflects the most pressing Australian Government concerns at the time. Security and governance became the central themes around which scholarships were framed.

Chapter Ten, 'Diplomacy or development?', is focused on the Australia Awards. A huge increase in the number of scholarship awardees reflected a diplomatic goal: a temporary seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). And while the provision of scholarships declined suddenly after the UNSC vote, the scholarships continued to play a role in Australia's aid delivery in the Pacific. Their contribution to Australia's diplomatic ambitions, and the way in which they were cut as soon as that goal was achieved allows for a thorough investigation of the importance of a scholarship scheme in the context of a modern bilateral relationship, albeit one of uneven power dynamics.

This text is taken from *Mandates and Missteps: Australian Government Scholarships to the Pacific – 1948 to 2018*, by Anna Kent, published 2024 by ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.