

Durham E-Theses

The Church of England and her schools 1800-1977: a consideration of the role of the Church of England in the development of the state school system in England 1800-1977

Churchill, Winston James Charles

How to cite:

Churchill, Winston James Charles (1978) *The Church of England and her schools 1800-1977: a consideration of the role of the Church of England in the development of the state school system in England 1800-1977*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10125/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Church of England and her schools 1800-1977

A consideration of the role of the Church of England
in the development of the state school system in England 1800-1977

Winston James Charles Churchill B.A.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts
in the University of Durham through the Department
of Theology 1978.

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter One. The origins of the Church's involvement in schools.....	4
Chapter Two. The pattern of development to 1839.....	19
Chapter Three. The striking of a modus vivendi 1840-1860.....	33
Chapter Four. 1830-1860 A ferment of ideas.....	61
Chapter Five. The years leading up to the 1870 Act.....	75
Chapter Six. 1870-1900 The mounting problems.....	108
Chapter Seven. 1902 Restoration and Incorporation.....	139
Chapter Eight. The failure of the Liberals 1906-14.....	161
Chapter Nine. 1918-1939 Unfulfilled ideals.....	180
Chapter Ten. The 1944 Act- the recasting of the Dual System.....	203
Chapter Eleven. 1944 onwards-the fading power.....	232
Chapter Twelve. The changing role of the Church.....	248
Appendix A. Brief note on the administration of Church schools.....	287
Appendix B. Statistical tables relating to Church schools.....	291
Bibliography.....	294

Note Throughout the thesis "Church" should be taken to mean the Church of England, whereas "church (es)" should be taken to mean all the denominations.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Abstract of a thesis submitted by W.J.C. Churchill for the degree
of Master of Arts in the University of Durham
entitled

"The Church of England and her schools 1800-1977"

being a "Consideration of the role of the Church of England in the development of the state school system in England 1800-1977".

This thesis covers the period 1800 to the present day and attempts to chart the role and influence of the Church of England on the development of a national system of schools in England. (Her role in the modern 'independent' sector is largely ignored, not because it is unimportant, but because it is in her dealings with the far larger number of Church schools within the State sector that matters of principle and practicality are more clearly revealed.) The chapters record in chronological order the history of the Church's role in schools except for chapter four, which examines some of the wide variety of ideas current amongst Victorian Churchmen on the matter of the nation's schooling.

A peculiar characteristic of this subject is the manner in which it touches on many diverse points of principle, e.g. Church and State, the rights and freedom of the individual, the nature of education and of the Church and the powers of central and local government. The historical survey covers in detail the closely interconnected elements of national politics, practical problems, social developments, differing educational philosophies and movements within the Church.

The history of the Church's 'rationale' concerning her schools (this phrase is preferred to the more neological 'theology of education') is considered at length in the final chapter. Behind any serious 'rationale' of denominational schools must lie a series of theological and educational presuppositions. That these presuppositions have varied widely between churchmen in this period is amply demonstrated by the long and difficult history of denominational schools recorded in earlier chapters. The thesis ends with a consideration of the present rationale for Church's schools and examines her position in the light of recent developments.

Chapter One

The origins of the Church's involvement in schools

The situation before 1800

In England all education before 1800 meant Christian education of one sort or another. Evidence from the end of the seventh century onwards points to the establishment of cathedral schools at various places (e.g. Canterbury, Winchester, Worcester). The Church, by its very nature as an institution requiring a certain level of intellectual and didactic powers, assumed the role of educating its followers. Indeed, since there was no other contemporary power or group in the country which required such skills the Church could command the field, thus ensuring a steady supply of educated clergy to fulfill the Church's wide ranging role in society.

The teachers were often in holy orders, but not necessarily so, as the case of Sevenoaks Grammar school shows. (1) The Church's monopoly of education was reinforced by a system of licensing. The licence to teach was granted by the bishop and licensees were regarded as officials of the bishop. (2) This system of ecclesiastical licensing was not finally abolished until the Endowed schools Act of 1869. There are examples of rogue schools being opened by unlicensed teachers but these were closed by the Church authorities, demonstrating the power of the Church and the importance she placed on her educational monopoly. It is significant that in the eighteenth century and nineteenth centuries when education for the masses developed the Church vainly tried to defend her monopoly but found that years of slow erosion of her position had fatally weakened her influence.

Another aspect of the church/education relationship was that of the concept of education itself. Not only was education under the control of the Church, it was an activity which had religion at its very heart. Secular subjects and the knowledge gained from them were worthless without the unifying principle and all-illuminating

knowledge of religion. There was no distinction between secular and religious education, both elements were present in the single seamless cloth of knowledge woven by God and given to man. Under such a system the control over the inculcation of the values and sentiments of society passed to the Church.

Under an established church where dissent was not tolerated this situation was clearly acceptable to all, but where dissent was tolerated the situation was vastly different. Control of the Schools meant, to a great extent, control over what people thought.

Small wonder that bitter battles were to be fought between Church, Chapel and nondenominational governments over such things as conscience clauses and catechisms! However, in the time of Henry VIII such denominational disputes were still in the future and this medieval concept of education as a unity controlled by the Church survived the reforms of the time. Indeed, Burgess suggests that the

"breach with Rome actually contributed to the ecclesiastical monopoly of education"

in that the old cathedral schools were reformed and re-established by royal authority but still under the control of the Church. (3)

An interesting legal case occurred in 1410 which was to influence thinking on this matter until the nineteenth century. This concerned an action in the civil court against an unlicensed school. The Lord Chief Justice ruled that the education of children was a spiritual matter and so came under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court not the civil courts. This principle was violated a few years later in 1440 when Henry VI granted a monopoly to his royal foundation of Eton, but this fact seems to have been overlooked by those members of the Church party in the nineteenth century who used, or tried to use, this judgement to support the Church's claim to exclusive control of education. All this apart however, this case does show the sort of ideas about education which were current at that time. Archbishop Cranmer (4) introduced the English Bible and the English Prayer Book into the schools.

6

The Prayer book catechism provided a simple statement of religious knowledge which could be expected to be within the powers of the ordinary members of the Church to learn.

A Mandate of the Privy Council of 1553 provides evidence that

◦ "the Edwardian Council hoped to assist the cause of uniformity by the compulsory use of a catechism in the schools and that it proposed to have schools inspected to see how the teaching progressed." (5)

Clearly the Church and State were at that time of similar mind as to the need for uniformity and ways of obtaining it. Elizabeth pursued the same policy, stressing the requirement of the episcopal licence for a teacher. Her aim was to increase religious unity, and so any Roman Catholics and uncompromising or extreme Puritans were not allowed to teach. The Church and State were regarded as aspects of the same society, the Church being the nation on its "religious side". This "Unity of the State" concept was admirably expressed by Hooker in his "Ecclesiastical Polity" and was to enjoy a very long, if eventful, life. The close harmony envisaged by Hooker (but never really attained in reality) was shattered by the intrusion of the Interregnum, after which such thoughts could never be seriously entertained again. The Commonwealth and the ideas which lay behind it were instrumental in breaking the Church's stranglehold on education. This is borne out in the events after the Restoration when the number of dissenting academies grew steadily in spite of the opposition of the Church. (6)

One of the effects of the Commonwealth and of the subsequent revolution of 1688 was the beginning of the slow process of the extinction of the idea of the nation as a Christian community in which the State existed to ensure the practice of a certain set of Christian principles. The seventeenth century had seen the persecution of religious dissent by the rulers of the Church and State and the use of the divine prerogative as an argument to support the oppressive actions of the State. The outcome of all the strife was a reaction

against religious fanaticism, the rejection of the principle of the divine right of Kings and the growth of the Nonconformist tradition and all that that entailed later on in politics, in education and in society in general. The Clarendon Code effected the ejection from the Church of many sincere ministers she could ill afford to lose, providing an increase in the numbers of dissenting religious believers. Other factors also contributed to the growth of nonconformist activity of course, such as the fact that those who could not accept the Church of England of the post Restoration period were naturally anxious that the State should not have the right to control the religion of its members, and consequently they resisted state intervention in any matter (such as education) which might lead to such control. This nonconformist tradition bore significant fruit in the nineteenth century in people like Edward Baines and R.W.Dale and was a force to be reckoned with throughout the nineteenth century. The characteristic of this line of thought was an "anti-state attitude" in which the State refrained from interfering with the natural forces operating in society. Private enterprise, and self help were virtues to be encouraged and State action should be resisted.

The Act of Toleration and the political supremacy of the Whigs, supported by the Dissenting vote further eroded the Church's position. Dissent was particularly strong amongst the middle classes, a fact which was of no mean significance, as N.Hans explains; (7)

"by the legal recognition of Dissent the Church of England definitely lost her hold on the middle classes and became the Church of the aristocracy and of the poorest classes This fact explains why the Church leaders were unable to conceive of a national system of education. For them the education of the two classes had to be separate and of different content; for the ruling classes, grammar schools and universities, and for the "deserving poor" charity schools of a very elementary standard."

As the eighteenth century went by the numbers of Dissenters grew rapidly, swelled by the spread of Methodism, and, according to the

census of 1851 Dissenters, accounted for 48% of the church going population. The rise of Dissent meant that whereas toleration of a sort was guaranteed in the nineteenth century a great battle was to ensue over the right to educate the people. The Established Church had at one time claimed a monopoly but could not do so any more. Dissenters were anxious to secure religious freedom in education, whilst the Church wanted to control her own schools (certain Anglicans wanted the Church to control all schools), as well as the teaching that was given in them. This clash of interests, arising as it did on religious grounds but having social and political ramifications, was to have a great effect upon the development of the schools of England in general and upon the teaching of religion in schools in particular.

A feature of the eighteenth century was the rise of the Charity School Movement. As the traditional grammar schools became more exclusive more charity schools were founded by philanthropists and religiously motivated men and women. The appalling social conditions which existed at the start of the eighteenth century provided the spur for the Charity School Movement. These schools tried to instill into their pupils an acceptance of the order of society and a sense of decency and religious propriety. Religious catechisms and the three R's were their staple educational diet, with the emphasis on the former rather than the latter and the teaching of the latter through the former. The recently formed Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge helped to spread the good work and, while never actually managing schools, the Society performed valuable services as an employment agency and as a stimulus to local interest. However, the changes of the latter half of the eighteenth century led to the decline of the Charity School Movement. Demands for child labour for the new factories and criticisms that educating the children of the poor was not merely unnecessary but also dangerous because it provoked discontent, led to a falling off in support for these schools. But the need was still there and growing all the time. The children of the industrial towns were

growing up brutalized and ignorant of religion. The last quarter of the eighteenth century saw the spread of the Sunday School movement as an alternative means of filling the gap. This, like the Charity School movement, was religiously motivated. Sunday schools had the advantage of not keeping the children from gainful employment during the week and also of being very cheap to run. Such schools were ideal places for well meaning middle class converts to offer their services as teachers. In many ways these schools were admirably suited to the spirit of the times, but they had their faults. Many of the teachers had little or no training or equipment to teach with, the curriculum was narrow and Bible based and, most important of all, the one day a week given to the school was just not enough. Only day schools could provide what was needed to educate the children of the masses, but the State was neither willing nor able to provide these schools. It is noteworthy that Sunday Schools had a great influence on the later development of education. In 1847 Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth wrote that Sunday Schools had

"laid the foundations of public education for the poor deeply in the religious organizations of the country. The type of this school had to a great extent predetermined the constitution of the daily school...." (8)

The idea that mass education was a bad thing took a very long time to die. As in the past moves for a better provision for education in general came largely from within the Church. This brings us to the beginning of the nineteenth century and the start of the close examination of the development of the Church's role, which forms the major part of this thesis.

The situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century

The school system at the start of the nineteenth century was in need of rejuvenation and expansion. The grammar schools and public schools had been under attack on two main points. Firstly

the schools were criticized on the matter of the curriculum. This was no recent complaint, as far back as John Locke at the end of the seventeenth century such thoughts were uttered;

"you think it worth while to hazard your son's innocence and virtue for a little Greek and Latin. How anyone's being put into a mixed herd of unruly boys and there learning to wrangle at Trap or rook at Span Farthing fits him for civil conversation or business, I do not see. And what qualities are ordinarily to be got from such a troop of play fellows as Schools usually assemble together from parents of all kinds that a father should so much covet, is hard to difine." (9)

The public schools were no better than many of the grammar schools. Dr. Thomas James, headmaster of Rugby from 1778 - 1794 wrote to a former assistant teacher giving details on the curriculum then being followed at Rugby. The vast bulk of this was Latin and Greek, other subjects only being taught on what were euphemistically called holidays. To be fair to the grammar schools there were certain difficulties in the way to a wider curriculum, as Leeds Grammar School's case showed. In 1805 Lord Eldon the Lord Chancellor gave his ruling; Leeds Grammar School might not introduce writing, arithmetic and foreign languages into their curriculum. The effect of such introductions would be to turn the grammar school into a commercial academy.

"This is a scheme to promote the benefits of the merchants of Leeds. It is not that the poor inhabitants are to be taught reading and writing English, but the Clerks and Riders of the Merchants are to be taught French and German to carry on a trade. I fear that the effect would be to turn out the poor Latin and Greek scholars altogether." (10)

Indeed many grammar schools had fallen on hard times, no doubt in part due to the narrowness of the curriculum, as the following extracts from Carlisle's Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales (1918) reveals only too clearly;

"The Grammar School of Bishop's Stortford no longer exists. The whole establishment, together with the school house is in ruins. The Library which is considered a scarce and valuable collection of books is deposited at the Vicarage, but they are also going to decay."

The Grammar School at Pocklington Yorkshire had an endowment of £1000 - £1200 but Carlisle reported that

"the Lower School room is made use of as a saw pit and barn - that the Master has not attended for the last 12 months and that the Usher - being deaf, the children have necessarily been sent to other schools."(11)

The second major criticism of the schools was about the conditions which were allowed to exist in the school building. Life in the public schools was often harsh and brutal, with poor food and chaotic administration, the pupils being mostly poorly supervised, especially out of lesson hours. Some dormitories were locked at night and the pupils not let out until the next morning. Bullying and fagging were the norm with discipline maintained by flogging, but as Curtis aptly remarks,

"An age which began with the use of the pillory and stocks for minor offences and hanged the small pilferer, which later sanctioned transportation to Botany Bay and suffered the sight of the bodies of criminals hanging on gibbets, was not likely to be unduly disturbed by the flogging of schoolboys."

Teachers often beat their pupils severely, indeed, in a class of seventy, this was one, perhaps the only way then known of maintaining order. One account of disciplinary measures of Christ's Hospital includes flogging, solitary confinement in fetters and public scourging. Such actions did not always pass unrebuked, especially in the smaller "community" schools as the following letter of complaint shows;

"I do certify that I placed my son under the care of Mr. Evanson, Master of the Free Grammar School in Oundle, but through Mr. Evanson's inattention to the few children he had under his care and his brutal behaviour to my son, by frequently knocking him down

and giving him severe blows on the head which brought his life in danger, I was under the necessity of taking him away. Mr. Evanson is extremely negligent in attending the school, seldom appearing before eleven o'clock and when there, his behaviour has so much the appearance of a man deranged in his mind, that many people have entertained an opinion of his being insane." (12)
(Mr. Evanson was subsequently dismissed.)

If such was the state of some of the well endowed grammar schools and public schools, then the general condition of some of the less fortunate schools does not require much imagination. However there was such a bewildering array of different types of schools that generalizations are dangerous. In addition to the old established schools there were grammar schools which, having fallen upon hard times, had become primary schools; charity schools, some very wealthy, others ailing for lack of support; petty schools which prepared children for grammar schools; and finally a vast array of private schools often run by the old or the unsuccessful as a last effort to stave off disaster.

In this situation the Church almost had a monopoly. The Dissenting Academies still existed and some of them did introduce much needed innovations into the curriculum, but the Church still dominated the educational scene. The Universities were firmly under Church control and Churchmen had had a hand in running or founding the majority of the more substantial (and many of the minor) educational institutions. Since 1698 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had been helping to start elementary schools all over the country, not just by providing money, but help in the form of expertise, speakers for fund raising exercises and books. By the start of the nineteenth century the charity school movement was declining somewhat, especially those schools which had tried to provide education and teach a skill such as spinning or carpentry. Many schools of this nature were started with high hopes, but, with a few honourable exceptions, the majority failed.

In the past Churchmen, especially Evangelicals, had led the way in

the provision of schools of all sorts, (notably Sunday Schools which appealed mainly for financial and economic reasons). The motivation for these actions stemmed largely from a desire to convey to the illiterate and ignorant the blessing of Christian salvation and redemption. Schools were seen as an excellent way of improving the morals of the young. Hannah More in the Cheddar district and Mrs. Trimmer in Brentford are excellent examples of religiously motivated people trying to educate the poor (but at the same time seeing that they kept their appointed place in society). (13) The importance of the Sunday School movement and of these other philanthropic educational enterprises must not be underestimated. In 1853 Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth wrote;

"It is also important to observe that the development of Sunday Schools for the poor proceeded with gigantic strides..... The idea of education for the poor sprang from a religious impulse it regarded the school as a nursery of the Church and congregation, and confided its management to the chief communicants to the deacons, elders and class teachers. Thus the Sunday School became the type of the daily school." (14)

If Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth's assessment of the situation is correct, small wonder then that education became a major issue between the various religious factions. The more such "nurseries" a church had, the larger it could expect its following to be. Perhaps in matters like this it should plainly be said that education was playing second fiddle to proselytizing, a change that modern church schools are anxious to refute. However, there remained major obstacles in the way of educational advance at the start of the Century, not the least of which was the sheer magnitude of the task as compared to the minimal resources available. The State would not take on the task of providing a national system of schooling and public opinion was by no means fully convinced of the benefits of educating the poor. Another major obstacle was

the small numbers of teachers available, not to mention the total lack of any administrative machinery which could cope with a large volume of educational work. These were clearly problems which could not be solved overnight.

A major boost to educational advance occurred when the Monitorial systems of Bell and Lancaster appeared at the start of the nineteenth century. Both systems were similar in that a single master could teach "pupil teachers" who could teach the pupils. Thus one master could (in theory) control large numbers of pupils. This monitorial system with its mechanical style of organization and teaching appealed to the current Victorian frame of mind - here was the ideal method of instruction being both cheap and efficient and easily regulated, just like a machine. Unfortunately after early friendliness Bell and Lancaster became rivals and Anglican support gathered round Bell whilst nonconformists and inter-denominationalists supported the Quaker Lancastrian. Bell supported denominational teaching in schools whereas Lancaster favoured a nondenominational approach. This split was in part due to the characters of the two men and partly to the publication in 1805 by Mrs. Trimmer of her "Comparative View of the New Plan of Education" in which she claimed that Lancaster had stolen his ideas from Bell. The question of the reality of the system's true origin pales into insignificance when the outcome is considered. From that point on supporters of education tended to polarise into two main groups. Anglican opinion was further estranged by Mrs. Trimmer pointing out that in Lancastrian schools the Catechism was not taught and Religious Instruction was undenominational. In 1808 the Royal Lancastrian Society was formed which later in 1914 became the British and Foreign School society. This became the society which was supported largely by Nonconformists and those opposing denominational instruction whilst supporting voluntary efforts to provide education.

IV "All schools which shall be supplied with teachers at the expense of this Institution shall be open to the children of parents of all religious denominations. Reading, Writing, Arithmetic and Needlework shall be taught, the lessons for reading shall consist of extracts from the Holy scriptures no catechism or peculiar religious texts shall be taught in the schools but every child shall be enjoined to attend regularly the place of worship to which its parents belong." Rules and Regulations of the Society. (15)

The supporters of Bell on the Anglican side did not form a comparable institution until 1811 when the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church was established by a group of liberal churchmen. It would be an oversimplification to see the National Society merely as a denominational reply to the British and Foreign Schools Society, there were broader principles involved. Even in 1808 Bell had published "A sketch of a National Institution for training up the children of the poor" which was a rough outline of the later National Society. A later sermon in St. Pauls by the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, Dr. March, entitled "The National Religion - the foundation of National Education" supported Bell's ideas. Indeed the National Society was notable from the very start for its high powered and influential support amongst the hierarchy of the Anglican Church. In the summer of 1811 the National Society was formed with the Archbishop of Canterbury Charles Manners-Sutton as its Chairman. The first Annual Report states as the aim of the society;

"to communicate to the poor generally by means of a summary mode of education lately brought into practice, such knowledge and habits as are sufficient to guide them through life in their proper stations, especially to teach them the doctrine of religion according to the principles of the Established Church, and to train them to the performance of their religious duties by an early discipline."

The rift between the two societies became irreparable in a short while. Birchenough comments;

"It was the difficulty of harmonising deep-rooted differences of religious and social ideals. In the present instance we have a party of men who regarded the widespread dissemination of the three R's and simple Bible reading, without note or comment as a matter of urgency. On the other side we see many individuals no less honest, pinning their faith to the spiritual uplift of religious formularies and observances, and less convinced of the importance and urgency of more secular instruction. In addition they were firmly persuaded that if any universal system of education was to be established, the Church was the only organization with the power and the sanction to carry on the work" (16)

From this beginning came a line of development which was to bring the "education question" to the attention of the nation on many occasions. The influence of the Church in this area was to provoke many controversies with the Government and the Nonconformists and even within the confines of the Anglican Church itself, with the National Society being both the instrument and the arena for these conflicting pressure groups.

Footnotes to preceding chapter

The origins of the Church's involvement in schools

1. In 1432 John Sevenoaks, founder of Sevenoaks G.S. definitely ordered that the master should not be a clergyman. S.J. Curtis, History of Education, pg.18

2. The Lateran Council of 1179 encouraged educational activities by ordering cathedrals and large churches to provide grammar school masters and also made the granting of licenses free.

"For a license to teach no one shall exact money, even if on pretence of any custom he ask anything from those who teach, nor when a license is asked, shall he prevent any one who is fit, from teaching. Whoever presumes to contravene this shall be put out from any ecclesiastical benefice."

A. F. Leach Educational Charters & Documents, pg.123.

3. H.J. Burgess, Enterprise in Education, pg.4 N.S. & SPCK.

4. *ibid*, pg.5. The Royal injunctions decreed that at Winchester College

"henceforth the Bible shall be daily read in English distinctly and apertly in the midst of the hall both at dinner and supper."

5. Burgess *ibid* quoting N. Wood, pg.120, The Reformation and English Education.

6. Two cases are noteworthy here. Firstly, in the Bates case the court ruled that if the founder of an institution appointed a teacher then this made a bishop's license unnecessary. Secondly, in Cox's case the court ruled that episcopal licenses were only necessary for grammar school teachers.

7. N.Hans, pg. 41, Educational Tradition in the English speaking countries, as quoted in Burgess *ibid*, pg.7.

8. quoted S. C. Carpenter, Church & People pg. 38.

9. S.J. Curtis, *op cit* pg,114.

10. *ibid* pg.125.
 11. Curtis *ibid* pg.123 quoting Vol 1 pg.554 & Vol II pg.864 of Carlisle.
 12. Quoted by D.W.Sylvester, Educational Documents 800 - 1816 pg.200.
 13. Not that Hannah Moore was universally acclaimed for her work. Augustine Birrell said, as he solemnly buried 18 volumes of her writings in his garden that she was

"one of the most detestable writers who ever held a pen ..."
- Quoted B.R. Marshall PhD Thesis, Theology of Church & State in relation to the concern for popular education in England 1800 - 1870" Oxford 1956 pg.151 note 30.
14. Sir J. Kay-Shuttleworth. Public Education pg.34 pub.1853.
 15. D.W.Sylvester *op cit* pg. 288.
 16. C. Birchenough, History of Elementary Education in England & Wales, pg.48.

Chapter two

The Pattern of Development to 1839

There are many statistics which can be bandied about concerning the growth of the numbers of children in National Society schools, but perhaps the most significant is that in 1812 the National Society had 52 schools with 8620 children in them (no mean achievement in just under a year!) and by 1830 there were 3670 such schools with about 34600 pupils (all these figures include Sunday Schpols scholars),(1) Whatever the absolute increase in growth, the crucial factor was that the (Anglican) National Society had far outstripped the nondenominational (and mainly dissenting) British and Foreign Schools Society and other dissenting schools. Brown gives the following figures from the Government census of 1833, but he admits that they may not be altogether reliable.

Children in Church Schools	1,140,655
Children in Dissenters Schools	47,287 (2)

He does however refer to a report on the education of children in Manchester which stated that

"out of every ten children of school age, four went to no school at all, three to Sunday school only, two attended the very unsatisfactory dame and common day schools and only one received an education which at least escaped the strictures of the committee." (3)

It is worth remarking at this early stage that the disparity in the rate of growth of the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society was to prove very important at a later date when the Government started to hand out money in proportion to the income of the educational societies. Under this arrangement the National Society was to receive the lion's share of the money, which consequently influenced the way Nonconformists and others looked at this arrangement. (4)

In the early years of the nineteenth century there took place a phenomenal growth in educational provision which

was due to the efforts of those members of various religious sects or other organizations who set up and paid for schools themselves. There had been various attempts to organize a national system of education (or at least to extend greatly the existing system) through Parliamentary channels. The first tentative step had been made with Sir Robert Peel's "Health and Morals of Apprentices" bill in 1802, which laid down that apprentices sent from Workhouses by Public Authorities should be taught the three R's during part of the working day, Religious Instruction on Sunday for one hour and attend Church at least once a month. The Act was of limited scope and had little value as there was no machinery for enforcement.

In 1807 Whitbread introduced his Parochial Schools Bill which was designed to establish a school in each parish in England and Wales, run on the lines of the monitorial system. This was doomed to failure for a variety of reasons. Firstly, many people had yet to be convinced of the value of educating large numbers of the poor (5) and secondly the Church was against any undenominational instruction (which Whitbread's Bill contained). The Bill was rejected by the Lords after a stormy passage through the Commons. The "religious difficulty" surrounding this Bill was not eased by the fact that the Bell versus Lancaster controversy was in full swing at the time.

If the Church would not have Whitbread's Bill the Nonconformists would not have that of Brougham in 1820. Lord Brougham was a strong advocate of education and had engineered the appointment of a Select Committee to look into the Education of the Lower Orders. The report of that Committee revealed the inadequacy of educational provision and the continuing growth of demand. (6) Brougham discovered that many educational charities existed and he pressed for these to be redistributed. His proposals to set up Commissioners to perform this task was reduced by amendments in the Lords to irrelevance, but the precedent and pattern was set for the Charity Commissioners of later years.

Brougham's Bill was designed to provide school places where voluntary effort had failed to meet the need. The idea was that the manufacturers would supply the money to build schools and the gentry would be taxed to pay the master's salary. Local rates would be levied to support the school and those parents who could do so were to pay 2-4d per week in fees. As if this were not inflammatory enough, Brougham further suggested that the master had to be a member of the Church of England and approved of by the local incumbent, who would have the power to dismiss the master, control the curriculum and visit and examine the schools. In an attempt to anticipate and forestall Nonconformist opposition Brougham suggested that Religious Instruction should be limited to studying Scripture, worship should be limited to the Lord's Prayer and that every child should go with his parents to church or chapel on Sundays. The Nonconformists objected to the Church's total control over the schools and many Anglicans were not happy with the idea of such a comprehensive system, so Brougham withdrew the Bill.

These two early clashes set the lines of battle for the years to come. The disputes over education produced a proliferation of societies and splinter groups within societies which can be rather confusing, but the main groupings are set out below at this early stage for the sake of clarity.

Firstly there was that body of opinion represented by the National Society. This was mainly Anglican and was committed to denominational teaching of doctrine and worship. Inside the National Society group there were those who were prepared to co-operate with the Government in the development of the system and to allow the Government to have a degree of control over the schools. On the other hand there was another group (later led by Archdeacon Denison) which, while being prepared to take government money, rejected the claim of the Government to have any say in how schools were run. In their eyes education was the domain of the Church alone and no interference by the State was to be permitted.

The rift between these two groups became pronounced as the tensions between the religious denominations and the State grew with increasing State involvement in this area.

The British and Foreign Schools Society represented those Nonconformists who were in favour of a voluntary system of education with nondenominational religious teaching. This grouping was less well defined than the National Society and underwent changes over the years which reflected the differing priorities of its members. Some supported it from an anti-Anglican viewpoint, others from a voluntaryist viewpoint, others from the belief that Religious Instruction should be nondenominational. Voluntaryism, which became a significant force in the 1840s was based on the argument that education was necessarily religious (or else it was useless) and because the State should not interfere with religion, education was not a proper sphere of activity for the State. Thus when it later became clear (especially under the Revised Code) that the voluntary system could not cope with the demand for education, many supporters of the British and Foreign Schools Society went their differing ways, many of them abandoning the voluntaryist ideal and supporting the state secular system rather than continuing to support a system which favoured the Anglicans, and was inadequate in any case.

The Roman Catholics represented a small well defined group and, to their lasting credit, they stuck tenaciously to their simple position "Catholic schools for catholic children". At no time, in spite of severe financial problems, did the official Roman Catholic policy change. In the majority of conflicts they would line up on the side of the Anglicans against the Nonconformists and radicals - a point which was by no means lost on many people at the time of the Oxford movement.

There also existed a small but growing group of radicals who wanted to create a state system of education beyond the control of the Churches. (7) As the years went by this group was swollen by those disillusioned by denominational squabbling and by the

increasing numbers of aetheists or agnostics. (8)

The years up to 1833 were characterized by the magnificent efforts of the clergy and their supporters to organize schools. To this end the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society gave grants and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge sold materials and gave advice. The voluntary societies faced formidable problems such as a rising population, a lack of funds; a severe shortage of trained teachers; the factories still demanded cheap child labour; school attendance was still voluntary (and remained so until 1880); fees ("school pence") often had to be charged to help make the schools pay which effectively debarred many from attending.

In the light of this situation the National Society took an extremely far sighted line of approach. Its objective was to put a school in every parish but its resources were clearly far short of financing even a quarter of this directly. Its policy was one of providing grants to add to local fund raising efforts to pay for the foundation of the school. In addition this grant was subject to various conditions covering such things as certain dimensions to classrooms, heating, lighting, area per pupil, roof construction etc. The land on which the school stood had to be freehold or held on a long lease. The school had to teach the Anglican catechism and could only use books from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge catalogue, (this caused many complaints). The school normally had to be a day school - not just a Sunday school but it had to open on Sundays as well. Finally, the Society encouraged an equal number of the sexes amongst the pupils (a most enlightened attitude for the time) although they did not insist upon it. The British and Foreign Schools Society followed a similar pattern but their conditions pertaining to religious teaching were understandably rather different.

The Government was not unaware of the need to do something for education but it was difficult to know what to do which would not offend one of the interested parties. Clearly a national system was not yet possible or even wanted, but assistance to the voluntary societies was possible and in 1833 Parliament granted £20,000,

24

"to be issued in aid of private subscriptions for the erection of School Houses for the education of the children of the poorer classes in Great Britain to the 31st March 1834." (9)

This was the State's first significant step into the educational field. It gave money to the voluntary societies with no significant strings attached (yet!), (10) which was divided in proportion to the amount raised by the different societies. The National Society received £11,000 and the British and Foreign Schools Society £9,000 of this first amount, but the disparity in growth and resources meant that the National Society rapidly increased its proportion of the grant at the expense of the Dissenters. Thus of the £100,000 granted by 1838 the National Society had received £70,000 and the British and Foreign Schools Society only £30,000. (11) The Dissenters resented this situation but were unable to do anything about it because firstly, they were in the minority and secondly, they were divided amongst themselves. Some (e.g. the Benthamites) wanted a secular system, whilst others strongly supported religious education as central to all education. This internal dissension in the ranks of the Nonconformists was to be their Achilles heel for some time and was not finally resolved until after the Cross Commission's Report in 1888.

In 1832 a Board of National Education was set up in Dublin giving grants to schools, subject to the condition that extracts from the Bible should be selected so as to give no offence to Catholics and were to be read twice a week without comment in school hours. This is an interesting early example of encouraging co-education of Roman Catholics and Protestants, and it is also an indication firstly, that education was coming to be seen as something within the sphere of activity of the State and secondly, it shows that the State was increasingly prepared to do something in education, however little that might be. It is sad to record that this system was abolished after pressure from the Roman Catholic hierarchy and led to the introduction of denominational schools.

The great reform movement of the 1830s was to have its effect in the sphere of education. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners set to work in 1835 by the reforming Whig party were reshaping the

outdated machinery and practices of the Established Church. The bastion of the Establishment, long under attack in such virulent publications as the Black Book (1820) and the Extraordinary Black Book (1831), was attacked from another angle in the form of a proposal for a national system of education. The formal proposals of the Whig Government in 1839 were preceded by manoeuvres by the various sides. In 1836 the Central Society of Education (including Spencer, Mill and some moderates) proposed a system of state schools and colleges with undenominational Religious Instruction given by teachers and denominational teaching given by Ministers at set times. This was rejected because some Dissenters wanted to educate their own children in their own way and some radicals were against any form of Religious Instruction in schools. In addition the Church objected on many grounds; (e.g. it enforced an improper separation of education into religious and secular, it took away the power of the Church to control schools and, it also meant that the State was no longer honouring its obligation to the Established Church of support and the right (according to some Churchmen) to all State aid).

In 1837 Lord Brougham's Education Bill, which envisaged schools built from funds raised from Parliamentary vote contained the clause that Religious Instruction should consist only of the Bible read without note or commentary. This Bill was defeated, but it had its supporters amongst the ranks of the Government party and the Dissenters. The Church was watching the situation carefully through vigilant individuals such as the evangelical Rector of Cheltenham who wrote as follows:-

"Mr. Dunn argues (and Lord Brougham's Bill adopts the argument) as if the Holy Bible itself in anybody's hands whether master or scholar, has a talisman effect on all who touch it... Does he forget that the Book in the hands of a bad man, an unbeliever, a Socinian, a Papist, may be perverted into a vehicle of error in the minds of children?" (12)

and the influential Bishop Blomfield of London said in 1838,

"no system of national compulsory education would be tolerable which isn't in agreement with the principles of the Church of England".

The Church of England was in an increasing turmoil in the 1830's and 1840's. The progress of the Oxford Movement was remarkable and its influence among clergy and laity increasing. Its teaching raised the question of the true nature of the Church, which inevitably led on to the Church/State connexion. It comes as no surprise then to see the Tractarians supporting the Church's stand against the encroachments of the State and secularism in education. However, the Catholic trend in the Church provoked a counter-reaction amongst the Evangelicals and Dissenters.

The Dissenting Press claimed (concerning Graham's Factory Bill);

"instead of being instructed in the Holy Scriptures the rising generation will be drilled in Puseyite obeisances." (13)

The suspicion grew in the 1840's that the Church of England was tainted with Romanism and as such it was no longer a trustworthy institution to perform such national tasks as education. Graham wrote to Peel in 1843

"It is quite clear that the Pusey tendencies of the Established Church have operated powerfully on the Wesleyans and are converting them rapidly into enemies." (14)

The last years of the 1830's saw an increased pace of activity by those interested in the Church's work in education. It was clear that the Government intended to produce a set of proposals inimical to the interests of the Church and it was necessary for the Church to counter these, as Peel said in November 1837;

"it won't suffice to abuse the Government plan, what was needed was cordial concert between the clergy and the laity." (15)

By the end of 1838 the National Society had produced a plan for the whole range of education including that of Teacher Training. The

result of pressure by such people as Peel, Acland, Gladstone, Wood and Ashley was the setting up of a Committee of Inquiry and Correspondence. This committee worked quite quickly and produced various proposals. It suggested that the Society's charter should be altered to permit it to establish "middle schools"; (i. e. schools for the lower middle classes providing some post primary education); that the terms of union should be revised so that books other than those on the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge booklist could be used. On a wider note it proposed the reorganization and revitalization (and where necessary the re-establishment) of diocesan boards in every diocese, which would collect and distribute money and inspect schools. As far as teacher training was concerned a group headed by S. F. Wood suggested that a Central College be founded in London to provide education of a more advanced nature. It was suggested that the Master of this new "Queen's College" should be the Professor of Education at King's College, thus ensuring higher standards and status for the enterprise and its students. At a diocesan level there were to be seminaries attached to the cathedrals where the majority of the masters would be taught, leading a "monastic mode of life." The ablest of these teachers would then go on to the central (Queen's) College. (16)

All these proposals were approved except the ones concerning the improvement of Teacher training and the new College. Burgess maintains that it was the success of this Committee of Inquiry rather than dissatisfaction with the status quo which prompted Lord John Russell into forming the Committee of Privy Councillors in 1839. This new burst of activity by the National Society had positive results in the country. Clergy were urged to set up local boards and keep in touch with the National Society and within the year "fifteen new diocesan Boards and many subordinate boards" were constituted and donations to these local boards rose to £15,500. (17)

One further area of innovation proposed by the Committee of Inquiry was that of inspection of Schools. There was no

comprehensive system of inspection of schools and the National Society and the Committee realized that the Government might use this as an argument to support any intervention they wished to make. The Government would only offer the National Society £500 to pay for inspection (the same sum as the British and Foreign Schools Society in spite of the difference in numbers of schools the two societies were linked to), Burgess writes;

"Clearly the Society's aim was to forestall State action by establishing its own system of inspection, controlled by the Church and subsidized by the State." (18)

In the light of subsequent events the National Society acted not a moment too soon in this matter. This period of time was to prove crucial for the Church and her influence on the development of the schools. In 1838 Gladstone spoke of;

"the safe and precious interval, perhaps the last, to those who are desirous of placing the education of the people under the efficient control of the clergy."

and in January of 1839 he referred to

"the hairsbreadth escapes of last session". (19)

The result of all this activity was that shortly after the Government announced the setting up of the Committee of Privy Councillors the National Society could claim that it had completed 425 inspections, that another 265 were in progress and also drop the broad hint that only shortage of money had prevented greater progress. (20)

The 1830's had seen the Church starting to revive from a very low ebb. The influence of the Oxford Movement was reminding people of the Catholic nature of the Church and its relationship with the State. The Church had been under attack from without for a long time but the reforms coming from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were such as to secure the longevity and wellbeing of the Establishment rather than (as many would have preferred) its dismantling and ultimate demise. During the first

30 years of the nineteenth century the relationship between the Church and State altered radically as the events of the 1840's were to show. In 1818 Parliament had voted £1 million to build new Churches and another $\frac{1}{2}$ million in 1824, yet twenty years later this would have been impossible. The events of the intervening years (especially that of the 1832 Reform Act) had witnessed the increasing power of the middle classes. This in turn had given power to the large number of Dissenters in that social group which was reflected in the various "liberalizing" Acts of the times, which weakened the Church's hold on society by making Dissent easier (e.g. the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts 1828, the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, the Reform Act of 1832.)

The issue of the Irish bishoprics was an example of how the State saw its relationship to the Church. Parliament had recognized Dissent and Dissent had a strong voice in Parliament. No longer could the Anglican Church claim "One Church, One State", but the implications of this change were lost on many. The Tractarians and the old High Churchmen attempted to maintain the Church's former position of total supremacy in matters concerning religion (such as education). The Evangelicals and the Broad Churchmen were prepared to co-operate with the Government over education, a reflection of the fact that their primary concern was not the preservation (or, more accurately, resurrection) of the old Church/State ideal but rather that of saving souls and guiding the Church through troubled times.

The Anglican revival of the 1830's and 40's was bound to bring into the open the differences between Church and Dissent over such things as Establishment and education. This was overlaid by political Whig/Tory division and as time went by Whig politics and Dissenting religion came to be as closely linked as Churchmen and the Tories. Later on in the nineteenth century educational controversy often blurred over into political wranglings under the guise of religious disagreement. The appointment in 1839 by Lord John Russell of a Committee of Privy Councillors

"for the consideration of all matters affecting the
Education of the People." (21)

marked the beginning of a conflict which was to simmer on in public view for many years, occasionally boiling over, much to the discomfort of the politicians who dared to stir the cauldron too much.

Footnotes to preceding chapter

The Pattern of Development to 1839

1. S.J. Curtis History of Education, pg 208.
2. C.F.K. Brown, The Church's part in Education, pg.4
3. *ibid.*
4. for details of amounts see below pg.19
5. See below page 61 ff.
6. Brougham said in debate;

"The average means of more education therefore was in fact one sixteenth in England, yet even this scanty means had only existed since the year 1803, when what were called the new schools based on the systems of Dr. Bell and Mr. Lancaster were established. Before 1803 then only the 21st part of the population was placed in the way of education and at that date England might justly be looked on as the worst educated country of Europe."

Hansard 1820 Vol 2. col. 61.

7. E.g. Roebuck's Education Bill of 1833 which proposed a national system paid for by taxation and fees for all 6-12 year olds.
8. E.g. The comment of the Chartist leader Francis Place in 1841;

"I hope to see the time when £20,000,000 will be voted to pay for the building of schools, schools for all, and when a compulsory rate will be levied on all, in each school district to pay for the expenses of carrying on the schools in which the teaching shall be really good and apart from all religion"

quoted F. Smith, Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth pg.75.

9. Hansard 1833 Vol 20 col.153
10. The conditions attached were that the grant would only be paid when at least half the total cost of the building had been provided by voluntary effort. Preference was to be given to large towns, but no conditions were laid down concerning

10. inspection, curricula and suitability of buildings. The National Society and British and Foreign Schools Society in the absence of any other suitable administrative machinery were to administer the grants. Curtis op cit pg.224.
11. J.R. Tate Chp V.M.A. Univ. of Durham. Life of W.F.Hook.
12. Burgess. Enterprise in Education. pg.71 Note 1. Cheltenham Journal, March 1838. Lord Brougham had despaired of a national system under the Anglicans and produced a Government sponsored system.
13. N.Gash, Reaction and reconstruction in English Politics, pg.97.
14. op cit B.R. Marshall, The Theology of the Church & State, pg.574 Vol II. Ph.D thesis Oxford 1956.

"The wave of successions which followed Newman's departure.. the spectacle of a Church deeply divided .. had all tended to weaken morale, and break down confidence in the National Church. ... Above all the Puseyite scare had so far progressed that Popery was smelt everywhere, and a certain restlessness was known to have communicated itself to the subscribers of the National Society".
15. ibid.
16. see E S. Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning, pg. 149 ff.
17. Burgess op cit pg.73 quoting National Society Annual Report 1839 pg. 10.
18. ibid.
19. Gash op cit quoting Sir Thomas Acland, National Education. The present state of the question elucidated. pg.78.
20. Burgess op cit pg. 74.
21. J.Stuart Maclure. Education Documents in England & Wales 1816 to the present day. pg.42. From a letter by Lord John Russell to Lord Lansdown, 4th February 1839.

Chapter Three

The striking of a modus vivendi 1840 - 60

The Committee of Privy Councillors worked quickly. One of its first acts was to appoint as its secretary a certain Dr. Kay (later Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth). This appointment was of the utmost significance in these early times of Government intervention. It was greeted with a certain amount of hostility, Kay was accused of being a Unitarian and of being opposed to the interests of the Established Church. In fact Kay was a communicant member of the Church of England. (1) His great tact and perseverance guided the State's hand in education through its first years and secured education as a legitimate activity for Government action forever. He was admirably suited for the task of Secretary to such a Committee. He had been a doctor in Manchester and had experienced the appalling filth and squalor of the poorer parts of that city. He wrote a pamphlet "The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester" which moved certain citizens to form societies to investigate conditions in towns like Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds and London. These inquiries revealed the decline of the schools, especially the private and dame schools. Inquiries in Leeds revealed that less than 2% of the child population went to day schools. All these reports pointed to the same conclusion, the voluntary system could not provide enough schools, of the right quality. The pressure for State intervention in such a situation began to grow.

Dr. Kay's Manchester experiences had convinced him of the need for State action in education, but he was also of the firm opinion that the monitorial system ("monitorial humbug" he called it) was totally inadequate on educational grounds. He had set up a workhouse school in Norwood in London where handicrafts and a pupil-teacher system were tried out. The success of this venture brought Kay to the conclusion that pupil teachers should be able to go on and train as masters to alleviate the severe

shortage of trained teachers. In 1839 it had been proposed to start a teacher training school at Kneller Hall. The proposals included nondenominational Religious Instruction with chaplains appointed for each denomination. This aroused such opposition that the scheme was dropped, but Kay was undaunted and in 1840 founded a College at Battersea with the help of his friend Mr. Tufnell. Three years later Kay, finding that the financial requirements of the college exceeded the resources available to him and his friends, handed the college over to the National Society. This demonstration of what was required did not go unheeded and by 1845 the Church of England had founded 22 Teacher training Colleges containing 540 students.

The evidence of the above paragraph is sufficient to demonstrate that Kay was an extremely able man, with sufficient insight and determination to see what was needed and to push it through, on his own if necessary. In his years in the "hot seat" of secretary the denominations were to find in Dr. Kay a firm but fair administrator of great patience and resolve. From the very beginning the Committee of Privy Council's actions were destined to bring them into conflict with the denominations, as the following extract from a letter from Lord John Russell to Lord Lansdowne as early as 4th February 1839 shows: after referring to the proposal to form the Committee of Privy Council Russell continues,

"In any Normal or Model school to be established by the Board, four principal objects should be kept in view, viz; 1) Religious Instruction 2) general instruction 3) moral training 4) habits of industry. Of these four I only allude to the first. With respect to Religious Instruction there is, as your Lordship is aware, a wide or apparently wide difference of opinion among those who have been most forward in promoting education. The National Society, supported by the Established Church, contends that the schoolmaster should invariably be a churchman, that the Church catechism should be taught in the school to all scholars, that all should be required to attend Church on Sundays, and that the schools should be in every case under the superintendence of the clergy of the parish. The British and Foreign Schools Society, on the other hand, admit Churchmen and Dissenters equally as

schoolmasters, require that the Bible should be taught in their schools, but insist that no catechism should be admitted.

Others again contend that secular instruction should be the business of the school, and that ministers of different persuasions should each instruct separately the children of their own followers.

In the midst of these conflicting opinions there is not practically that exclusiveness among the Church Societies nor that indifference to religion among those who exclude dogmatic instruction from the school, which their mutual accusation would lead bystanders to suppose.

Much therefore may be effected by a temperate attention to the fair claims of the Established Church and the religious freedom sanctioned by the law. On this subject I need only say that it is Her Majesty's wish that the youth of this kingdom should be religiously brought up and that the rights of conscience should be respected." (2)

This lengthy quotation serves to show two things. Firstly, that at this early stage (1839) Lord Russell had an accurate assessment of the situation and, secondly, that he was prepared to concede the "fair claims" of the Anglican Church. However, he was also careful to protect "religious freedom sanctioned by law" and "the right of conscience". The story of the next few years was the clarification of what were "the fair claims of the Established Church." As Burgess points out;

"The Church would have felt obliged, in any case, to oppose the emergence of this Committee, for its mere existence indicated the Government's abandonment of the role of mere paymaster, and its intention instead to be its own agent for education. Here was a direct incursion by the State into a province hitherto exclusively under the sway of the Established Church and its Dissenting rivals." (3)

This opposition was immediately sharpened by the Committee's proposals concerning the establishment of Normal schools, its assumption of a right to inspect all schools receiving a Parliamentary grant and the offering of this grant to bodies other than the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society. The proposal that the State Normal school was to have unsectarian Religious Instruction incensed the Anglican establishment. The Dean of Westminster said that such an arrangement would break

"the solemn and sacred union between Church and State", and the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to the Times protesting against any religious teaching consisting of Bible reading without note or comment. (4) Motions were passed by the National Society and British and Foreign Schools Society stressing the importance of the position of the clergyman as the recognized teacher and the role of the Church as the provider of education (which was, of course, regarded as indivisible,) to all society. Opposition to these proposals was so intense that the Government withdrew them, but it stood firm on its proposals to establish the Committee of Council and to increase the education grant to £30,000. Efforts to rescind the Order in Council establishing the Committee were defeated by five votes only and two days later the majority on the Government motion shrank to two. Thus the Church had failed narrowly to prevent the advent of a State controlled body into the sphere of education. However, it had managed to kill Lord Brougham's Bill and the Normal school.

This was only a temporary victory, they had scotched the snake not killed it. The thorn of the Committee remained in the side of the Established Church and worked to break the Church's stranglehold on education.

The real battle was to be waged over inspection. In view of her failure to remove the Committee of Council the Church had to be on her guard against further incursions into her own territory, and one such incursion was inspection. The Committee of Council announced that all building grants would in future carry with them the right of inspection. After a certain amount of dissension over tactics the National Society decided to proceed cautiously on this matter, but this did not produce the conciliatory response they had hoped for. Instead the Committee of Council stated baldly,

"The right of inspection will be required by the Committee in all cases; inspectors authorized by Her Majesty in Council, will be appointed from time to time to visit schools henceforth to be aided by public money: the inspectors will not interfere with the Religious Instruction or discipline or management of the school, it being their object to collect facts and information, and to report the result of their inspection to the Committee of Council." (5)

It is difficult to fail to see the force behind Burgess's comment;

"Here was the crux of the matter, hitherto the Church had had sole control over its schools and the State had subsidized the building of Church schools on conditions which only had reference to the cost of the building. Now the State, in return for grants which were less than half the cost of the building, and without paying anything towards maintainance, was demanding the permanent right of inspection. Small wonder the Church refused to submit!"

Burgess gives a comprehensive account of the inspection controversy whose details are unimportant save for the result and its general significance. (6) The National Society refused to accept the Committee's proposals and declined to process any more grant applications for Government money, choosing instead to find the money from its own resources and start its own system of inspection. A cogently argued seven point presentation of the Society's case was published, and the first National Society Inspectors appointed, with detailed guidance as to the range of their inspection (which was very wide and thorough). The National Society was well supported by the public and the clergy in this dispute,

"...of 204 Anglican applicants to whom the Government had promised aid only 49 accepted it and even of these 14 later withdrew their acceptances."

Thus the situation was that the Committee was in the position of seeing the Parliamentary grant going to Dissenters' schools only. As this situation was politically undesirable the Committee came to a Concordat with the National Society (who, of course, could not make up the loss of revenue for ever) which largely

vindicated the National Society's stand. By this Concordat the Archbishops were to be consulted before an inspector for National Society schools in his province was appointed. The Primate could suggest suitable people, veto and terminate appointments. Also

"such portions of the instructions to these Inspectors as relate to the religious teaching shall be framed by the Archbishops and form part of the general instructions issued to use by the Inspectors of such schools, and that the general instructions shall be communicated to the Archbishops before they are finally sanctioned by us." (7)

Duplicate copies of the inspectors' reports were to be sent to the provincial archbishop and the local diocesan bishop. This Concordat was the working basis for the next thirty years over the issue of inspection, but it had two drawbacks. Firstly, it made no provision for assisting the National Society in inspecting those schools which did not receive a Government grant and secondly, the ecclesiastical unit of administration was the diocese and not the province. The National Society decided to appoint more inspectors of its own and to encourage dioceses to appoint their own inspectors. This meant that there were three levels of inspection, governmental, National Society, and diocesan, all of which continued on their somewhat inadequate way until the great reshuffle of 1870.

The significance of the inspection controversy is quite simple. What sort of activity was education and did the Church have sole authority over her schools? Burgess claims that

"the Concordat of 1840 represents the high water mark of the Church's power in the struggle to decide who was to determine educational policy." (8)

Whatever the merits of this view the fact remains that the State had established its right to inspect the secular aspects of schools and its right to promote and extend elementary education outside the confines of the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society. Thus far the territory of the Church had been

encroached upon. In future the Church was to find that, unlike the occasion of the inspection question, she was no longer able to speak with one voice and consequently her power waned: Burgess puts it quite bluntly

"never again would the Church, by simple refusal to co-operate, be able to bring the State to heel."

Supporting evidence for this assessment of the state of affairs comes from the furore surrounding Sir James Graham's ill-fated Factory Bill of 1843. The Factory Act of 1833 had provided that all children employed in factories should receive some daily education. It had not however provided any schools for them but only factory inspectors. Abuses and evasions of the provisions of the Act prompted Lord Ashley to engineer the setting up of a Select Committee to look into the working of the Act. The recommendations of that Committee laid the foundations for Graham's Factory Bill which regulated the hours that children might work in the textile factories. In addition to this schools were to be built through Government loans which were to be repaid by school fees and a local school rate. All the children under thirteen were to be required to spend three hours a day in these schools. All this provoked little enough reaction, compared to the disagreement centred on the question of the management of the schools.

The proposals were quite straightforward - a management committee of seven persons was to be set up. The local Anglican priest would be a member and he could nominate his two churchwardens as well. The remaining four members, of whom two were to be mill owners, were to be elected by the magistrates. The headmaster was to be a member of the Church of England and had to be approved by the bishop. Religious Instruction was to be based on the Book of Common Prayer and attendance at Church was compulsory (although a conscience clause for Nonconformists was included). Finally, inspection of the schools was to be performed by the clerical managers or trustees and the Committee of Council.

Sir James Graham could be forgiven for thinking that his proposals (which were approved by the Anglican hierarchy) would be found acceptable. Graham was, however, fully aware of the delicate nature of the "religious question" in education. As early as 1841 he had told Brougham,

"Religion, the keystone of education, is, in this country, the bar to its progress." (9)

He had, however, miscalculated the strength and effectiveness of Dissenting opposition. All the evidence of previous Parliamentary business in education had shown the Church of England to be a very powerful force. It became clear during the lifetime of this Bill that Dissent was also a force to be reckoned with. In 1843 alone over 11,000 petitions objecting to the Bill with over 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ million signatures were laid before Parliament. Gash remarks,

"the Bill of 1843 marked the point beyond which the Anglican revival could not go"

and he enlarges on this;

"the lesson of the crisis was clear. Defence of the Church was one thing, enlargement of the Church a quite different one. For all its revival since 1832 the Church of England as a State establishment could no longer in practice call upon the State either for wider pastoral privileges or even for peculiar financial assistance." (10)

In spite of the several concessions offered by Graham the Non-conformists wanted the denominational aspects of the bill removed. Graham refused and the Bill was dropped. He said,

"I say that as a Minister of the Crown - that Crown being head of the Church established by law - I should betray my duty if I made any concession on this point." (11)

The Nonconformists, headed by Edward Baines the Editor of the Leeds Mercury, objected to the fact that although all the inhabitants were going to have to support such schools via the school rate, the Established Church had sole control over its management. One Nonconformist, Spencer Morely, set his ten objections to

rhyme, whose essence was

"Petition and petition still
For 'tis in fact a Tory Bill" (12)

The opposition may also have had political undercurrents because the past experiences of Dissenters had shown that the State and more particularly, the Whigs, had eased their situation in life. The Tory's return to power in 1841 was greeted with a certain amount of apprehension by Dissenters and the attempt (as they saw it) in Graham's Bill to establish a national system of education firmly under the control of the Established Church was seen as an attack on their religious independence. Baines described the Bill as

"a deep scheme for getting the education of the whole people in to the hands of the Church ... full of Jesuitical cunning." (13)

In reality the numbers of children involved in this particular Bill were quite small (Cobden calculated around 60,000) but the Nonconformists saw it as not only attacking their principles, but also as a way of undermining them in their area of strongest support - the manufacturing districts.

"This insidious Bill seeks to recover the ground which the Established Church has lost in the manufacturing districts... instead of being instructed in the Holy Scriptures the rising generation will be drilled in Puseyite obeisances, and made to stammer through the Apostles Creed and the Ten Commandments .. and in another generation the religion of the manufacturing districts, now ... a matter of conviction, feeling and practical force, will be reduced to a thing of forms and ceremonies and delusive superstitions." (14)

The debacle of 1843 proved to be a turning point for both the Nonconformists and the Anglican Church. The Nonconformists no longer had any confidence in State action in the educational sphere and so Voluntaryism (the principle that the State did not interfere in education) became the hallmark of the Nonconformists and others. The Voluntarists, led by people like Edward Baines and Samuel Morely, in conjunction with the Congregational Union and others raised funds and began to set up an independent system of education.

In 1846 they established their own Teacher training College at Homerton and by 1851 they had opened 364 schools without any state aid. (15)

For their part the Anglicans had been decisively defeated on a proposition to put a national system of education under Anglican control. Never again was this idea to be seriously considered by Parliament. Education had become an ecclesiastical and political issue of great importance. The denominational wrangling which started in the 1840's was to go on for the rest of the century and beyond. To modern minds it is perhaps inexplicable but in those days education was an issue that went to the roots of a man's political and religious beliefs. The bitterness of the denominational strife turned some men (e.g. Cobden) into secularists, not for any reason other than that in secularism they saw the only way of instituting a national system of education. The real loss of 1843 was the wasted opportunity of setting up a system capable of developing into a national system. Such a step had to be put back for thirty years during which time the struggle between the State, the Church and Dissent was to continue unabated with education as the loser. It is no less than tragic that though such goodwill, effort and such a 'high' concept of education and its value prevailed amongst the denominations, they could not yet bring themselves to agree to differ and to co-operate on that basis as far as was possible.

"The opportunity was lost of taking the Church in a liberal, genial mood and of providing for children of various sects, being reared as brethren, while instructing each other in the doctrine of his own communion. All that was possible was done for the perpetuating of sectarian rancour, and for hounding on ignorance and bigotry to new assaults on the innocence and peace of society" (16)

The "education problem" as it came to be known was indeed a very difficult one to solve. Lord Ashley said;

"United education is an impossibility. The Dissenters and the Church have each laid down limits they will

not pass, and there is no power that can either force, persuade or delude them." (17)

Somehow the State had to steer a path between this Scylla and Charybdis and many constructive proposals were doomed to be wrecked because they veered too much to one side or the other. It required firm resolution to bring about innovations in this field as the Management and Conscience Clause controversies show.

The Management Clause Controversy began in 1847 when the Committee of Council began to insist on the insertion of a previously voluntary Management Clause into the trust deeds of all schools receiving State grants. The new conditions were acceptable to the Wesleyans and the Roman Catholics came to a compromise in 1850 but the Anglicans objected strongly.

A careful study of the main proposals (see especially Clause A in notes at the end of the chapter) reveals to modern eyes an Anglican "closed shop". Why then did the Tractarians object so strongly and why did Kay-Shuttleworth hazard so much to enforce these apparently innocuous conditions?

The answer to these questions is quite simple. The aim of the Management Clauses was to reduce the power of the local incumbent. Kay-Shuttleworth wrote as early as 1843 concerning Church schools,

"They are (often) conveyed to the clergyman as trustee, and managed by him to the exclusion of all laymen," and so "his opinions, however extreme, rule the school." (18)

Kay was no great supporter of the more extreme Anglican position, he refers to them as "the medieval party" of the Church which saw

"The interference of the State in public education as an intrusion into the province of the Church, and the attempt to establish co-operation between civil and spiritual power as a struggle between irreconcilable systems." (19)

It must also be remembered that Kay had his political master's opinions to consider. In 1843 he wrote;

"When your Lordship and Lord Lansdowne in 1839 appointed me Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education I understood the design of your Government to be to prevent the successful assertion on the part of the Church then put forth, for a purely ecclesiastical system of education... I understood your Lordship's Government in 1839 to assert the claim of the civil power to control the education of the country." (20)

No wonder that the Church opposed Kay over the Management Clauses when there was such a wide divergence between their fundamental aims! In the above extract is clearly revealed the Whig determination to oppose ecclesiastical domination in education. The Management Clauses of 1847 (produced during a Whig Government) were merely an extension of this policy. By enforcing the transfer of the management of all aspects of school matters (except religious instruction) from the incumbent to a committee, the State was weakening the hand of the clergy; providing a continuity of lay interest in the school; and setting up a uniform administrative system. Under such circumstances it became less likely that "State aid ... was endowing intolerant and exclusive religious teaching." (21) All this would be a cause of great satisfaction to the Government, and the Committee of Council and Dr. Kay were quite firm in their resolve to push these clauses through.

Burgess traces in great detail the course of the Management Clause Controversy. His assessment of the situation is one of two parties (Archdeacon Denison and company on the one hand and Kay and the Privy Council on the other) struggling to exercise a decisive influence over a third (the General Committee of the National Society). Pointing out that the National Society were considering adopting a Management Clause before the Privy Council put forward proposals, Burgess shows that the progress of the negotiations between the Privy Council and the National Society was such that agreement would almost certainly have been reached if Denison and his supporters had not intervened. Burgess, in his zeal for the National Society, glosses over the fact that in 1846 the National Society

sent out to its schools a copy of the new proposed terms of Union which provided for appeal to the Bishop (on any matter concerning instruction) whose decision was to be final. This had prompted Kay to object to this new provision,

"It places the whole of the instruction in elementary schools under the guidance and control of ecclesiastical authority. I will not stop to show you, as I might, that if this be a deliberate act, it is a revolution in the affairs of the National Society." (22)

Kay-Shuttleworth drafted a set of Management Clauses (reproduced in outline at the end of this chapter) which were designed to ensure local control by a Committee rather than an individual. His proposals also ensured that the Privy Council and the advice of the Inspectors would be heeded. Four points emerged from the negotiations over the Management Clauses proposed by the Privy Council. Firstly the National Society disliked the division implicit in the suggested division between religious and secular instruction. Secondly the National Society was unhappy about the wording dealing with "membership" of the Church of England. Thirdly, the National Society questioned the desirability of the method of electing managers and fourthly, the National Society wanted promoters of Church Schools to be left free to choose which one of the four Management clauses they wanted. In 1848 the General Committee of the National Society sent a Memorandum to the Privy Council which pressed for freedom of choice for promoters of schools. It also sought to provide an appeal "of a safe and easy nature" in case of differences among the managers. (This became, under pressure from Denison, a demand that in all matters appeal should be made to the diocesan bishop). It also claimed the right of the incumbent to use the schoolroom on Sunday (which the Privy Council agreed to) and also it attempted to define closely the meaning of the phrase concerning "membership" of the Church of England, as follows;

"That all members of the Managing Committee of a school ... shall qualify ... by subscribing to a declaration that they are bona fide members of the

Church of England and are not joined members or frequenters of the worship of any other religious denomination." (23)

The Privy Council refused to accept the last (underlined) clause - a significant indication of the way their minds were working, but eventually an agreement on this was also reached. Further negotiations led to agreement over choosing different Management Clauses. This left one issue outstanding, the matter of appeal "of a safe and easy nature". Kay-Shuttleworth could not concede Denison's demand that there should be an appeal to the Bishop in all matters - this would have defeated the whole object of the Management Clause exercise, (which was to eliminate the possibility that schools could be controlled by ecclesiastical authorities in toto). (24) Some measure of agreement on this between the Privy Council and the General Committee of the National Society had been reached when Denison's influence began to make itself felt.

Agreement by the negotiators was one thing, but agreement by the National Society at large was quite another. The Annual meetings of the National Society of 1848 and 1849 were the arena for the warring factions within the Anglican Church. Starting in 1848 and continuing until 1852 Denison and his supporters came in large numbers to the Annual General Meetings of the National Society to press their opinions on the Committee. In 1848 Denison was persuaded not to press his resolution pending the outcome of the negotiations, but a year later no such agreement prevailed. Denison led a vigorous campaign on the basis of no compulsory management clauses whatsoever. (25) He supported his theory with vigorous action, withdrawing his applications for government grants and writing to his local Government Inspector,

"My dear Bellairs, I love you very much, but if you ever come here to inspect again, I will lock the door of the school and tell the boys to put you in the pond".

His campaign attracted much support and many people wrote to the National Society pressing Denison's case. This pressurised the National Society into taking a tough line. Archdeacon Manning

supported Denison's general approach.

"What a mess Kay-Shuttleworth is making. You see that the Committee of Privy Council have refused the terms of the National Society and I must declare my hope that the Church will set to work again as in 1839 to do its own duty and refuse with absolute firmness all share and entanglement in Government education". (26)

and on another occasion he puts the "medieval party's" viewpoint very clearly;

"I believe the education of children to be a duty inherent in parents and pastors, to be essentially religious, indivisible in its elements; incapable of a concurrent control by two heterogeneous powers. The education of the people can never be in the hands of one power and the pastoral ministry in the other.... What the Government is doing is to make itself joint founder of schools on terms which the Church cannot accept without ultimate injury." (27)

Purcell gives a careful account of the 1849 Annual General Meeting which seems to bear out Burgess's assessment of the situation. Bishop Wilberforce persuaded Manning (whose opinions on the Management Clauses were well known) to propose an amendment to Denison's resolution. This amendment was more conciliatory than Denison's outright rejection and it had the merit of forcing Denison to reveal his real objection to the Management Clauses - which was that they provided for lay managers and diminished the power of the clergy. (28) Manning's amendment reads as follows;

"That this Meeting acknowledges the care and attention of the Committee in conducting the correspondence pending with the Committee of Privy Council on Education and regrets to find that a satisfactory conclusion has not yet been attained. Secondly, that while this Meeting desires fully to co-operate with the State in promoting the education of the people, it is under the necessity of declaring that no terms of co-operation can be satisfactory which shall not allow the Clergy and Laity full freedom to constitute upon such principles and models as are both sanctioned and recommended by the order and practices of the Church of England". (29)

Archdeacon Denison's modification of the above Amendment reads;

"and in particular, when they should desire to put the management of their schools solely in the hands of the clergy and Bishops of the Dioceses".

Manning's Amendment was passed, with Denison's reluctant agreement (after Manning had accepted Denison's short addition) amid confusion as to whether the two motions added up to the same thing. The result of Manning's action was to give the Committee of National Society confidence to carry on attempting the impossible - trying to find common ground between the Privy Council and Denison's group. The thing which Manning feared was a total break with the Government;

"The Committee of Council and the National Society have suspended their correspondence on account of disagreement. The National Society has already gone beyond the sense of the Church at large and is in middle position which the Government will not accept nor the Church ratify. I am afraid that we shall have mischief either way. A break with the Government would be most mischievous, only less so than a giving in to them." (30)

His intervention at the Annual General Meeting meant that the absolute break with the Government was for the time being avoided. One result of this Annual General Meeting was the temporary defeat of Denison and the paralysis of the General Committee of the National Society, which, being constantly bombarded with petitions and memorials against the Management Clauses and being without the guidance of the Archbishop (he had withdrawn from the negotiations in March 1848), slowly hardened its position.

Another event occurred which finalized the impasse. Kay's health broke down and he withdrew from the conflict to be replaced by R. E. Lingen - a much less conciliatory man. Denison's pressure group succeeded in persuading the General Committee to end negotiations with the Government and so the Management Clauses were imposed without the consent of the National Society.

This controversy had threatened to split the Church of England and the National Society in two. Reflecting Broad church opinion F. D. Maurice wrote;

"I have been spending a most grievous five hours at the National Society public meeting, listening to speeches from clergymen that it almost broke one's heart to hear, and seeing demonstrations of a spirit which betokens schism and destruction. Mr. Denison, who opened the debate, is a vulgar Church agitator using the most sacred phrases for claptraps and throughout confounding the right of the clergy to have their own way with Church principles." (31)

On the other side, Denison, looking back, had no doubt as to the significance of that meeting;

"I have never ceased to regard that day as the beginning of the surrender of the Church schools into the hands of the civil power; ... all I know is that it was first by his hand (i. e. Manning's) that the Church schools in England was destroyed." (32)

This lengthy treatment of the Management Clause Controversy reveals the true nature of the Church/State relationship at that time. Gone were the days when the Church could expect special treatment from the Government. The reality (as the 1851 census showed) was that the Anglican Church was merely the largest denomination and could not in all honesty justifiably claim to speak for the whole nation "on its spiritual side". The Management controversy showed that the balance of power had shifted since the days of the Normal School proposals of 1839. The position now was that if the Church and State could not agree the State carried on regardless and the Church was left to carry on as best it could, protesting loudly, but usually in vain. The role of the Church had changed from being first in the field to the position of an important competitor protesting that the referee was changing the rules of the game unfairly.

Another alteration in the "rules of the game" was the Government's determination to ensure that all schools receiving State aid had a conscience clause in their trust deeds. This was simply a device

enabling the parents to withdraw their child from denominational Religious Instruction. The history of the Conscience Clause controversy preceded and continued after the Management Clause controversy. Burgess establishes quite clearly (33) that from its inception in 1811 the National Society's policy over this was permissive until the late thirties when the influence of the doctrinal emphasis of the Oxford Movement began to be felt and the problem of the "single school areas" became more apparent as the National Society began to apply its rules more strictly.

The "single school area" problem was that in the country in many districts the only school for miles around was the local Anglican village school, so Dissenters were faced with either denying their children education or sending them to a school whose religious teaching they found repugnant. The problem could easily be solved by withdrawing the particular child under a scheme devised on the lines of the Conscience Clause. While enforcement of the National Society's rules was lax there was no real problem, but by the 1840's the situation had changed and the trouble began.

In this particular battle the lines of the combatants were drawn up differently from the Management Clause controversy. Firstly the Dissenters were directly involved and fighting for their rights. Secondly a large body of liberal opinion within the Church of England supported the idea of Conscience Clauses. For example the Rev. E. Girdelstone spoke of

"The moral danger of being so bigoted as to shut the door in the face of Dissenters and expose them to ignorance and vice just because they would not repeat every word of the Church Catechism". (34)

On the other side Denison and his followers, pushing the National Society along with them for part of the way, held out unrepentant to the end. Cruickshank comments;

"...for the first time therefore, the Church found herself in conflict with a powerful combination. Final defeat was inevitable." (35)

The argument of the High Churchmen was that Church schools had been built by the Church through her own efforts and initiative. On what grounds could Dissenters who chose of their own free will to send their children to such schools object to the teaching which went on in them? The Dissenters' reply was that they had contributed to the Church Schools through the Government grants, that the sending of their children to Anglican schools was not a matter of choice and that freedom of conscience was as important a principle in education as the unity of education which the National Society was always stressing.

As would be expected Kay and the Privy Council were on the side of the Conscience Clause, (36) but for some time no action was taken because of other problems. Denison of course had anticipated the problem very early on;

"In 1843, having built my schools, I had my first fight with the Committee of Council on Education. They wanted a loose constitution I told them I would have nothing but a tight one and they gave way." (37)

His opposition to the Privy Council was certainly deep seated;

"All the evil of the time is, as it were summed up and condensed in it; it is to me, always has been as "the abomination of desolation sitting where it ought not". (38)

There was no other single subject which bred such mistrust and ill will between the Denominations as the Conscience Clause. Dissenters saw in it the essence of the Church's claim to be responsible for educating all the nation in the Anglican tradition, attempting to maintain the norm as Anglicanism and putting Dissenters at a disadvantage (especially in rural areas). Dissenters were very jealous of their hard won freedom and conscious of the threat of a reviving Established Church, which was attempting to gain a 'stranglehold' in the nursery of Church membership - the local school. Even in 1839 Edward Baines wrote to Kay about the proposed Normal School;

"I, as a Dissenter, object to the principle of making a certain provision for the religious education of churchmen in Normal schools and leaving that of the Dissenters (in your own words) contingent. To appease the Church you are compelled to give prominence to this injustice towards Dissenters." (39)

The freedom which Dissenters had slowly gained was endangered by the provisions of Sir James Graham's Act of 1843. Lord John Russell, ever watchful on this point, wrote to Kay;

"By the Acts of 1828-9 we secured that all civil offices, except that of Lord Chancellor should be open to Protestant and Catholic Dissenters - yet here is a new civil office, with a salary paid by the public, restricted to Churchmen by a method as sure as the Sacramental test." (40)

With such intractable extremes it was clear that the National Society was to be the battleground of an internal struggle to control policy. Denison was of course his usual blunt, polemic self;

"I am not, never was, or could be a "voluntary school" supporter... a "voluntary school" admitting any child under conscience clause or any child except those baptized into the Church, or preparing to be baptized, is a place from which I shrink to enter or to have anything to do with. It is a building with the gargoyles turned inside instead of out." (41)

Kay retired before the Conscience Clause was really out in the open. Lingen was anxious to exploit the "local Liberty" concerning conscience which the National Society was accustomed to claim existed. As a result of Keble's intervention, (42) an Inquiry was instituted to find out how many schools insisted on the letter of the National Society rule over consciences being implemented. While this was being executed Lingen suggested to the National Society that appeal should be made to the bishop if disagreement arose between the incumbent and the managers concerning the exemption of Dissenter's children from denominational teaching. The National Society hedged and played for time until the results of the Inquiry were known. The returns showed quite clearly that the National Society regulations were almost universally applied to the letter.

This was an apparent victory for Denison but his abrasive campaigning tactics were producing their inevitable reaction. For too long he had bought the Annual General Meetings of the National Society into disrepute and his support waned. He suggests that this may have been due in part to his opposition to Gladstone's election at Oxford. (43) The 1853 Annual General Meeting accepted what Denison called a "most meagre, insufficient and incomplete and therefore most unsatisfactory" result of the Inquiry and failed to press for further action. Two years later Denison was defeated on the question of enforcing the Catechism at a meeting of the Bath and Wells Diocesan Board and for the next seven years he retired from the scene.

In spite of Denison's demise the question of the Conscience Clause was to drag on unsettled until 1870. The Privy Council, seeing that the Management Clauses did not provide adequate protection for the children of Dissenters against the more militant clergyman, began in 1852 to suggest to the National Society the insertion of a Conscience Clause, and in 1860 it began to demand a Conscience Clause in certain schools in Wales where the Anglican Church was in the minority. The National Society objected to this new departure but received an assurance that these were regarded as special cases. Shortly after this the National Society discovered that not only had this new condition been applied to an English school, but that also a new application form had been issued compelling the applicant to state "either that every child shall be compelled to learn the Church Catechism... and to attend the celebration of Divine Worship according to the Church of England, or that no child shall be so compelled when the parent objects on conscientious grounds".

This prompted the National Society to send a Memorandum to the Lord President of the Privy Council complaining that the Conscience Clause broke the National Society's Terms of Union whilst the other new insertion deprived "the Managers of that discretion which

the Terms of Union permit, and which have been extensively and advantageously exercised." (44)

This was rather a pathetic reply, indicating the difficult position of the General Committee who were caught in no man's land between Denison and the Privy Council. Their explanation was riddled with problems and inconsistencies. If schools did have total local discretion why did the General Committee always reject applications for grant aid or union from schools with a written rather than an unwritten Conscience Clause? Also if there was local discretion, why had the Committee objected in 1853 to Lingen's suggestion that disputes be referred to the Bishop? Also, perhaps most significantly, if local discretion existed, why did the result of the 1852/3 Inquiry indicate that it did not? Lingen withdrew the offending form but continued to insert Conscience Clauses into potential single school areas in England. The National Society continued to refuse aid to those schools accepting a Conscience Clause. This caused a progressive decline through 1861 and 1862 (which caused the National Society much concern) in the proportion of National Society schools successfully applying for Government aid. Denison returned to the struggle in 1863 and forced the General Committee into the ridiculous situation of declining to interpret one of its own trust deeds by the simple ruse of asking if a school in which all children were taught the Catechism were still in union with the National Society.

Further cogent arguments to embarrass the General Committee came from Lingen when the National Society protested in 1862 over the decline in numbers of Church schools receiving Government aid. Lingen, dealing with the problem of Dissenter's children and local discretion, wrote:

"If the Royal Commissioners are right in describing the Dissenter's position under the above circumstances as one of "injustice", it ought not to remain a matter of private discretion whether or not he be placed in it." (45)

At least Denison was consistent in disagreeing with the Royal

Commission's first point, which is more than can be said for the General Committee. They claimed local discretion and yet they would not officially recognize it. If they admitted the practice of discretion (i. e. the protection of Dissenters' consciences) in principle then they could not treat as a matter of grace what was a matter of justice. Lingen made further detailed proposals permitting exemption under certain circumstances from Prayer Book doctrine. The National Society (under pressure from Denison) rejected these suggestions and the matter rested in this unfortunate impasse until 1870.

Notes to preceding chapter

The striking of a modus vivendi 1840 - 60

1. F. Smith Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, pg. 81/2
2. J. Stuart Maclure, Educational Documents 1816 to present day pg. 43/4.
3. Burgess, Enterprise in Education pg. 77
4. Times 2nd May 1839.
5. Minutes of Committee of Privy Council 24th Sept. 1839 quoted Curtis, History of Education, pg. 238.
6. Burgess op cit pgs 80 - 90
7. Printed in full J. Stuart Maclure op cit 46/7
8. Burgess op cit pg. 90.
9. J. T. Ward and S.H. Treble. "Religion and Education in 1843. Reaction to The Factory Education Bill". Journal Eccles History Vol 20, No.1. April 1969 pg. 81.
10. Gash, Reaction and Reconstruction pg. 89.
11. Curtis op cit pg. 341.
12. Ward and Treble op cit J.E.H. pg. 86, Vol 20 1969.
13. Ward and Treble op cit pg 91.
14. F. Smith op cit pg. 146.
15. Curtis op cit pg. 242.
16. F.W. Cornish pg. 207/10 A History of Church of England in nineteenth Century, Vol I.
17. Sir Robert Peel (1889) II pg. 561/2 Parker as quoted M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education pg. 7.
18. Burgess op cit pg 146 quoting F. Smith.
19. Public Education, Sir James Kay Shuttleworth.
20. Burgess op cit pg 146.
21. F. Smith op cit pg. 186.

22. *ibid.* Kay-Shuttleworth put his finger on another aspect of permitting the management of schools to be put on the shoulders of one individual trustee.

"individual trustees and their heirs might be non-resident minors, lunatics or otherwise incapable"... Time would have brought "a harvest of discord, confusion or plunder." F. Smith *op cit* pg. 186.

As many schools were solely under the hands of the local clergy this was a not insignificant problem. According to one estimate as many as 80% of National Society schools were without a Management Committee. Burgess *op cit* pg. 148.

23. Burgess *op cit* pg. 152.
24. Burgess *ibid* pg. 148.
25. F. Smith *op cit* pg. 186
26. Extract from a letter from Manning to Sidney Herbert 8th Oct. 1848 quoted in Purcell Life of Cardinal Manning Vol I pg. 419.
27. *ibid.* Taken from another letter dated 4th Jan 1849.
28. The Management Clauses and the expansion of teacher training in the pupil teacher scheme of the 1846 Minutes date from the same period and complement each other.

"What Kay-Shuttleworth feared above all was complete clerical control of the schools, and therefore at the time when he was preparing a scheme to give annual grants he took steps to establish a system of local management which would secure adequate representation of the laity and ultimate control by the Committee of Council through its inspectors."

Clearly there could be no meeting point between Denison and Kay-Shuttleworth. In 1845 the latter wrote to the Bishop of London;

"I need not remind your Lordship that any attempt to exclude the laity from their position as managers of funds subscribed by themselves (or the Government) would not only fail but would bring ruin and disorder." F. Smith *op cit* pg 164 f.

29. Purcell *op cit* pg. 426/7
30. *ibid* pg. 421, Letter to Sidney Herbert Jan 4th 1849.

31. *ibid*, pg. 431, quoting a letter to Miss Hare dated 6th Jan 1849. Purcell then says in his footnote.

"The Ven. Archdeacon Denison, I am sure, will not be offended at the abuse of so vulgar an assailant."

(Thus reflecting that same spirit to which Maurice refers.)

32. *ibid*, pg. 432.
33. Burgess *op cit* pg. 158.
34. *ibid*, pg. 160
35. Cruickshank *op cit* pg. 10.
36. see above pg 35 his determination to "respect the rights of conscience".
37. Denison, Notes on My Life, pg. 93.
38. *ibid*.
39. F. Smith *op cit*, pg. 84.
40. *ibid* pg. 151.
41. Purcell *op cit*, pg. 432 quoting a letter of Denison's in unrepentant mood in 1889.
42. This arose from a report by an Inspector Fletcher claiming that at least 50% of National Society schools respected the consciences of the children of Dissenters. Burgess *op cit* pg. 163.
43. Denison *op cit* pg. 164.
44. Burgess *op cit*, pg. 166 quoting National Society Minute Book Vol. VI pg. 121.
45. *ibid*, pg. 168.

The Content of the Privy Council's Management Clauses
of 1847

Clause A.

The Minister is to have the superintendence of the moral and religious instruction of the scholar. Upon any difference arising between him and the committee of management upon these points, the Bishop is to be the referee. In all other respects the management is to be vested in a committee consisting of the Minister (who is to be chairman, with a casting vote) his licensed curates if he choose to appoint them, the Churchwardens, if members of the Church of England, and of a number (apparently varying with the size of the parish) of other persons, members of the Church of England, resident or having a beneficial interest in the parish, and subscribers to the amount of one pound, to be elected by subscribers to the amount of ten shillings being similarly qualified. The Master or Mistress must be a member of the Church of England.

A secretary is to be appointed by the Committee.

Clause B

In this the first committee is to be named in the original deed. No secretary is mentioned, but otherwise Clause B is identical with Clause A.

Clause C

The school is to go on without a committee of management until the Bishop directs that one be formed. Henceforth it is to be under a committee, of which the first members are to be nominated by the Minister, but vacancies are to be filled up as directed in Clause A. The secretary is to be appointed by the Chairman.

Clause D

The first committee of management is to be named in the trust deed, and is to continue self-elective until the Bishop shall direct

otherwise, when the subscribers are to elect as in Clause A.
There are no directions as to the secretary.

Taken from

Appendix A. Burgess H. G. "Enterprise in Education," pg. 219.

Chapter Four

1830 - 1860, A Ferment of Ideas

The preceding chapter gave a historical review of developments in the Church's role in schools up to the end of the 1850's. In order to complement this chronological account of these years this chapter will attempt to deal with some of the ideas which the "education question" threw up. The events of the previous chapter took place against a background of slowly changing views on education and amid a welter of suggestions as to how education and the Church should move forward.

One important aspect of this period is the slow but steady disappearance of the once commonly held belief that the education of the masses was a bad thing. In 1847 Macauley made an important speech in Parliament in support of the Parliamentary grant to education in which he argued that the ignorance of common people was the key cause of danger to persons and property. G.M. Young sees this as a turning point;

"Henceforth the education of the people was admitted to be a primary function of the State. From this admission it is not far to the Radical position - education, universal, compulsory and secular - and the only question remaining was how slowly and by what devious routes and compromises it would be reached, and how much energy would be squandered by the way on the interminable rancours of Church and Dissent." (1)

However, many of the local squirearchy were very suspicious of education, it was feared that education would make the poor unhappy and dissatisfied with their lot. The joke about the squire talking to the Vicar;

"You keep 'em ignorant and I'll keep 'em poor." (2)

had an element of truth in it. Cobbett once asked why a ploughboy should be taught to read and write when these things would be useless for mounting a horse. As time went by this attitude began to disappear as the consequences of the industrial revolution became clear. Not only did the new

technology bring large cities with their attendant social problems, but also it demanded a higher standard of education than was then available. Unfavourable comparisons between England and other European countries (especially Prussia) were made, and it slowly came to be realised that education was not only a good investment but a very necessary one if England were to keep her place in the technological race. This change of opinion lay behind the Government's increasing intervention in educational affairs in these years which was traced in the last chapter.

It would be wrong, simply to conclude on the basis of the constant wrangling between the clerics, the Government and the Dissenters, that the clergy were by nature a difficult and recalcitrant lot. Many tales of the meritorious efforts of individual clergy can be told about their efforts and sacrifices to further the work of education. Their motives in undertaking and fighting for education were basically twofold. Firstly, there was undoubtedly a desire on the part of some clergy to improve the lot of the poor by providing cheap education, but the main force of their motivation was theological in nature. Not only did adherence to a particular social grouping (such as the Anglicans) through such institutions as a Sunday School or day school provide "secular" advantages for a child, but it was seriously held by the clergy that the acceptance by the child of a set of beliefs was vital to its well being in the after-life. For example Shaftesbury wrote, commenting on the Board schools of the 1870 Act;

"The godless, non-Bible system is at hand and the Ragged Schools must perish under this all conquering march of intellectual power . . .
Everything for the flesh and nothing for the soul:
everything for time and nothing for eternity." (3)

Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find that doctrine and moral behaviour were more prominent in some schools than the three R's. The latter might help the pupil in this life but only the former would help him in the next. It is also not surprising that this doctrinal emphasis made co-operation with Dissenters difficult.

Some of the early advocates of education (e.g. Mrs. Trimmer and Hannah More) were very anxious to ensure that their pupils did not get ideas above their station in life. There undoubtedly was an element in educational thought at that time that education should keep the poor in check, but the great efforts of the clergy and others to spread education indicate that this was not their major concern. As Kitson Clark points out;

"The best policy for those who wish to keep a class in subjection is to prevent literacy not to encourage it." (4)

Rev. R. Dawes is a good example of a committed educationalist who saw the social implications of the Church's role as educator.

"The National Society and perhaps a majority of the clergy wish to introduce a system of education which would establish in every parish a charity school for the education of the poor ... to make the face of the country a "net-work" of schools on eleemosynary principles, keeping the labouring classes, in the education, and habits formed early in life, entirely apart from the classes immediately above them. Now this is making a distinction of a most invidious kind, the labouring classes feel no elevation of mind in being educated in this way: on the contrary...." (5)

Dawes attacks the prevailing attitudes to Church schools - too many clergy regarded the schools as a place to teach the children to read the Bible, to learn the Catechism and to do their manual labour - in other words "a means of perpetuating the status quo." Dawes' comments show that English society was still fairly clearly stratified and whilst movement between the strata was not unknown or impossible, it was unusual. One result of the Anglican Church's acceptance (with some important exceptions) of this stratification of society was that it was very difficult for the Church to conceive of a truly national system of education. The rich had the public schools and the universities; the poor had their own charity schools; the middle classes had to make do as best they could with a mixture of schools of varying quality, not always giving the education the middle classes wanted. In addition, the middle classes contained a large number of Nonconformists and so the

middle classes were to a large extent "lost" to the influence of the Church.

The Church was faced with a dilemma over education. If the clergy were serious when they claimed for the Church the right to educate the nation, then the Church had to get on with the job. On the other hand if the Church recognized the need for more education but would not provide it, on what grounds could she complain when the urgency of the situation brought about by her own inaction forced other agencies to make up the deficiency? There was a group in the Church who saw the Church fulfilling her national duty as educator of the people. In 1838 Manning wrote optimistically:

"The church is thoroughly furnished with everything needful for the education of a great and intelligent people." (6)

Events were to show that the Church was not "thoroughly furnished" for such an event, or if the Church were so furnished, she was not at any rate prepared to make the effort or sacrifices involved in providing "everything needful" for the education of the nation.

There were, however, those clergy who realized that time was short and the need great. If the Church did not act quickly then the chance to fulfill her much prized duty would be lost forever. With this in mind the National Society in 1838 produced carefully drawn up plans to broaden its activity into "post primary" education by extending country schools and building Church commercial schools in the towns. Nothing much came of this because of a shortage of money and the National Society's preoccupation with elementary education.

A major educational leader amongst the educationally minded clergy was the Tractarian vicar of Leeds the Rev. W. F. Hook. In spite of his Tractarian leanings he was sufficiently clear-sighted in the early 1840's to realize that unless the Church made a supreme effort, the task of educating the masses would fall

to the State. Hook was no mere theoretician about education, his achievements in Coventry and Leeds were quite remarkable. In 1837 there were in Leeds 3 schools and 15 churches and by 1859 this had risen to 30 schools and 36 churches, and the Grammar school had been remodelled (1854). Before this in Coventry he had revitalized the church, expanded the Sunday school tenfold to 1200 and founded the Religious and Useful Knowledge Society, whose objective was to provide library facilities and lectures to working class people, (and also to provide an Anglican alternative to the Mechanic's Institute, which was run by Dissenters). (7)

Hook was a rare sort of Anglican cleric. He was one of the small number of clergy who were aware of the poor situation of the large cities, the vast slums and the squalor which the Anglican Church had in large part so far passed by. This may help to explain why Hook's ideas concerning education were somewhat radical for someone of his position and ecclesiastical leanings. He supported Graham's Factory Bill of 1843 and wrote to Wilberforce in July of that year saying that Bishops should sell their lands and pay for the Church's schools. (8) Eight years before his famous publication "On the means of rendering more efficient the Education of the People", Hook was thinking along the lines he was later to make public in his pamphlet of 1846. Thus, in a letter to his friend William Page Wood in November 1838, Hook outlined his plan for a local school board empowered to levy a rate and organize adequate provision of schools into which the ministers of the various denominations would come at a set time to teach "their" children. Hook was a fair man and a realist as well, he saw that the only way the Church could legitimately exercise her claim (disputed by many) to be the educator of the people, was to provide the necessary funds. If the Church could not or would not do this the result was inevitable.

"If the Church supplies the funds, let the education be an exclusively Church education; if the State provides the funds the State is in duty bound to regard the just claims of the Dissenters." (10)

Elsewhere Hook's utterances reflect his experiences as a pastor in a large industrial town like Leeds where religion and class were closely linked;

"If we are to educate the poor in Church principles, the education must be out of Church funds. Let wealthy prelates give most of their stipend. Then the Church will live in the hearts of the people who now detest her. Many in the manufacturing districts consider the Church to belong to the party of their oppressors, so they hate it and consider a man of the working classes who is a Churchman to be a traitor to his party or order. He is outlawed in the society in which he moves. Now this being the case, the Church must try for God's sake to win the people by making a great sacrifice. The Church should say "we will educate the people in our own way out of our own funds." Till something like this is done, it is useless to invent schemes of factory improvement, i. e. useless to undertake partial schemes for the education of factory children. I am almost a Radical; for I do not see why our Bishops should not become poor like Ambrose and Augustine etc. that they may make the people really rich." (11)

This long extract shows how a pastorially orientated cleric could see the influence and need of education and also how the lack of it damaged the Church's claims concerning her "national duty" - especially among those who the Church had passed by. By 1846 it was clear to Hook that the Church was not going to make the effort required. The Voluntary system could not cope with the increasing demand. Everywhere he saw deficiencies in educational provision; not enough places, books and other materials; not enough teachers; an irregular supply of money from the public to the voluntary societies. (12) If the Church could not educate the people then clearly the State would have to, but the difficult question was, how should this be done?

Hook rejected the idea (based on the Irish pattern) that the State should teach Religious Instruction in such a way as to cause no

denominational offence in its own schools, because he maintained this would produce what he called "Nothingarians". (13) He also rejected the idea of a totally secular state school system because the omission of Religious Instruction would lead pupils to the inevitable conclusion that it was unimportant (which idea Hook, of course, abhorred). His suggestion in his famous pamphlet to the Bishop of St. Davids was that there should be a state school system managed by a locally elected Board of Managers in which all the denominations would have access to their children on two afternoons a week for the purpose of Religious Instruction. Apart from those two afternoons no Religious Instruction was to be taught. This had several advantages. It lifted the burden of fund raising from the shoulders of the clerics and freed them to prepare their Religious Instruction more thoroughly. It also improved the position of the teacher in that he no longer would be quite so dependent on school pence to make ends meet and to pay his salary.

Hook did not mince his words in his analysis of the situation;

"But, my Lord, when I look upon all that has been done, I ask, what is the result? I must contend that, compared with the educational wants of the country, we have done next to nothing; we have lighted a lantern which only makes us more sensible of the surrounding darkness." (14)

He praised the work done by the Voluntary Societies but said that there was too much for them to do. He gives a graphic illustration of a clergyman striving to open a school and of the tenuous existence and low status of the master. He compared England with six other European countries (including France and Prussia) and showed how poor the English educational provision was in comparison. His conclusion was that the State should pay for and run a national system of education, leaving Religious Instruction for those best fitted to give it - the representatives of the various denominations.

As might be anticipated Kay Shuttleworth welcomed Hook's

pamphlet (which Hook sent to him before publication for his comments) and all the more so because it came from a well known Tractarian;

"The pamphlet is a great experiment worthy of the hardihood which has led you to dare and to accomplish so much; and if the organs of the High Church party will unite with the organs of the State party in its support, the pamphlet would make a great impression on public opinion. It is important for its success that it should bear, as it does, the complete impression of your own mode of thought and expression." (15)

Indeed, the authorship of such a pamphlet was crucial to its reception and influence;

"Dr. Hook possessed, in a preeminent degree, the confidence of High-Churchmen. No-one could suspect him of any unworthy concession of the claims of the Church or religion." (16)

Unfortunately, Dr. Hook's pamphlet was not well received on all sides. The Voluntarists opposed it because they opposed State interference in education. The High Churchmen denounced it because it gave the Dissenters equal status and treatment and they rejected Hook's contention that the Church did not have the sole right to State aid. Other adverse comments about the separation of secular and religious education and the importance of self help and independence were made in conjunction with disagreements over Hook's assertion that "next to nothing" had been done. Hook stood firm although he realized that his initiative had failed. He wrote;

"I hear that I am praised by some papers and abused by others for my pamphlet on education. I am too old to care for praise or blame. But I know that I am right and when it is too late Churchmen will see that I am." (17)

On another occasion Hook wrote in 1850 concerning the foundation in that year of the National Public Schools Association - a secularist education pressure group. (18)

"The evil I wished to avert will come to pass. If we don't look about us we shall have secular schools

established by the Government and controlled by ratepayers to which we will be denied access. If we had moved first our offer might have been liberal, but we should have gained control of the Schools." (19)

The accuracy of Hook's predictions is uncanny. He saw how things would develop and this prediction was proved correct in the establishment of the Board Schools of the 1870 Act.

Hook was not the only person to have ideas as to how the education system might best be expanded. One such person was Nathaniel Woodard. He was a good example of the cleric motivated by evangelistic desires to try to reach a part of society which the Church had failed to reach, - the middle classes. In 1848 he wrote a pamphlet called "A plea for the Middle Classes". This was in effect a comprehensive plan to recover the middle classes for the Church of England through an education system tailored to meet their needs. There were to be three different types of schools covering the varying requirements of the middle classes. It was envisaged that the richer schools (for the gentry) would subsidize the poorer (those for the tradesman and small businessman). In spite of considerable support Woodward was simply not able to cover the country with his schools, but by his death in 1891 he had built 11 schools which were educating 1350 pupils. (20) His example inspired others and he attracted many offers of schools from other clergymen, not all of them firm Tractarians as he was. Woodard's effort stands as an example of the Voluntary System working well, but even when working well it is clear that the chief weakness of such a system is the shortage of money and support. The Voluntary System just could not cope with the growing demand for more schools and there was an unfortunate tendency for schools to decline after the founder had left, thus wasting the money so carefully raised.

Other clergymen produced schemes for providing education. J.L. Brereton produced a very good scheme except that it was far too expensive. (21) A more practical set of ideas came

from F. D. Maurice and his friends. In the 1850's they began to set up Institutions to promote education among the working classes. Maurice did not spare his readers when examining the response of the Church at large to the educational challenge;

"No shame for past misuse of the trust which has been committed to us shall tempt us to the further sin of denying that we retain it. But at the same time we are bound by the most solemn obligations, to make our pretensions good, to prove that they are not put forth rashly or proudly for the sake of self display The ablest speakers in both Houses of Parliament rested their case on this ground; "the English poor are in a state of wretched ignorance, you have not cured it - we must." I rejoice that they have estimated our condition so truly It would be a delightful change if we began . . . frankly and from our inmost hearts owning that we, our priests, our kings, our nobles, everyman among us, have failed of our duty, and are suffering, and must suffer the appointed punishment." (22)

There were other clergy who regarded the need for education as something demanding a wider view of things than a mere ecclesiastical or party outlook. One such man was Rev. Richard Burgess who wrote;

"The necessity of a free, cheap and general system of education for the poorer classes of this country, arises from their present physical and moral condition, which every enlightened and benevolent mind must deplore. . . the Voluntary System, in providing for the spiritual instruction of the country, is failing every day: to attempt the moral and religious education of the poorer classes in the same way, would be to attempt an utter impossibility." (23)

Seeing this situation Burgess urged a state system of education with provisions built into it to ensure that it would be a "Christian System" as well.

This welter of conflicting ideas as to how the Church's role in the schools should best be played out had some unfortunate results. One of these was a schism in the National Society in 1852 and the establishment of a rival "Church of England Education Society" in 1853. This latter society, though small, (24) was instrumental,

by its vociferous protests, in stopping the usual annual grant to the National Society of the Queen's Letter, as a result of which neither society benefitted from the Royal Letter again. This ferment of ideas or "conflict of opinion" as Brown calls it, (25) concerning the state of education in general and of elementary education in particular, reflected the growing interest of the age in all educational matters. In Parliament the years 1850 - 1855 saw no less than five education bills founder in the Commons. In 1856 the Committee of the Privy Council was upgraded into an Education Department with a responsible parliamentary head of department who would be a member of the Government - an indication of the growing power and influence of the State in education. It was clear that great changes were going to have to be made in education and that the State would have to do more in some way or other.

The problems of the Voluntary System were of paramount importance and any revision of the system would have to attempt to tackle its inherent weaknesses. Kitson Clarke summarizes these admirably;

"As the history of the Woodard schools goes to show, and that evidence could be reinforced from elsewhere, very large sums could come from this source (i.e. private subscription) but as a source it necessarily had its limitations, and those limitations seem to enforce two other lessons which this period has to offer. The first was that the Church of England could not by itself cover the whole ground. Neither Gladstone and his friends, nor Woodard, nor Brereton, nor all these taken together and added to all the other schemes for church secondary education, all the ancient grammar schools and all the individual schools started by parsons in their parishes, could supply a tithe of the secondary education the middle classes needed. And the second lesson was that any venture not backed by a substantial and well managed endowment or a considerable and reliable income from fee payers and subscribers, was not likely long to survive when the impetus which had brought it into being died down, or the man who started it went away." (26)

There was another reason for growing public interest in education - the cost. From the first grant of £20,000 for a school building in 1833 had risen to £723,000 by 1859 and covered such things as school buildings, college buildings, teacher training and teachers

salaries subsidies, providing equipment, an administrative machinery and a full inspection system. This increase, coupled with the concern that the system was not producing the right sort of results, induced the Government to set up a Royal Commission to look at the state of popular education and to advise as to what action was required,

"for the extension of sound cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people."

The Newcastle Commission was a reflection of the concern and interest current in education, which, at the start of the 1860's was regarded as of vital importance. The next few years saw a crop of inquiries into education; the Newcastle Commission reported in 1861, when the Clarendon Commission into the public schools was also set up; this led on to the Taunton Commission of 1864 which investigated the state of secondary education. All this careful scrutiny of matters revealed that things were not as they should be. The question was "what is to be done about it?" As can be imagined there was no shortage of suggestions, in fact the arguments raged all through the 1860's, becoming sharper as the inevitability of a new Education Bill became apparent. It is to the manoeuvres and debates leading up to the new Bill that we must now turn, revealing as they do the continuing erosion of the Church's position and her attempts to defend it.

Notes on preceding chapter

1830 - 1860. A ferment of ideas.

1. G.M. Young, Portrait of an Age, pg. 62.
2. Desmond Brown, The idea of a Victorian Church, pg. 196.
3. Burgess, Enterprise in Education, pg. 201.
4. Kitson Clarke, Churchmen and the Condition of England, pg.102.
5. C.F.K. Brown, pg. 32. The Church's part in Education.
6. Manning, National Education 1838, pg. 32.
7. J. R. Tate, M. A. Thesis Life of W. F. Hook, pgs 85/6. Univ. of Durham.
8. He also supported Ashley's Bill in 1844 to limit female and child labour in factories. In spite of the fact that many wealthy men in his parish were factory owners, he supported the Bill on moral, medical and educational grounds. Tate *ibid*, pgs. 27 + 31 + 99.
9. It took the form of an open letter to the Liberal Bishop of St. Davids in 1846.
10. Stephens, Life of Dr. Hook Vol II pg. 114.
11. Letter to Wilberforce 1843. A. Ashwell, Life of S. Wilberforce Vol I pg. 224 f.
12. Money tended to come in well during a dispute but the flow dwindled in times of peace. Perhaps Denison and his followers unwittingly did education a good turn by their disputes.
13. The clear implication of this line of argument is that a major aim of sectarian education then was to provide a means of introducing children into a particular sect. On this see below pg.84/5
14. Hook, pg. 7. "On the means of rendering more efficient the Education of the People".
15. F. Smith, *op cit* pg. 174 ff.
16. *ibid*.

17. Stephens op cit Vol 2 pg. 211.
18. Formerly the Lancashire Public Schools Association. Rivalry over education was strong in the industrial north. See Michael Sanderson "The National and British School Societies in Lancashire 1803-39. The roots of Anglican supremacy in English Education" pgs. 1-36 of "Local Studies and the History of Education" ed. T.G. Cook. History of Education Society Methuen 1972. Sanderson maintains that Anglican supremacy was due to better organisation and resources on a national level and suggests that the Nonconformist realization that they had lost the battle with the National Society fuelled their objections to denominational education.
19. Stephens op cit Vol 2 pg. 343.
20. Kitson Clarke op cit pg. 108.
21. For a detailed description of this lavish scheme see Kitson Clarke op cit pg. 108 ff.
22. Has the Church or the State the Power to Educate the Nation? F. D. Maurice pg. 163 ff, 1839.
23. Educational Statistics. Richard Burgess 1838 quoted Brown op cit pg. 24.
24. The Newcastle Commission Report gives its annual income as £1782.
25. Chapter title Brown op cit pg.23.
26. Kitson Clarke op cit pg. 112.

Chapter Five

The years leading up to the 1870 Act.

The Newcastle Commission produced its report in 1861. It was not a unanimous report (1) and only one of its recommendations (that of payment by results) was put into effect by the Government of the day. It was a most exhaustive study and provided the best figures and evidence concerning the state of schools which had yet been collected. The establishment of the Commission together with some remarks contained in the Annual Report of the Committee of Council in 1859 referring to the need "to consider anxiously the means of retrenching expenditure" had alerted the Voluntary Societies to the possibility that changes were imminent.

Resolutions were passed by the Annual General Meetings of the National Society and the Home and Colonial School Society supporting the status quo and deprecating "any fundamental or material change." (2)

The Report was produced in March 1861 and its recommendations were wide-ranging. It recommended that the Committee of the Privy Council should extend its operations (something which the Church was bound to oppose), but that the policies of no interference with denominational bodies and no central control over school management should continue. Considerable financial innovations were suggested. It was proposed that capitation grants from the State (with extra grants for pupil teachers) should be paid. This payment was to be supplemented by money from local rates which would be levied by a new system of county and borough education boards. (These boards were not given the task of setting up new schools and differed radically from the Boards of the 1870 Act.) Underlying all this was the new principle of payment by results.

This last idea was the only thing for which the Newcastle Commission was to be memorable. All its other new recommendations were too far ahead of public opinion to be put into effect, although many of the suggestions bore fruit in the 1870 Act. Besides the general effect of revealing the gaps in educational provision in England and Wales

the Report had one fairly immediate result - the Revised Code of Robert Lowe. Replying to questions in the House of Commons Lowe gave an assurance that the Government was keeping to the existing system. However, on the day that Parliament was prorogued Lowe laid a new Minute on the table abrogating all the existing Minutes of the Privy Council. Sullivan comments drily,

"The course he pursued cannot be considered as in accordance with frankness and fair dealings." (3)

By this device Lowe was able to consider the whole range of the Code of Regulations made by the Privy Council with a completely free hand. This reconsideration led to the production of the much reviled Revised Code. The Code abolished payments direct to certificated teachers and made them payable in a single grant direct to the school managers, thus opening the grant system to schools with teachers of poor quality. It also abolished grants for building and improving training colleges. The number of pupils per teacher was raised and a new lower class of teachers certificates was introduced by reducing the length of the training course. Government grants for pupils were to be paid according to the results achieved by the children in tests administered by the Inspectors. Religious Instruction was not to be inspected (except in Anglican schools where, after inquiries from the National Society, the Privy Council agreed that the Concordat of 1840 would continue and that any grant earned by schools would be wholly or partially withheld if the Religious Instruction was found to be unsatisfactory.)

The storm of protest was immediate and came from all sides, (4)

"Papers of all kinds, secular and religious, Liberal and Tory, united in their attacks, and a crowd of correspondents, clerical and lay schoolmanagers and teachers, wrote letters to the editors." (5)

Only from one quarter did support come for the Code, this was the extreme end of the High Church group. They supported the Code because the alterations in the way in which payments were

made put the teachers even more firmly under the thumb of the (usually clerical) managers. The major objection to the Code was that as the examinations in the three R's were financially crucial these would inevitably be given pride of place. It was well known that in many schools the standard of these subjects was poor and that an excessive amount of time was devoted to religious instruction; under the new Code this would have to alter if the school was to qualify for a reasonable amount of Government grant.

So great was the opposition to the Code that its implementation was twice postponed before it was finally introduced in August 1863. In the interim the National Society had collected opinions and sent a carefully argued Memorandum to the Privy Council (to which it received no reply). After commenting adversely on Lowe's methods of introducing a revision of the Code of Practise the Memorandum spelt out the arguments one by one; the Code penalized non attainment in the three R's and would consequently "greatly discourage the Religious Instruction of children"; it took no account of things like good discipline, good habits of order and cleanliness; it was also pointed out that the Newcastle Commission itself had shown that the deficiencies in teaching the three R's were due to matters beyond the control of the teacher (such as irregular attendance of children, insufficient infant schools, dialect problems). In addition the poor quality of much teaching was the result of inadequate teacher training, so on what grounds could the proposed cut in the length of the teacher training course be justified?

Burgess follows the Parliamentary struggle in valuable detail (7) in which various concessions were wrung from the Government. (8) One new aspect of the battle was the alliance of the National Society together with the British and Foreign Schools Society, the Home and Colonial Schools Society, the Wesleyan Education Committee and Sir James Kay Shuttleworth all coming together to fight against the Code. (9) The failure of such an alliance to alter the Code

substantially is noteworthy. Powerful influences were at work supporting Lowe's suggestions. Any method of reducing expenditure and improving efficiency was bound to attract attention and support. Lowe was not slow to point this out.

"I cannot promise the House that this system will be an economical one and I cannot promise that it will be an efficient one, but I can promise that it will be one or the other. If it is not cheap it shall be efficient; if it is not efficient it shall be cheap." (10)

Other factors influenced the acceptance of the Code in high places according to Burgess. Not only were the two members of the Government (Russell and Gladstone) who were sympathetic to education occupied with other matters at the time, but the Newcastle Commission Report was used to justify the innovations. Also, deeper motives were at work; (Burgess's comment on Lowe was to a certain extent justified by later admissions by Lowe in the 1870 debate).

"If not agnostics they (i.e. Lowe and Lingen) were both secularists.... They must have foreseen that by attaching State aid to the three R's they would undermine the existing emphasis on religious education in schools. With a clear objective before them they set their course and with skill and made clever, if unscrupulous, use of the Newcastle Report wherever it criticized the existing system."

In spite of all the attacks the Code was implemented and (with some later alterations) remained in force for many years, at least as far as the system of payment by results was concerned. It is true that the Code reduced expenditure from £813,000 in 1862 to £636,000 in 1865 and that the numbers of schools and school attendance rose so that Cruickshank's assertion that the Code was "not wholly disastrous" (11) could be said to be true, but on the other hand the Code had many adverse effects. Kay-Shuttleworth said of it later,

"the Revised Code has constructed nothing, it has only pulled down."

There was a decline in the standards of teacher training and many

of the teacher training colleges went through a difficult period because of the reduction in the length of the training period. Also, the system of payment by results distorted classroom methods and produced harrowing tales of little children dragged from their sick beds to perform for the Inspector so that the school might earn the largest possible grant. For a while attention was concentrated on the merits and defects of the code, but it soon became apparent that some sort of national system of education was not just desirable but essential. The present situation was felt to be inhibiting development and holding Britain back. Throughout the 1860's the feeling grew that the time was drawing near when some sort of national system of elementary education should be instituted. Competition from foreign countries was growing and the defeat of France by Prussia was felt in some way to be not unconnected with the very advanced educational system of the latter. If England was to keep ahead of its rivals then some sort of national education system was needed. The time was ripe; the death of Palmerstone and the enfranchisement of the urban working classes in the second reform Act gave impetus to the feeling that a new period had started in politics and that great changes were imminent. The forces of change gathered themselves into the typical Victorian institution - "the Society". At the inaugural meeting of the National Education League on 13th October 1869, Follet Osler F.R.S., an American manufacturer, gave an address in which he said that German and American merchants

"have been for years, and rapidly too, . . . supplanting English goods the world over, with the products of the educated workmen." (12)

In addition to this argument the more familiar arguments in favour of a national system were reiterated. Education was seen as a way of stabilizing society and preventing the violent upsurges of mass discontent which had occurred elsewhere. The opinion began to be more and more voiced that education was necessary not because a man was a rate-payer or a supporter of this or that

sect, but because he was a man. A political dimension to the argument came in Robert Lowe's remark made in connection with the passing of the 1867 Reform Act, when he spoke of the need

"to compel our future masters to learn their letters." (13)

With this in mind the preliminary manoeuvres to the framing of the 1870 Act began.

The National Education League was founded in October 1869 in a move by (in the main) Nonconformist elements to influence the shape of the impending legislation, indeed, a special Committee was set up to draft a Bill which could be presented to Parliament. The League had such notable leaders as R. W. Dale and Joseph Chamberlain, and campaigned for a national system of rate aided schools, locally managed but nationally inspected. Attendance was to be compulsory and Religious Instruction was to be "unsectarian". This last point caused some confusion and in 1874 this was changed to "secular", but by that time the damage had been done, in Nonconformist minds at least. The confusion arose from the fact that many of the League's supporters supported the Radical line of totally free and secular education, but the majority favoured unsectarian Religious Instruction often taking the form of Bible readings without comment. (14) The vague phrase "unsectarian" was an attempt to gloss over this division of opinion. In the short term it was successful, but later events were to reveal the rift in the Nonconformist camp. Putting the "religious issue" aside, it was also true to say that the League was supported by many people who simply thought it the best method of obtaining a truly national system of education. As McCann has shown the majority of Trades Unionists supported the League (15) as they did not want "to have the Gospel and geography mixed together". (16) This support is not surprising as many of the leaders of the Trades Unions were drawn from the ranks of the Nonconformists. Other supporters included the Royal Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufacture and Commerce and some former members of the Newcastle Commission. The League was extremely active and vigorous. It raised £60,000 for a 10 year campaign fund;

it held over 100 meetings all over the country and took out full page advertisements in the Times outlining its ideas and giving lists of its supporters.

Such a vigorous challenge was met by the establishment of the Manchester based Education Union. This was the response of the Church party - a Union pledged to a national system of elementary education by supplementing the denominational system and offering a conscience clause. It was very much a reaction to developments rather than an attempt to lead from the front, as the Bishop of Manchester's remark at a meeting of the Union shows,

"if it had not been for the Education League and the programme they put forth, this Education Union, which has assembled us here tonight, would have had no existence." (17)

The Union campaigned for support from rates and taxes for denominational schools and opposed the abolition of school fees (except for the children of the very poor). It also opposed compulsory education, except that indirect compulsion (such as forbidding the employment of children under a certain age) was deemed acceptable.

The establishment of these two rival societies heralded the beginning of a great national debate about education culminating in the 1870 Act, which was to be a watershed for the Voluntary Societies. The 1860's had seen the gradual dissolution of the Nonconformist Voluntaryist grouping into various other factions. The facts of life were producing shifts in support as earlier positions became patently untenable. Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, for long an ardent advocate of the old system, regretfully admitted that it was necessary to give central government powers to initiate schools where they were needed rather than merely waiting to support applications by the Voluntary Societies whenever and wherever they chose to make them. Edward Baines and Edward Miall parted company at this time, with Miall and Dale going into the League campaigning for secular schools and Baines joining the Union in defence of denominational schools. At a meeting in 1867 of the Congregational Union Baines admitted that the Voluntaryists could no longer hold out,

"in short, the purely voluntary system, which had done such immense service in former years, was obviously overmatched and undermined... as educational voluntaries we are last in the field, and there is no dishonour in retreating before irresistible numbers."

The 1867 Reform Act had extended the vote to the urban working classes, much strengthening the hand of the Nonconformists. The Nonconformists were opposed to the power and privileges of the established Church and were thus the natural political allies of the Liberal party. The 1868 elections with the expanded electorate returned a Liberal majority, with a considerable number of Radical successes. The new government was not very Radical in its composition, the only Radical in the Cabinet being John Bright whose influence was curtailed through illness, but nevertheless church rates were abolished in 1868 and in 1869 the Church was disestablished in Ireland. These victories for Dissent meant that Nonconformist hopes were high as far as the forthcoming Education Act was concerned, relying as they did on previous actions and statements of the Government. In view of the strong party alignment with the opposing religious groups it is not surprising that disputes about education between the sects often blurred over into general inter-party political wrangling. The support of the Nonconformists for the Liberals was a mixed blessing, as Gladstone was later to find out to his cost, when the actions of the Government over education offended the sensitive 'dissenting conscience' and precipitated not only the withdrawal of their support but even their active interference in selecting candidates on the issue of their attitudes to the education issue. (18)

The Church party had also undergone certain changes. It was now generally acknowledged that the Voluntary system could not supply the complete elementary school system which the country needed and the Government demanded. The point at issue was - how was this to be done? There had been a number of straws in the wind, indicating the way the Government might move. One of these was the Bill proposed in 1867 by H.S. Bruce, the Vice President of the Committee of Council. The scheme was quite simple; it proposed

rate aid for the erection and maintenance of new and existing schools with the aim of providing free compulsory education. Church schools were included in the scheme, as long as they accepted a conscience clause. Forster supported the Bill, perhaps recognizing in it the seeds of his own Bill which appeared two years later.

For many years the National Society had been opposed to rate aid for denominational schools for a variety of reasons - principally because the advent of rate aid would cause the supply of voluntary donations to dry up, but also because it was feared that rate aid would bring with it a degree of possibly hostile local control which would be unacceptable. Another point to be considered was that the Terms of Union of the National Society meant that schools in Union with it could not accept rate aid, so that if the National Society remained adamant the supporters of Church schools would be asked to pay twice, once for their Church schools and once for the education rate. Arguments of this sort led to withdrawal of Bruce's Bill, but it was clearly a problem which would require attention in the near future. Previous Bills relying on rate aid had been defeated because of Church opposition, (19) though some Churchmen had long advocated rate aid and denominational schools as a reasonable solution. Lord Ashley changed his mind on this and, after early support, spoke of the education rate as,

"a water rate to extinguish religious fire among the people." (20)

Francis Close said that such a rate would,

"have dried up all the sources of voluntary effort and ultimately would have handed all the schools of the country to the Secularists". (21)

Denison and the other extreme High Churchmen took a predictable line on this question seeing rate aid as yet another attempt by the Church's enemies to gain control over the Church's schools.

However, it was clear that the Church's former policy over education had to be revised in the light of impending battle and the superiority of the opposition. A general line of approach needed to be decided on and various concessions made as required by force of circumstances. The disintegration of the Voluntarists and the subsequent growth of the Union by the arrival of a number of Nonconformist moderates meant that the Union needed to be quite specific over the vexed problem of the Conscience Clause. Unfortunately the National Society remained publicly opposed to the Conscience Clause right up until the publication of the Bill and for a while thereafter. In addition, though the Union did finally accept the Conscience Clause, there was still a certain amount of disquiet at the attitude of some Anglican clerics to this matter which came out at public meeting of the Union. (22) All this did nothing to enhance the image of the Union or the National Society in the eyes of potential Nonconformist supporters. Nonconformist support for the Union was also tempered by the realization that any extension of the Voluntary system would inevitably mean that the Anglican Church, already far ahead of all the other sects, would go even further ahead as she would continue to receive the lion's share of the grant. The Church already had the largest number of schools and, more importantly since the cessation of the building grant in 1860, a near monopoly in the range of teacher training. This situation was to cause much adverse comment from Nonconformists in later years when the vast majority of teachers were trained in denominational colleges.

The damage done to the Church's cause by this obstinate refusal to admit the justice of the Conscience clause cannot be underestimated. If the Church had agreed on an effective Conscience clause which the Nonconformists had accepted, then the alignment of forces on the collapse of the Voluntarist movement might have been radically altered. It was the refusal of the Church over this point which drove the Nonconformists into the arms of the secularists, and led directly for Nonconformist pressure to end denominational instruction in schools. This issue provided the spur to the Nonconformist offensive and contributed in no small way to the growing strength

and fierceness of the opposition. Even Burgess remarks regretfully,

"Now it (the National Society) had to face the fact that no Government Bill could simply prolong and augment the existing denominational system. Fierce denominational feeling which divided the Christian forces, and the League's campaign which had attracted dissenters and secularists into the same camp and had made that certain." (23)

All sides were agreed on the need for a National system of education, but the disputes arose on how this should be achieved. (24) The essence of the division was exemplified by the differing attitudes of the League and the Union to denominational schools. The Union wanted to preserve and extend the denominational system, making it the backbone of the national system, whilst the League wanted the absorption of such schools into the national system of unsectarian schools. The minority groups like the Roman Catholics and the Jews wanted to retain the voluntary system and demanded rate aid for their schools. The battle over the elementary schools was the crucial one for the denominations, and it is at this level that motives are at their plainest. At elementary school age vocational subjects could not be taught to any great extent and at that level were to be found the greatest number of children. Thus, so the argument ran, whoever controlled the schools would have a sort of "spiritual stranglehold" on the nation's religious life. This argument lay behind the fierceness of the sectarian struggle for control, or, in the case of the Nonconformists, a guarantee that religion would form no significant part of school life. To a dispassionate observer this line of argument was plainly false, as experience had already shown. As far back as the 1851 Census Mann had noted this and commented;

"At first sight it appears inevitable that in the course of time the mass of the population educated of necessity in Church of England schools must gradually return to that community; but in opposition to this natural anticipation; is the curious fact that - while for many years past at least 4/5ths of all the children who have passed through public schools must have been instructed in the schools of the Church of England - concurrently with this a very considerable augmentation has (according to the Tables of

Religious Worship) been proceeding in the numbers of the Dissenters, so that now they number very nearly half of the total population. This appears to prove that either the education given by the Church has been administered on very tolerant or liberal principles, or else, the sectarian and doctrinal instruction of the day school is extremely ineffective in comparison with the religious influences which the scholar meets elsewhere." (25)

Needless to say such evidence and arguments did not convince the Nonconformists that their fears of Anglican domination were unfounded!

On 17th February 1870 Forster published his Education Bill. Its reception in the House was quite cordial and Forster's long introductory speech contributed in no small way to this. In framing the Bill Forster had had to take into account various facts of political and economic life. Firstly the vast sums of money invested in education and represented by bricks and mortar of the voluntary schools could not simply be appropriated, nor the efforts and financial support, both past and future, of the denominationalists simply ignored. They clearly had to have a future of some sort in any national system. In addition to this demands for economy meant that the Church schools could not simply be "bought out" by the Government, which would also have to contribute towards any new schools which were needed. Forster stated that his aim was

"to obtain complete and efficient school provision ... (with) the least possible expenditure of public money and the least possible injury to existing schools." (26)

This idea certainly did not excite any wild opposition!

Forster rejected the proposals of the League and the Union. The former was too expensive and would alienate many of those who feared most for education, whilst those of the latter he regarded as both impracticable and potentially very expensive for the State. His Bill attempted to draw support from both sides; (in fact, as Parliamentary voting showed, it did do this). It acknowledged the efforts of the past and made good use of them but it also made

provision for the State to supplement these voluntary efforts to fill in the gaps. This was the essence of the Dual System, the Voluntary schools were to remain, supported by the State, whilst in addition to them other schools were to be provided by the State through the agency of the School Board.

Before considering the detail of the Act a comment on the broad outline of the scheme would not be out of place. In practical terms Forster had little room for manoeuvre. He had to devise some sort of scheme which allowed the Voluntary Schools to continue yet which also allowed for the State to ensure that adequate provision was made. The situation made some sort of dual system inevitable, the modern all embracing system of the central Department of Education and Science and the Local Education Authority was unacceptable to contemporary public opinion, long steeped in the traditions of laissez faire and voluntary effort. Distaste for interference by Government was strong and it was with some reluctance that many people admitted the need for central Government to have any say in the development of the schools. The necessity for a partner in education besides the denominations stemmed from the failure of the Voluntary System to cope with demand. Yet this failure was not a total failure and the measure of its success can be seen even today in the number of Voluntary schools still in existence. The Voluntary System had served its purpose in an earlier situation but was rendered obsolete by changing circumstances. The Forster Act was a judicious attempt to graft a new scheme onto the old and to a large extent it was successful, although problems did arise later on for the Voluntary Schools.

The proposals were fairly straightforward, in the first draft at least. When the Bill was first published the plan was that the country was to be divided into areas and the educational needs of these areas was to be ascertained. In those areas where there were deficiencies in provision of places the Voluntary Societies were

to be given a year to make up this deficiency. If, at the end of this time, there remained a shortfall in the number of places available School Boards were to be set up with powers to make good the deficiency. These Boards had wide powers and could cause a rate to be levied to provide money to establish the necessary number of schools and to pay for their running costs. They had the power to provide whatever kind of Religious Instruction they saw fit in the schools under their charge, and could thus provide a totally denominational school in all but name or even a totally secular school, it was all a matter for local decision. These powerful Boards were to be appointed by Town Councils in municipal boroughs and by vestry meetings elsewhere. Other details included the acceptance of a Conscience Clause as a condition of a Government grant and that both sorts of school, Board and denominational, could receive rate aid. Finally, and very significantly, the State would in future only pay for secular education. Religious Instruction was no longer to be inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectors and the Concordat of 1840 was to be finally ended.

The reaction of the National Society to these proposals was cautious and considered. As Burgess shows, (27) putting to one side the public statements of the Society, there is evidence to indicate that the National Society had at last given in over the Conscience Clause but it was opposed to the League's idea of a time table conscience clause. It was also concerned about the problem of exercising control over managers of schools who turned over their schools to the State. The Society could also foresee financial problems ahead for Voluntary Schools and so it asked for either rate aid for its schools or rate exemption for the supporters of its schools, who would otherwise be paying twice. This was a change of policy by the National Society who had long resisted rate aid and it was not a universally popular idea. In the parliamentary debate Gladstone's words of 1856 were flung back in his face,

"As the right honourable Gentleman at the head of the Government remarked in the great Education debates of 1856 April 11th, 'such a system would put an end not only to voluntary subscriptions, but also, as a consequence, to that interest in education which ought to be felt throughout the whole community'". (28)

As might have been expected, other reactions to the proposals were not always as well considered and restrained as the National Society's comments. The Radicals were greatly dismayed at the proposals which seemed to them to give the greatest power to the strongest sect. This "undesirable" state of affairs would clearly favour the Established Church and so the Nonconformists were implacably opposed to these sections of the Bill. The ardent Nonconformist Francis Adams wrote,

"The Bill was wasteful, to the extent that it required schools provision, and took no security that it should be used. Great and unnecessary delay was encouraged by the Bill ... The proposal to extend the denominational system was itself objectionable. The country had a right to ask that the new system should be of a public character, under public management, and conducted on unsectarian principles. The extension of the denominational system was a direct restraint on the establishment of a national system." (29)

The debate in the country was prolonged and animated. Education was a key question of the day, both money and principle were involved, not to mention the various competing vested interests. Armytage comments,

"It would truly have been said to have been hammered out. The hammering was not so much by the 174 Members of Parliament who spoke on it in the Commons, the 8 bishops, and 26 temporal peers who spoke on it in the Lords, as by the specialist groups that worked it over outside the House of Commons. One has only to read the press, editorials or reports of public meetings and assemblies to realize that this Act was a classic example of the political mediation of specialist interests." (30)

In debate Forster was quite clear as to why the Government had rejected secularist pressure for a total ban on all forms of Religious Instruction in schools, (and his answer was to be heard again as an echo in the 1944 Education Act debates).

"Why do we not prescribe that there shall be no religious teaching? If we did so out of the religious difficulty, we should come to an irreligious difficulty. We want ... to do that which the majority of parents in this country really wish, and we have no doubt whatever that an enormous majority of the parents of this country prefer that there should be a Christian training for their children .. would it not be a monstrous thing that the book, which, after all, is the foundation of the religion we profess, should be the only book that was not allowed to be used in our schools?" (31)

Forster's perception of the unpopularity of the secularist line was accurate. At a public meeting in June of that year attended by more than 3,000 people a secularist proposal to ban religious influence in rate aided schools (in effect a moderate proposal) received only 20 votes. (32) Forster was content to let the local Boards decide what kind of religious teaching, if any, was to go on in their schools. The Nonconformists however, were against this, as it opened the way for Board schools which would teach denominational Religious Instruction and the Anglican Church was bound to dominate many of the local Boards. This "permissive denominationalism" was condemned and the Nonconformists demanded a decision by the central authority, Parliament, rather than letting each Board decide its own policy on this matter.

Nonconformist opposition to the Bill both inside and outside Parliament was instrumental in altering the Bill in many ways. Even so their opposition was by no means totally united. Many Congregationalists, led by Edward Miall, rejected Religious Instruction in schools outright (seeking instead to limit this to the worshipping community of a church rather than the educational community of a school). On the other hand other Congregationalists like Samuel Morely and C.H. Spurgeon were in favour of Bible teaching. The Methodists were also divided, some supported the League whilst others, like Dr. James Rigg the principal of Westminster College, wanted to maintain and even extend the Methodist school system.

In spite of these divisions various amendments were made to the Bill. The Parliamentary debates were marked by a good deal of hard talking and the "religious issue", which Forster had intended to "canter over", took up a great deal of time. Only a few members seemed to be able to remember that there were educational needs to be considered as well as tender religious consciences. Lowe, commenting on the "great merit" of the Bill's wide scope and the concentration of the House on the religious issue said,

"Is it not lamentable, is it not melancholy ... that we should have been forced to concentrate our attention entirely on this very narrow point.... Is it not a pitiable sight? It reminds me of a fine herd of cattle in a large meadow deserting the grass which is abundant about them and delighting themselves by fighting over a bed of nettles in one corner of the field." (33)

As might be expected from such a compromise, it was condemned by the Church for giving away too much whilst Dissent opposed it because it gave away too little. The Nonconformist opponents castigated the Government over the proposed "year of grace" in which the denominationalists could take steps to make good the deficit. This was seen as a golden opportunity for the denominational system to expand, which of course ran plain contrary to the expectations and aspirations of the Nonconformists. The reaction was fierce;

"If as I expect nothing is done, then the year is wasted, if under the dread of a school Board and rates, a denominational system is set up - is forced and struggles into existence - the year is worse than wasted - it is misused." (34)

The above comment by a Radical Member of Parliament is typical of the strong pressure against the Government which forced a reduction of the grace period to six months. Chamberlain was hostile to the Bill,

"If it be carried out without alteration I venture to say it will be the signal of a conflict such as this country has rarely seen ... the result of which will be the disestablishment and disendowment of the English Church." (35)

Other points which provoked Nonconformist wrath were the elections to the Boards by vestry meetings and the "permissive compulsion" inherent in the proposals. The Boards could, if they wished, pass local bye laws compelling children to go to school, but this was regarded as unsatisfactory by the Nonconformists who wanted direct compulsion. Also on Board elections, the Nonconformists were very suspicious of the ecclesiastical connections of vestry meetings and feared that by allowing local control over Religious Instruction Board schools would become denominational schools of the Church of England in all but name. This prompted an amendment by the Nonconformist Member of Parliament Dixon,

"that no Measure for the elementary education of the people will afford a satisfactory or permanent settlement which leaves the question of Religious Instruction in schools supported by public funds and rates to be determined by local authorities." (36)

This was a crucial point. Had the Government been able to carry this the position of the Church would have been far stronger, because, as the Nonconformists so rightly saw, past experience had shown that local control very often meant Anglican domination. The Dixon amendment was debated for three nights and, after a threat by the chairman of the League that a movement for exclusively secular education would start unless concessions were made, the Government bowed to pressure and agreed to alter the Bill. It was not a minor alteration, but a major reconsideration of policy. Forster's previous idea had been that public funds should support the religious teachings of all denominations by giving rate aid to all schools both denominational and Board. Although in theory it was a good idea and appeared to be impartial, in practice it was distinctly pro-Anglican.

The opposition to it was so great that it had to be dropped. This event marked the great divide in relations between the Church and State over education. For the first time government money was going to support non sectarian State run schools. The image of the

Church as the "spiritual side of the nation" was thus finally shattered, although for many years there had been little or no substance in the claim. As the State could no longer favour the Church in education it became, as a direct result of the changes in the Act, officially neutral to religion and all the denominations. So it was that the Church finally lost for ever the opportunity to take up on a permanent basis a dominant position in education in the great expansion of education of the century following 1870. Dissent had thus virtually achieved the formal "educational disestablishment" of the Anglican Church. The opposition which forced this change was deep rooted and had as its aim the total disestablishment of the Church. The dissenting Member of Parliament Wintherbotham said in Parliament;

"To understand our strong repugnance to these denominational schools the House must patiently bear with me while I show them shortly what is the attitude of Dissent towards the Church, especially in the rural parishes... Dissent in many rural parishes is treated like cattle plague - to be stamped out. This state of feeling is due ... primarily to the mere existence of an Established Church ... the law of the Church and of the land recognizes one man and one man only as the authorized religious teacher of the parish, all others are interlopers, trespassers, poachers on his spiritual preserve." (37)

Faced with such opposition the Government had two options. Firstly, it could insist that no Religious Instruction was taught in Board schools or it could allow only undenominational Religious Instruction in Board schools. The Cabinet, after some dissension, (38) favoured the latter course of action, although with a distinct lack of enthusiasm. So the Cowper-Temple amendment was accepted by the Government and became famous. This allowed for the teaching of Religious Instruction in schools by the master in such a way as to use "no religious catechism or religious formulary distinctive of any particular denomination." (39) Dr. Hook's prediction concerning State schools and the danger of "Nothingarians" had come true. (40) Gladstone also had no high opinion of the "watered down" Religious Instruction which could offend no one referring to it as

"a moral monster borne of the State's supposition that it possessed a charter from heaven to authorize a new religion" (41)

As Disraeli said concerning the position of the master under this novel arrangement;

"You will not entrust the priest or the presbyter with the privilege of expanding the Holy Scriptures to the scholars; but for that purpose you are inventing and establishing a new sacerdotal class." (42)

The Cowper-Temple Amendment was vague to say the very least, but Gladstone firmly resisted any attempt to define the terms used and preferred to trust to common sense.

"We know perfectly well that practical judgement and the spirit of Christianity combined with common sense, may succeed and does succeed in the vast number of cases." (43)

Events were to vindicate Gladstone's assessment of the general feeling in the country. After the Bill was passed the Cowper-Temple Clause was by and large accepted and administered by School Boards in ways which were acceptable to all sides. This is not to say that the Clause was implemented in the spirit in which it was intended. As Murphy makes clear, (44) Cowper-Temple was the leader of the Union faction in Parliament and it was his intention that whilst no creeds or formularies distinctive of any sect should be allowed, it would still be possible to give a denominational slant to Religious Instruction. Forster himself agreed with Cowper-Temple's idea that denominational instruction was still possible even without the distinctive formularies and catechisms,

"you may have sectarian teaching without sectarian formularies and catechisms." (45)

All this is noteworthy because the spirit of the Clause was largely misunderstood in the country at large, though perhaps in the happiest possible way. Even so the clause was permissive not compulsory, School Boards could if they so wished give an entirely secular education in their schools. The fact that very few (only 41

out of 500) Boards separated religious and secular education totally (in the fashion of the Birmingham Board for example) indicates a victory for moderation and common sense so notably lacking amongst the leaders of society. More than one historian has commented that the "problem" was more apparent than real and seemed confined to certain small groups in society. The usual reaction of parents to these matters was indifference or at best a concern to find the best school irrespective of the nature and standard of its Religious Instruction.

The Government changed its mind on another matter as well. It had originally been envisaged that denominational schools accepting a Conscience Clause and being recognized as efficient would receive rate support. The Nonconformist opposition to this was extremely strong and a rate strike was threatened. The bogey of religious persecution was dredged up to inflame support;

"it was not right to take money from the general taxation of the country and apply it to the purposes of religious instruction and worship... if they claimed the right to compel one man to pay for the support of another man's religion, and to enforce that, as they must, by penalties of law, they passed at once into the region of religious persecution." (46)

The compromise worked out by the Government was that instead of rate aid the denominational schools should receive a 50% grant from the Exchequer towards the cost of maintenance. (47) On the other hand all building grants were to cease after the expiry of the grace period, so that any denominational school founded after that would require greater initial funding. This 50% grant was the only advantage the Church gained in the entire Act and in reality it was nothing more than the Government recognizing the plain fact of life that if the denominational schools were to stay, they needed more support. Even so, this limited support was not popular with the Nonconformists. Adams commented sourly;

"These proposals could hardly be satisfactory to the League of the Nonconformists. The ministry,

in fact, threw themselves into the arms of their enemies. They adopted the clause proposed by the Chairman of the Union, and the suggestion made by Lord Robert Montagu that they should return to the former liberal scale of grants. The building grant was discontinued in such a manner as to give a stimulus to the foundation of denominational schools." (48)

Other changes to the Bill concerned elections. Instead of elections by town councils and vestry meetings the Boards were to be elected by rate-payers. This was another victory for Nonconformist pressure who saw this as a way of preventing Anglican domination of the Boards. Finally, the rather ineffective Conscience Clause was replaced by a time table conscience clause. By this device the Nonconformists ensured that Religious Instruction would always be at the beginning and/or at the end of a session of the school so that Dissenting parents could withdraw their children without trouble and inconvenience. Burgess comments;

"The real loss was in the realm of Religious Education. The time table conscience clause achieved that divorce between religious and secular education which the Church had always opposed. Religious Instruction no longer formed the "pivot of teaching" but became a mere adjunct. Instead of religion providing the integrating factor which gave meaning to the whole of the curriculum, it became one of the subjects competing for a place in the timetable... The abandonment of the Concordat of 1840 merely emphasized what the time table conscience clause made inevitable, for the fact that Government Inspectors henceforth took no cognizance of Religious Instruction reduced its status still further in the eyes of teachers, scholars and parents alike." (49)

Even Adams admitted,

"The integrity of the denominational teaching was broken by the clause. The principle of the division in time between the two branches of instruction once admitted, the complete separation in other respects has become a question of patience." (50)

These changes satisfied neither side, especially the Nonconformists whose hopes of removing voluntary schools had been high. Their consequent opposition to these proposals which not only permitted such schools to exist but actively encouraged them through the grace

period and the increased grant was understandably great. (51)
Forster himself had a motion of censure passed on him by his own constituents of Bradford, the wording of which gives little credit to its supporters,

"in passing the Education Bill, he had legislated for the majority of the country as a whole, and not for the minority of his own political supporters, and ... in doing so he had betrayed that section of his party which had reposed the greatest trust in him." (52)

All through its passage through Parliament the Nonconformists and Radicals opposed the Bill, which was only finally carried by an alliance of those Liberals loyal to the Government and the Tory opposition. The Tories were not in any way enamoured of the Bill but it was felt that if this comparatively mild measure were rejected then something much worse would inevitably follow.

Shaftesbury said in debate,

"the Government had saved a great deal for the friends of scriptural education...he felt as sure as he did of anything that if this Bill were lost a measure of purely secular education would be passed by the House of Commons next year. He believed that even many of those who had stood up for the Bill this year would in another give up the struggle from mere weariness." (53)

The Radicals campaigned ceaselessly against the voluntary schools and wanted much tougher treatment of them by the Government.

Gladstone was adamant on this;

"If we treat these voluntary schools as institutions either to be proscribed or at the best only to be tolerated, limited, hemmed in, permitted to exist, merely because they do exist - as things which it is not worth our while to recognize, or honour, or encourage, on what principle can we justify such a policy? On none that I know of, but that secular instruction becomes tainted by being brought into the neighbourhood of specific religious teaching. Under the provisions of the Bill the secular instruction given in voluntary schools will be severely tested and... it shall be of as high a quality as that given in the rate supported schools. It will be cheaper to the public, though it will be dearer to the individual. On what principle, then, can we refuse to avail ourselves of the advantages which it is calculated to confer." (54)

Gladstone was sensitive to the "religious difficulty". He accepted the proposal for a system of cumulative voting for Board elections, in the hope that

"the representation of all classes and sections of opinion on the local Boards would have considerable effect in disarming jealousy and would enable us to go more freely forward with this measure." (55)

This new system gave each voter as many votes as there were seats on the Board, so that by casting their votes carefully, a minority could usually manage to elect a member onto the Board. This new system did not always produce the harmonious effect Gladstone desired, as for example the first elections in Birmingham were to show, (56) but by and large the device seems to have worked reasonably well.

On reflection the 1870 Act was a great landmark in the development of the English school system. It created the framework necessary for the provision of a truly national system of education by creating the local Boards. It was only passed after many battles and at great cost to all sides. The Radicals did not give up the fight in Parliament. In 1872 Dixon put forward a motion condemning the working of the 1870 Act as unsatisfactory and claiming that;

"it provokes religious discord throughout the land and it violates the rights of conscience." (57)

This motion was heavily defeated but the Liberal dissidents gained some satisfaction in the next round of election results in 1874 when the Liberals were themselves defeated. The Liberals had lost the active support of the Nonconformists because of their Education Act and so they suffered the consequences at the polls. Adams describes the action of the League both in the Bath bye election (and in other bye elections) and in the general election saying that the League "incurred much odium for dividing the party". League support for a Liberal candidate was conditional on his acceptance of the League's line on education. Adams claims that out of 425 Liberal candidates in 1874, some 300 were pledged to support the League's demand for repeal of the 25th section of the Act. This 25th clause,

which permitted Boards to pay for children of poor parents at any public school in their area, had slipped through unnoticed and had become a 'cause célèbre' for the Nonconformists. It symbolized all that they opposed in regard to payments to voluntary schools from public funds. Adam's comment on the failure of the Liberals in the elections contains overtones of self satisfaction mixed with genuine regret;

"The defeat of the Liberal party, calamitous as it proved in some respects, was not an unmixed evil. It has taught the country that no Government will be allowed to juggle with great principles with impunity. It also prepared the way for the re-union of the party on a more liberal basis, with more assured purposes, and with infinitely superior organization. It is impossible also not to believe that the events recorded will have a marked influence on the educational and ecclesiastical legislation of the future." (58)

This was not the last time that the "education issue" led directly or indirectly to a change in Government. The Conservatives in 1902 passed an Act which so aroused Nonconformist wrath that in 1906 there was a great Liberal revival and the Liberals were returned to power, only once again to disappoint their supporters over the education issue.

Overall the Church had come out of the struggle rather better than might have been expected, although her position was considerably weakened. It was true that the voluntary system remained, but then its immediate demise was never really a practical possibility, however much some may have wished it so. It had gained the short term advantage of the six months grace period and it took maximum advantage of this, but in the long term the Church was at a disadvantage. The abolition of the building grant, no rate exemption for its supporters and, most of all, the advent of a local rival educational organization with a regular income which could be adjusted to meet requirements had created such a situation that, although denominational schools still existed, it was clear their continued existence would demand active support rather than mere toleration or assent. In addition to all this there was the time table conscience clause. Burgess comments;

"The time table conscience clause was the price that the Church had to pay for the stiff and unyielding attitude of the National Society over the Conscience Clause question over the previous twenty years. This Clause of the Act was regarded by the Radicals as a triumph for their own policy of freeing education from ecclesiastical control. The Church made the inevitable concession (to the Dissenting conscience) too late, and, alienated by years of frustration, Dissent allowed the secularists to achieve their goal - a position where the State was not merely neutral between the denominations, but neutral towards religion itself." (59)

The frustration of the Nonconformists is perhaps more easily understood in the light of the Church's attitude to Dissent. As late as August 1871 the Monthly paper of the National Society contained the following "conciliatory" statement;

"They (the children) ought to know why they should be Churchmen, and not Dissenters; why they should go to church and not to meetings, why they should be Anglicans and not Romanists. The time has come when probably the whole fate of the Church of England, humanly speaking, will turn upon the hold she may have upon the rising generation. Political changes are giving more and more power to the people. If the Church have the people with her she will be beyond all danger from adverse legislation. Let her, then, educate the children of the people in her principles."

Adams also quotes an example of a catechism for use in church schools prepared by one Rev. Gace. It is hardly surprising that the Nonconformists smarted under such remarks as;

"Question. We have among us various sects ... by the general name of Dissenters. In what light are we to consider them?

Answer. As heretics, and in our litany we pray to be delivered from the sins of false doctrine, heresy, and schism.

Question. Is Dissent a great sin?

Answer. Yes, it is in direct opposition to our duty towards God.

Question. Is it wicked then to enter a meeting house at all?

Answer. Most assuredly...." (60)

Whilst Nonconformist feelings were aroused by such offensive remarks, the time table conscience clause also caused deep resentment amongst supporters of denominational schools. It struck at the very root of their idea of education as an integrated whole rather than a ragbag

of assorted parts which could be rearranged with additions and deletions as desired. One Bishop remarked,

"Religion must be the essence of all education, and if it is driven into a corner, if it is placed, so to speak on the outskirts of secular teaching, what must be the impression made both on the children and the teacher?" (61)

The whole basis of the Church/State relationship in education had undergone a radical change with the passing of the Act. Even Gladstone admitted in debate that, compared with the situation in 1843 and the proposals of Sir James Graham,

"May it not rather be said that the tables are turned? There is no special recognition of the Church in the present plan." (62)

Later in the same speech Gladstone was even more candid about the position of the Church under the new Bill;

"But one distinction which there will be in these schools (i. e. Board schools) is a distinction not in favour of the Church, but hearing rather upon her, - I will not say with hardness, because I trust and believe that it will not be so, but with something like an inequality. Something less than equality on this occasion she has been contented to accept."

"Something less than equality" is a reasonable estimate of the Church's position after the Act was passed. As time was to show her position became progressively less and less equal as her problems mounted.

When it was all over the Nonconformists were just as dissatisfied (if not more so) as the Anglicans. They attacked the Government fiercely for letting them down so badly over the education question. John Morely wrote in the Fortnightly Review;

"Mr. Disraeli had the satisfaction of dishing the Whigs who were his enemies. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, dished the Dissenters who were his friends. Unfortunately he omitted one element of prime importance in these rather nice transactions. He forgot to educate his party." (63)

Even in the usually formal third reading of the Bill Miall, speaking as the Nonconformist leader in the House, complained bitterly that

he and his friends had been made to pass through the Valley of Humiliation (a reference to the fact that on many divisions the Government had only won with Tory support) and warned the Government "once bitten twice shy." (64) In fairness to the Government it must be admitted that the Nonconformists had in fact been given most of what they wanted, if only they could have seen it. There was now to be a national system of undenominational schools run by democratically elected local school Boards. Some of the Nonconformist leaders were clear sighted enough and magnanimous to admit that the fundamental principles of the Nonconformist position had been included in the Act. Even Samuel Morely could admit at a later date with the benefit of hindsight, (65)

"It would have been unjust, even if it had been possible, to force on England a Bill in all respects carrying out mere Nonconformist views."

The 1870 Act laid the foundations of a national system in which the Church had an important and integral part to play. It is true that her role had changed since the early days but the fact of her efforts in her schools was acknowledged and encouraged, but from now on the Church was plainly following, not leading the State. The State, through the Board schools, was now actively participating in initiating educational innovation and expansion. It was, inevitably, in many ways a rival to the Church. Whereas in the past the State had been content to sit on the side lines, handing out money and directing its use, so that there had been "no education without religion," it was now committed to an active policy of promoting a system of schools in which it was possible that religion played no active part. Secular education only was the concern of the State, religious education was an optional extra and suffered accordingly in years to come. The result of years of ecclesiastical intransigence came in this change of heart by the State and the Church was subsequently forced to gather in a slowly diminishing harvest in progressively more and more strained circumstances.

Notes on preceding chapter

The years leading up to the 1870 Act.

1. There was a minority report suggesting that the State aid should be limited to the children of the poorest classes, the majority supported the continuation of State aid but rejected the idea that education should be free or compulsory.
2. Burgess pg. 173. Enterprise in Education.
3. J. Sullivan, Educational work of Robert Lowe. University of London, M.A. Thesis 1951 pg. 84.
4. So J.R. Murphy, The Education Act 1870, pg. 26.
5. F. Smith, pg. 266 ff. Life and work of Sir J. Kay-Shuttleworth.
6. Perhaps the damage to Religious Instruction might to a certain extent be mitigated by using one of the books written by the Secretary of the National Society on biblical mathematics. One Member of Parliament remarked;

"There were 12 apostles, 12 patriarchs and 4 evangelists. Multiply the patriarchs and apostles together and divide by the evangelists. Solomon had so many hundred wives and so many hundred concubines - I forget which, for I have not mastered the niceties of this subject."

Quoted E.R. Rich, The Education Act 1870. What with biblical arithmetic and geography and history it is evident that no mere Code would defeat the use of the Bible!
7. Burgess op cit pg. 180 ff.
8. Eg. Children under six were excused the examination but were still counted for capitation purposes; part of a school's grant became dependent on a general inspection and part on examination; the withdrawal of Teacher Training College grants was temporarily suspended.
9. J.R. Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain 1800 - 1970, pg. 72. Even Kay-Shuttleworth was moved to object that the state of co-operation between Church and State had been "abruptly and harshly changed by a fiat of a Minister, without the consent of the great controlling bodies and communions, who have expended

twice as much as the State. Even were Parliament to make such a change it would be a great national dishonour." An extract from a letter to the Earl of Granville on the Revised Code in 1861.

10. quoted J. Stuart Maclure, pg. 79 Educational Documents 1816 to present day.
11. Cruickshank pg. 11 Church & State in English Education.
12. W.H.G. Armytage B.J.E. Studs. pg. 122, June 1970 Vol. 18 No. 2 "The 1870 Education Act."
13. Hansard 3rd series Vol 198, col. 1549.
14. See Cruickshank op cit pg. 16. Highlighting the need for some moderation of policy by the League, so that the middle ground should not be lost, she quotes some correspondence between the Radical Dilke and the more realistic Harcourt.

"Neither in the House of Commons nor in the country can we beat denominationalism by secularism. If we attempt to meet the flood by a direct dyke it will simply be over our heads and we shall go to the bottom. We must break the force of the wave by the side slope."

Unsectarianism would, he thought, form a convenient side slope, a line of defence behind which a strong party could be rallied.'
15. "Trade Unionists, Artisans and the 1870 Education Act." McCann, British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 18 pg. 134.
16. Armytage ibid, British Journal of Educational Studies pg. 122
17. Francis Adams, The Elementary School Contest 1882 pg. 200
18. For a detailed account see Adams op cit pgs. 291 ff, where he deals with the League's actions in the Bath bye-election. See above pg 98
19. Principally those of Sir John Pakington (1855) and Lord John Russell (1856)
20. L. Hammond, Lord Shaftesbury, pg. 257.

21. The Spirit of the Debate in the House of Commons on Education
pg. 21 f. Close.
22. Burgess op cit pg. 134 ff.
23. ibid.
24. Government enquiries in Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester confirmed the assertions of other groups that educational provision was both inadequate and haphazard.
25. Mann's Census of 1851, on education quoted J. A. Dewey Ph. D. Keele University; "An examination of the Role of the Church and State in the development of Elementary Education in North Staffordshire between 1870 - 1903." Chp. IV pg. 54.
26. Reid, Life of Rt. Hon W.E. Forster I, 463 ff.
27. Burgess op cit pg. 194.
28. Hansard February 17 1870, 3rd series Vol 199, col. 473. (Cruickshank's paraphrase is more colourful, see op cit pg. 27.)
29. Adams op cit pg. 212/3.
30. op cit, British Journal of Educational Studies pg. 134.
31. Hansard 3rd series, Vol 199 col. 457/8.
32. McCann op cit, British Journal of Educational Studies, pg. 134.
33. Hansard 3rd series, Vol 199, col. 2060.
34. ibid, col 1969.
35. D. Nicholls, Church and State in Britain since 1820, pg. 81. R. K. P.
36. Hansard 3rd series Vol 199, col. 1919.
37. ibid, col. 1974/5
38. Gladstone and others favoured a secular system, so Cruickshank pg. 29 op cit.
39. Education Act, 1970 Section I Clause 14, subsection 2.
40. see above pg. 67 note 13.
41. B. Sacks, The Religious Issue in England & Wales, pg. 84.

42. Hansard 3rd series Vol 202, col. 289.
43. *ibid*, col 276.
44. J. Murphy, Church - State and Schools in Britain 1800 - 1970.
pg. 58/9.
45. Hansard 3rd series Vol 202, col. 1251.
46. *ibid*, col. 498/9.
47. This failure to "get on the rates" was a serious financial blow. Even the Roman Catholics (whose leaders were away at the Vatican for much of the crucial period) failed to see the significance of this until it was too late. Forster commented later to a Catholic friend:-

"What fools you Catholics were not to claim exemption, for your schools were obviously outside the scope of the School Board system. The Jews were better advised or more on the alert, for they obtained what you did not even ask for."

Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning, Vol.I pg. 493.

48. Adams op cit pg. 225.
49. Burgess op cit pg. 198.
50. Adams op cit pg. 236.
51. G.O. Trevelyan felt so strongly on this matter that he resigned from the Government.
52. T.W. Reid, Life of Rt. Hon. W.E. Forster 1888 pg. 519, as quoted in "A Political party and education, Reflection on the Liberal Party's Educational Policy. 1867 - 1902." K.M. Hughes, British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 8 pg. 112 1959/60.
53. Hansard 3rd series Vol. 203, col. 1168,
54. Hansard 3rd series Vol. 202, col. 941/2
55. *ibid*.
56. In the first Board elections in the stronghold of the League, Birmingham, the Anglicans, by using the cumulative voting device carefully, achieved a majority on the Board. This led to problems with the local Council, see below, pg. 118.

57. Hansard 5th March 1872, Vol. 209, col. 1395 3rd series.
58. Adams op cit 301.
59. Burgess op cit 199/200.
60. Adams op cit pg. 245.
61. Hansard 3rd series Vol. 202, col. 1170.
62. ibid, col. 948.
63. New series, pg. 149, and The Struggle for National Education,
John Morely, pg.15.
64. This speech provoked the following reply from Gladstone,

"Far be it from me to say this is a perfect measure...
We have had to steer our course amid competing bodies
and conflicting difficulties".

Speech in Debate on 3rd Reading pg. 507 of "Elementary
Education Bill 1870."
65. Hodder, Life of Samuel Morely, pg. 255/6 quoted Cruickshank,
op cit pg. 34.

Chapter Six

1870 - 1900 The Mounting Problems

There were two immediate results to the passing of the 1870 Education Act. Firstly, there was a great rush of applications for building grants passing through the channels of the voluntary societies, as the denominationalists made one last effort to meet the deadline set by the Act. Secondly, the first of the School Boards were set up and the first Board Schools started in temporary premises.

The efforts made by the voluntary societies were certainly prodigious. The National Society issued a Special Appeal and raided its reserves to meet the demand. By the end of 1870 it had allocated over £18,000 in grants (1) and finally had to call a halt in the following year because grants of £63,600 had almost exhausted its reserves. The rate of applications to the Government for building grants went up from about 150 per month to 3342 in the five month period of grace allowed under the Act. (2) This was the start of a great increase in the number of children in Voluntary schools. In the six years following the Act about £5,000,000 was subscribed voluntarily (3) and by 1880 the increase in places in the voluntary sector was 935,993. This compared very creditably with the 1,016,464 places provided by the rate aided School Boards in the same period of time, and at that time more than twice as many children were being educated in denominational schools as Board Schools. (4) However, this great effort could not go on indefinitely. By 1872 the National Society had to suspend the allocation of all grants because its "entire income was pledged for two years in advance" to the tune of £57,763. (5)

In this great expansion following the Act the seeds of future trouble were sown. From this time onwards until the 1902 Act the denominational schools were destined to struggle and fight for survival against the rising tide of the Board Schools and the

falling away of voluntary subscriptions. Even within nine years of the passing of the 1870 Act 477 Church schools had been transferred to School Boards and only the intervention of the National Society had prevented another 410 from a similar fate. This pattern was to be repeated down the years until in December 1901 the Bishop of Rochester wrote to the Prime Minister; (6)

"If the schools are not in some way relieved many will go within the year - enough to greatly weaken the cause, and, by creating the impression that "the game is up" to bring down others in increasing numbers and at an accelerating rate. I am speaking of what I know."

This chapter is concerned with the development of the situation from 1870 to that described by the Bishop of Rochester above. The early rush of enthusiasm had by that time (1901) long since faded and many Church schools were clearly on their "last legs". This result of the 1870 Act was not what the Government had envisaged but had been brought about by the workings of the Act and subsequent rulings on points of law, together with the general situation which the Act created.

The roots of the problem lay in the compromise worked out in the Act. This had satisfied neither the League nor the Union and even after the Act had been passed agitation continued against it. (Reference has already been made to Dixon's motion of 1872 attacking the Act).⁽⁷⁾ In the same year the League abandoned the ambiguity of "nonsectarian education" and it campaigned boldly for "secular education". This resolution of internal division in favour of the secularists did result in the withdrawal of support of some prominent Nonconformist supporters (e. g. Dr. James Rigg, C.H. Spurgeon, Samuel Morely) but even so, the League remained an extremely strong and well organized pressure group.

In these conditions of acrimony and dispute it is hardly surprising that many School Boards became the battleground of conflicting groups. This was unfortunate in that it had been the Government's

intention that the School Board and the voluntary societies should work in harmony rather than as rivals. What in fact happened in many areas was that the School Board and the Church schools were often in competition and disputes broke out as to who should provide any extra school places where they were needed. In one or two areas (e. g. Winchester and Birkenhead) the various denominations managed to sink their differences and combine their efforts, thus "keeping out" a School Board by catering adequately for the needs of their area. A similar line of action was common in many rural areas, where landowners would start or support denominational schools so that they would be spared the education rate which a School Board would levy. In these areas the establishment of a School Board could sometimes be a very long and laborious process, due mainly to reluctance or ignorance on the part of local population. Curtis refers to one example where more than 10 years elapsed between a notice of insufficient accommodation and the first inspection of the school. He also quotes the case where the entire School Board were illiterate and therefore unable to deal with the Inspector's letter.⁽⁸⁾ The rural School Boards (where they existed) were very often Church School Boards in all but name and the lot of the Dissenting children in rural areas was not greatly improved by the Act. Many still found themselves in single school areas with no Board School within easy reach. The working of the Conscience Clause in some Anglican forms could take on some peculiar forms. (In one Church of England school in West Butterwick all the children, irrespective of what denomination they belonged to, were required to repeat that they loved the Anglican Church best as part of the regular lesson.)⁽⁹⁾ These difficulties were only very slowly remedied as time went by and the number of Board Schools was increased by the direct action of the Department of Education stepping in and causing the formation of a Board.

The hostility of the Anglican Church to School Boards did not blind Anglicans to the fact that membership of such Boards was a good thing.

It soon became clear that where a Board was sympathetic to denominational schools they had an easier time than where a hostile School Board set about undermining them, (which was not difficult). In addition to this School Boards were very powerful bodies, controlling large sums of money and with authority to levy a rate, and being empowered to decide on the nature of any Religious Instruction given in their schools. Many Nonconformists accused the Anglicans of seeking election to the School Boards as a way of protecting local denominational schools and also of preventing large sums being expended on Board schools. (10) Chamberlain was his usual inflammatory self, claiming that the Church was trying,

"to stunt the programme of the Board School system, to prevent the erection of new schools and the provision of sufficient accommodation, to prevent the reduction of the cost of education to parents and to prevent the expenditure necessary to secure the efficiency of the schools." (11)

The Anglican reply was that the "efficiency of the schools" was their true objective, but that this meant ensuring that no more educational provision was made than was absolutely necessary, and that the curriculum was kept within acceptable limits, thus avoiding the expenditure sanctioned by some of the more progressive School Boards on new subjects like cookery, science and hygiene. The best example of this sort of concerted denominational action was the three year long attack by the denominational minority on the London School Board (1873 - 6) directed against estimates of "necessary" school places and expenditure on Board Schools. The leader of this attack, one Canon Gregory, said years later that he had never yet set foot in a Board School and fervently hoped that he would never do so. (12)

As N.J. Richards has shown at some length (13) the School Boards (with some exceptions) were often the scene of bitter electoral battles over rival sectarian policies. The most famous and instructive dispute arose in Birmingham in the term of the first School Board.

In the 1870 Board election the Anglicans, by fielding only eight candidates and concentrating all their votes as the Act allowed, had managed to elect all their candidates to the Board. In addition to this the single Roman Catholic candidate had by a similar use of the cumulative voting system managed to come top of the poll. The Nonconformists on the other hand had fielded 15 candidates (one for each seat on the Board) and suffered from the resultant thin distribution of their supporters votes, electing only six members to the Board. This gave the denominationalists a clear majority on the Board (9 to 6) and it meant that the Nonconformists had suffered defeat in their stronghold and the home of the League. It also meant that the School Board was politically out of step with the Nonconformist and Liberal majority on the town council. This factor was to prove crucial in the struggle over section 25. Section 25 of the 1870 Act has been described as

"the smallest ditch over which two political armies ever engaged in civil war." (14)

This Section had been allowed to slip through unchallenged by the Nonconformists and it permitted the School Boards to pay for the education of the children of the poor at any public elementary school if the parents desired it and if they were too poor to pay the fees. After the Act had been passed it was realised that this section made it possible for School Board money (i. e. rates) to be paid to denominational schools. This roused the Nonconformists to great indignation and the League and the Liberals stirred up public opinion over this Section. The Union and the denominationalists were of course in favour of this provision, but were often unsure as to how far they could go in making use of it in the teeth of bitter Nonconformist opposition. In the six years of its stormy existence payments made under this Section totalled only £18,000 and more than half that was spent by the strongly denominationalist Manchester School Board. (15) Policies differed from School Board to School Board with some Boards paying fees in "exceptional circumstances", and others refusing to pay at all (whilst paying the fees for poor pupils

at their own schools). Manchester School Board even appointed an Inspector to oversee the denominational schools receiving money from the Board, whilst Salford School Board in its early years did not operate its own schools but merely paid the fees of about 10% of the children attending denominational schools. (16)

It was in Birmingham that the bitterest clash over Section 25 came. The first School Board approved payments to denominational schools under Section 25 but the town council refused to levy the appropriate rate to cover this expenditure. After lengthy legal action culminating in the Queens Bench Court (at the expense of the Town Council) the School Board won its case, but in the face of resolute local opposition, it did not attempt to collect the levy. F. Adams, who was closely associated with the Nonconformist struggle, wrote;

"The 25th Clause was merely the key of a position chosen upon which to fight the issue, whether the country was prepared to accept in perpetuity the system of sectarian schools supported by public rates." (17)

The Nonconformists maintained that, apart from resisting the basic principle behind the Section 25 payments, it had clearly been the intention of Parliament to sever completely the financial links between School Boards and denominational schools. This was the reason why the 23rd Clause of the original version of the Education Bill had been deleted and the direct grants to denominational schools increased to 50%. There was some substance in this claim, but the fact was that the Act had been passed with all its "faults" and it had to be made to work, because the Government could not attempt any more major educational legislation without serious damage to its support. As it was some Nonconformists still refused to pay their rates because they objected to public rates going to support denominational teaching.

In the wider framework of general financing it soon became clear that even with the increased grant the denominational schools were going to be progressively squeezed out of the system. The reasons for this were complex. Firstly, even though the Government grant

was increased to 17/6d from 15/-d per pupil in 1876, (18) this did not mean that the Voluntary schools' financial problems were solved. Until that time the Government grant had matched the voluntary amount raised (up to a maximum of 15/-d) and after 1876 the 17/6d grant per pupil was paid as a minimum. If the school could raise more than 17/6d per pupil in voluntary subscriptions then the Government would continue its previous policy of matching the grants with any voluntary contributions raised in excess of 17/6d. However, these grants took no account of maintenance costs, which were rising, and very soon the denominational schools found themselves in financial difficulties. The grant system worked to the advantage of the rich and well supported schools to the detriment of a poor school. It was often the case that even where (on the payment by results system) the school had earned a large grant the actual amount paid was reduced because the voluntary subscriptions had not reached the level necessary to equal the Government grant. Thus a good school in a poor area suffered financially under this system (which offered little encouragement to staff) solely because its subscriptions were not likely to match its grant award.

Subscriptions had in general fallen off for a number of reasons. Firstly, after the rush following the Act, the general level of ardour had diminished as the dust of the arguments settled. Secondly, people who supported denominational schools also had to pay the local School Board rate and so they were effectively paying twice for their denominational education. Also, people realised that the education offered by the School Board was often as good as if not better than that of the denominations. In strong contrast to the denominational schools trying to raise every penny the Board Schools of the more progressive School Boards were well built and often lavishly equipped. The teachers

were paid higher salaries than their denominational school counterparts, and so many able teachers moved from denominational to Board Schools. The Board Schools' curriculum was more varied and specialist teachers were often employed to teach these "new" subjects. More and more people began to send their children to Board Schools because of the superior facilities available. It is indicative of the sort of gap which was opening up between Board and denominational schools that in 1870 the Church of England spent (on average) £1-5-5d per pupil, in 1880 it was £1-14-10 $\frac{1}{4}$ d and in 1890 it was £1-16-10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d, whilst in comparison the figures for School Boards were £2-1-11 $\frac{3}{4}$ d in 1880 and £2-5-11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d in 1890. Forster had envisaged that the education rate would never exceed 3d in the pound but by 1880 many areas had education rates of 5, 6 or even 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. No wonder that the supporters of denominational schools, faced with such rate demands, began to give less generously! Nor is it surprising that the Board Schools, with their higher expenditure per pupil and their assured income were often more desirable institutions than the cramped and dingy premises of the local Anglican school. Under such circumstances the denominationalists began to complain about unfair competition and began to seek to redress the balance of the situation.

It is worthwhile considering what the relationship between the two systems was believed to be in these years. Even as late as 1886 more than $\frac{2}{3}$ rds of all elementary school places were in the voluntary system in spite of the rapidly growing School Board sector. The crucial point was - which system was regarded as the basic or the norm? The Nonconformists clearly saw the Board School as the basic type and regarded the denominational school as an unfortunate but slowly disappearing creature. The denominationalists on the other hand saw their schools as basic and the Board Schools as merely filling in gaps, and they claimed the right to provide new schools where they were required.

Some School Boards acquiesced in this but others resisted strongly on the grounds that such provision was their prerogative alone. (19) This fundamental cleavage of opinion lasted right up until the 1902 Act. Later historical development might incline modern readers to regard the School Boards as the predecessor of the Local Education Authorities and therefore by implication see the Board School system as the embryonic all embracing school system of today. This is an understandable line of thought, but a fair case could be made out for claiming that the denominational schools were the basic system, providing as they did the major share of the places, whilst the School Boards were local committees set up to fill up any gaps. This view was taken by A. J. Balfour,

"I entirely deny that the Board School is the normal and proper system of managing education. I consider that it is and ought to be merely the supplement to voluntary schools when voluntary schools fail to do their duty." (20)

This ambiguity of status of the two systems inherent in the 1870 Act certainly bedevilled relations between the parties until the 1902 Act, causing much trouble to Governments in the meanwhile.

One of the problems which the Act threw up was the interpretation of the Cowper-Temple clause. It had been Cowper-Temple's intention to permit denominational instruction but to prohibit "distinctive creeds and formularies". The question immediately arose - what constituted a formulary? Gladstone gave his opinion in 1870 that the Apostles Creed was not a formulary under the terms of the Act and so it could be taught in Board Schools. Uncertainty persisted until a formal ruling in 1888 in favour of the Apostles Creed, but even then the majority of the School Boards avoided using it and the Nonconformists regarded it as "virtually an Anglican formulary", seeing its use as "contrary to the whole spirit and intention of Mr. Forster's Act." (21)

The School Boards, by and large, adopted the idea of undenominational Religious Instruction without too much heart searching. Many Boards adopted verbatim the resolution of the London School Board,

"That in the schools provided by the Board the Bible shall be read and there shall be given such explanations therefrom in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacities of children, provided that in such explanations and instructions the provisions of the Act relating to the "Conscience Clause" and the Cowper-Temple Clause be strictly observed both in letter and in spirit, and that no attempt be made to attach children to any denomination." (22)

This could be said to represent the middle position from which some Boards did deviate, but very few exercised their undoubted legal right to exclude Religious Instruction entirely from their schools. (23) As the London School Board resolution seems to indicate, the belief spread that in Board Schools denominational Religious Instruction could not be given; so strong was this belief that the Cross Commission were surprised to be told that this was not so. It was in fact perfectly legal to give denominational instruction in Board Schools as long as no distinctive formulary or creed was used. The policy adopted by most Boards with regard to Religious Instruction was to let well alone. The peace, such as it was, was a very uneasy one and those Boards who attempted to deviate too far to either side of the middle position usually found that difficulties arose.

The fragility of the settlement was amply demonstrated by the furore created in 1893 on the London School Board when the denominational majority attacked the vague character of Religious Instruction given in Board schools. The denominationalists approved a circular to all teachers instructing them to

"impress upon the children the relation in which they stand to God the Father as their Creator, to God the Son as their Redeemer, and to God the Holy Spirit as their Sanctifier." (24)

The resentment this directive provoked led to more than 3,000 teachers asking to be relieved from teaching Religious Instruction. The 1894 School Board election was fiercely fought over this issue and the denominationalists were returned with a reduced majority. (25) No effort was made to enforce the circular and calm slowly returned

as it became clear that the status quo was not going to be disturbed, but the lesson was clear - there was a point beyond which denominationalists could not ask the teachers to go, a factor which was to become progressively more and more important as time went by. (26)

At the other end of the spectrum the Birmingham School Board had experienced some similar difficulties in their first three years. During the term of the first School Board Chamberlain, the leader of the Nonconformists, was strongly opposed to the Board's policy of daily Bible readings and instruction and he made it his business by careful questioning of the teachers to demonstrate to everyone the impossibility of achieving the non-denominational teaching the Board required. (27) During this time the League changed its policy from unsectarian education to a totally secular one. Chamberlain and Dale with their Nonconformist supporters wanted to achieve the total separation of secular and religious education. It is important to note that the Nonconformists were not against Religious Instruction as such, they, like the Anglicans and Roman Catholics, considered it vitally important. Their differences arose over the Nonconformist contention that the proper place for Religious Instruction was the church or chapel and not the school. On their return to power in the 1873 School Board elections Birmingham Nonconformists attempted to put their theory into practice. The teachers were to give only secular education and all Religious Instruction was to be taught outside school hours by voluntary agencies representing all the denominations. To co-ordinate all this Dale set up the Birmingham Religious Education Society to provide Religious Instruction teaching in Board schools. This policy, known as "the secular solution", was not a success. There were many reasons for this, the major one being that the proposals were not supported by the Anglicans, who refused to co-operate. Also many Nonconformists (especially the Wesleyans) disapproved of the Board's policy and did not give it their whole hearted support. (28) In addition the Nonconformists

found that there was a severe shortage of teachers willing to teach under such circumstances and many of those who did teach were inadequate or incompetent, so that discipline and education suffered accordingly, much to the displeasure of the regular teachers. In 1879 the Board admitted defeat and reverted to a policy of allowing Bible reading without note or comment. (29)

The troubles and ultimate failure of the policies of the more extreme elements in the Birmingham and London Boards illustrated what both sides came to realise later, that neither side was strong enough to enforce its policy 'in toto' on the other, so that some compromise was inevitable. In addition to this, the general feeling of the public seemed to be that some sort of Religious Instruction in schools was a good thing, but that specific denominational teaching was not. The thorny question of using rate money to provide denominational Religious Instruction was to recur repeatedly in future years, but the final answer on the issue of Religious Instruction never altered very significantly from the position adopted by the London School Board. In effect, they had approved of "Cowper-Temple type" Religious Instruction but rejected both fully secular and fully denominational approaches. This middle position remained unchanged for many years in spite of attempts by both sides to force the issue. Many Churchmen were never reconciled to Cowper-Temple teaching which they regarded as rate supported Nonconformist teaching, and they continued to urge the foundation of new Church schools and the great value of the Church's dogmatic teaching. (30)

In the initial period following the passing of the Forster Act some ambiguities were cleared up. Boards were set up and the more active ones were a great source of improvement and innovation in the educational sphere. The Voluntary system had also expanded and after one or two skirmishes the two elements in the system settled down. The problem was that the modus vivendi set up by the Act greatly favoured the Board Schools and soon complaints began to be heard from the supporters of denominational schools alleging unfair competition and extravagant expenditure. For example (22)

Spalding defends in detail the grand scale of the London School Board's plans, seeking to deflect "the violence of public criticism" by maintaining that the Board's plans were what was "ultimately desirable rather than what was at present attainable". From the other side the Nonconformists were still pressing for free unsectarian education and complained about the denominational domination of Teacher Training Colleges. The Roman Catholics also added their voice to the chorus of complaints, with Cardinal Manning complaining bitterly about the poor position of voluntary schools under the Act. One result of all this pressure was the setting up in 1885 (under a Conservative Government) of a Royal Commission under the Chairmanship of Lord Cross to "inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts England and Wales".

When the Cross Commission reported in 1888 its final Report reflected the deep divisions of opinion over education. The Commission had a large membership (including Cardinal Manning, representing Roman Catholic interests for the first time ever on a Royal Commission on education). They could not produce a united report because of internal divisions, which usually followed sectarian lines. Fifteen of the twenty three members produced a majority report which was basically in favour of voluntary schools. They recommended that voluntary schools should be given grants raised from local rates without their having to accept the Cowper-Temple Clause. In addition all public elementary schools for which no rent was paid (i. e. most church schools) should be free of rates, and they came down in favour (on balance) of retaining school fees. Cardinal Manning wanted the Commission to go further and give greater financial security to denominational schools, emphasising his point by adding a Note of Reservation to that effect. The proposals of the majority concerning rate aid to denominational schools were admittedly very tentative; but even so they were rejected in uncompromising terms by the Nonconformists in the minority report. Another majority recommendation concerned the

thorny problem of who should provide any extra school places required.

"We see no reason why voluntary effort should not be entitled to work *pari passu* with a School Board in providing accommodation to meet any increase of population subsequent to the determination of the necessary school supply arrived at by the Department after the first inquiry of 1871" (31)

The majority report also stressed the importance of Religious and Moral training. It rejected the separation of religious and secular instruction but underlined the importance of observing the Conscience Clause. In general it found that parents wanted Religious Instruction for their children and so recommended that the first duty of Her Majesty's Inspectors should be to consider the moral training and condition of a school.

Needless to say the minority report differed on many points, although there were considerable areas of agreement on such things as school building standards and the need to abolish the system of payment by results. The Minority report opposed the payments of rate aid under any form to denominational schools and pressed for the provision of unsectarian schools all over the country "where there is a reasonable number of persons desiring them". The issue of teacher training was also a matter of dispute. The majority report had approved of the pupil teacher system, with certain reservations, and wanted to increase grants to denominational Teacher Training Committees possibly with a view to the establishment of a third year of training. The minority considered the pupils teacher system inadequate seeing it as the "weakest part" of the teacher training system. It was described as

"the cheapest and the very worst possible system of supply and it should be abolished root and branch." (32)

They also considered payments to denominational Teacher Training Committees as a temporary arrangement and looked forward to the speedy establishment of nondenominational Teacher Training Committees, thus providing an entry for Nonconformists into the teaching

profession which was not then available to any great extent.

It would be misleading to think that the Cross Commission merely produced a mass of disagreements, it did in fact make many valuable suggestions which were later taken up. However, as Maclure comments,

"the denominational tension which was the case of the Commission being set up, and which led to a divided report, did not grow any less in the years which followed its publication." (33)

On balance the Cross Commission was a failure, at least as far as the Anglican Church was concerned. Its production precipitated the drawing together of the Nonconformists under a common policy whilst the Church still floundered around looking for a realistic coherent policy - such as their Roman Catholic brethren had, but which they feared to embrace. S. G. Platten sums up,

"The Anglican Church's failure to see the need for unity among denominationalists at the time of the Cross Commission, meant that this report was to be perhaps the Church's greatest lost opportunity on the educational issue. Never again would the Church be in a position of such power nationally, never again would religious interests be represented so forcefully on an educational commission with such broad terms of reference." (34)

One topic touched upon by the report was the problem of child attendance and compulsion. Matthew Arnold in 1867 had indicated that poor attendance was the main hindrance to progress.

"The truth is, what really needed to be dealt with in 1862 as at present, was the irregular attendance and premature withdrawal of scholars, not the imperfect performance of their duties by the teachers, but it was easier to change the course of school instruction and inspection, and to levy forfeitures for imperfect results upon managers and teachers than to make scholars come to school regularly and stay there for a sufficient length of time." (35)

Some progress had been made in this matter. Many Boards did not make use of their power under the 1870 Act to pass bye-laws compelling children to go to school. This was not always due to

a desire to avoid compulsion on sectarian grounds, but often sprang from a realization that compulsory attendance was only slowly becoming acceptable to the public and that it represented a major departure from previous custom. The London School Board formed a sub-committee to deal with drawing up bye-laws on this subject and the sub-committee's report recommended that any bye-laws should be

"carried out, especially at first, with as much gentleness and consideration for the circumstances and feelings of the parents as is consistent with its effective operation." (36)

In 1876 the Government made an attempt at indirect compulsion in Lord Sandon's Act by forbidding employers to employ children under 10 and by allowing 10 - 14 year olds to work for only half a week.

However there were too many exceptions and loopholes in the Act so that its working was not altogether satisfactory. Mundella's Act of 1880 compelled all School Boards and School Attendance Committees (which operated where School Boards did not exist) to frame bye-laws making attendance compulsory and it reduced the number of loopholes considerably, making non-attendance much more difficult. In 1893 the school leaving age was raised to 11 and in 1899 to 12.

One of the side effects of increasing attendance and raising the school leaving age was an increase in the number of places required. The Nonconformists and the League, realizing that the denominations could not provide these extra places, were always urging compulsory attendance and free education. The denominationalists, well aware of their weakness, resisted direct compulsion preferring the indirect compulsion amply exemplified by Lord Sandon's Act of 1876. Similar differences appeared over the minimum requirements for school building and curriculum developments. (37) On every count the denominationalists dragged their feet over the raising of minimum

standards and followed rather than led the educational innovations such as new teaching methods, better equipment, new subjects, specialist teachers etc. (38) Ensor comments bluntly,

"The Church wanted to keep a large proportion of the schools, but it could not afford to provide good new buildings. Consequently it opposed their being provided by the School Boards either, and its representatives on those bodies were often driven into an attitude indistinguishable from obstruction. The squabble went on all over the country. Most School Board elections were fought over it. It was perhaps inevitable under the terms of the 1870 Act, but it cannot be said to have been fortunate either for the Boards, or for education or religion." (39)

The financial problems of the denominations did not become any easier. Yet another of the League's demands, that for free elementary education, was granted by Lord Salisbury's Act of 1891, which abolished school fees. In their place the Government gave an annual grant of 10/- per pupil. For the Roman Catholics, whose fees were low, this was a boon, but for the Anglicans this represented a considerable loss. (40) In this situation it is unfortunate that the National Society should have seen fit to reject the tentative suggestions of the Cross Commission that denominational schools should receive rate aid. Whilst the Roman Catholics were strongly in favour of it, many Anglicans held back and proposed various piecemeal schemes for increased Government grants, or diocesan schemes, and only a minority were in favour of rate aid. In strong contrast to the disarray of the Anglicans, the Nonconformists had at last succeeded in settling their differences. The report of the Cross Commission had provoked the various sects into arranging a compromise. They decided that the previously divisive problem of secular education versus unsectarian Religious Instruction in schools should be left to local decision and all the parties (Methodists included) joined in support of the School Boards.

The Anglican party was in a wretched state. Church schools were being transferred to School Boards at an ever increasing rate. (41)

Although the majority of teachers were trained at Anglican colleges, many of them were seeking the greater financial rewards and security of posts in Board Schools. (42) "These schools" wrote Lylph Stanley, "are suffering from want of means and consequently from an underpaid and insufficient staff". Section 18 of the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Education said.

"At present the School Boards with practically unlimited resources at command, have undue advantage in staffing their schools." "Give us cheap teachers" was the constant cry of the voluntary school managers." (43)

The leader of the resistance to a clear Anglican policy in favour of rate aid was Archbishop Benson. He considered rate aid would be "disastrous, dangerous" and "lowering". (44) The general fear was that rate aid could, under a hostile Government, become the means of wresting control of the schools from the Church.

In general the 1890's was a decade of argument within the Church about education. It was recognised by all that "something would have to be done" about the problems of voluntary schools, but the old fears of the Anglican hierarchy paralyzed any really positive action for a long time. A speaker at the Church Congress in 1894 at Exeter voiced the thoughts of many when he declared,

"If our leaders will not lead the cause is lost." (45)

It would be true to say that in many ways the Church did not change her position voluntarily but was rather forced into change by circumstances beyond her control. One such event was the Report of the Bryce Commission in 1895. The changes suggested in this report were a strong influence on the shape of the 1902 Act which radically altered the educational scene. The brief of the Commission was "to consider what are the best methods of establishing a well-organized system of secondary education in England". The situation which the Commission discovered was chaotic to say the least.

Basically there were two authorities, in the field of secondary education, the Department of Education and the Science and Art

Department. Under the Department of Education were the School Boards, many of which gave secondary education in Higher Elementary classes (or even in separate schools). In addition to this the Science and Art Department gave grants to the recently established County Councils, who were responsible for what was called Technical Education, but what was often secondary education in all but name. In addition the Charity Commissioners and the Board of Agriculture provided funds for some schools. Finally, in total isolation, there was a large number of places in public schools and the considerable residue of grammar schools and day schools of ancient foundation scattered all over the country. The Bryce report recommended that education as a whole needed a central authority governing primary and secondary education to develop and co-ordinate all the multifarious agencies providing education. The Commission was of course fully aware of the need to counteract the tendency of a strong central bureaucracy to formulate rigid uniform codes, as had happened in the elementary sector with the Revised Code. The report also reflected the distrust of central bureaucracy prevalent at the time and stressed the need for local bodies to fulfill the role of encouraging local development and harmonizing local effort. To this end the central bureaucracy was to be limited and counter-balanced by the creation of a Local Education Authority (based on the administrative bodies set up by the 1888 Local Government Act) who would oversee and administer secondary education in their areas. It also recommended that where Higher Grade schools had been set up by School Boards they should be regarded as secondary schools (as, for all practical purposes, they gave secondary instruction).

A detailed consideration of the Bryce Report is inappropriate here as many of its recommendations were carried through by the 1902 Act, but it did have significant results before that in the form of the 1896 Education Bill. In 1895 the Conservative Government was presented with a Memorial from a conference specially convened by both archbishops. It was not a conciliatory document, asking that in any

new Education Bill the religious nature of education should be preserved by retaining voluntary schools. They also asked for more government grants (especially for the poorer schools) with the abolition of the grant limitation and provision for Religious Instruction in both voluntary and Board schools. On the broader scale they wanted power to establish denominational schools where parental demand warranted it and sought to protect the parental right to choose the type of Religious Instruction given to their children and also they asked that "no school should be penalized because of the religious views held by the teachers or pupils." (46)

The bill of 1896 was a response to this memorial.

It is hardly surprising that the 1896 bill never became law. The Conservative/Unionist Government was an uneasy partnership when it came to such matters as Education. Chamberlain, the Unionist leader, could not altogether ignore his previous activities on behalf of the Education League. He did appeal to his supporters "to let bygones be bygones" but he realized that the majority of Nonconformists would not accept this. The issue of education was the most likely cause of trouble in the coalition, but it was one which the Church would not let the Government pass over. A major problem was the lack of any really long term cohesive policy amongst the leaders of the Church. (This did not appear until after the death of Archbishop Benson). With indecision on the one side and hostility amongst the Nonconformists in the Government on the other, the scales were tilted against Sir John Gorst's Bill. The Bill's proposals ensured a united opposition. It proposed the creation of Local Education Authorities to cater for secondary (including technical) education, thus following the general line of the Bryce report. Voluntary schools were to be exempted from rates and in addition to the abolition of the grant limit, proposed an extra sum of 4/- per pupil to be given to the Local Education Authorities to assist voluntary schools in their area. It proposed a limit on the amount School Boards could raise from the rates and permitted "reasonable arrangements" to be made for separate

denominational instruction in Board Schools and voluntary schools where parental demand justified it. (47) Finally there was a provision under certain circumstances for the transfer of Board Schools to county or borough Councils where these schools gave secondary education.

Cruickshank describes the Bill as "a piddling makeshift measure" (48) and as a remnant of a more comprehensive plan which the Unionists in the Government had fought against and watered down. The School Boards, seeing that their incorporation into the Local Education Authorities was possibly only a matter of time, and the Nonconformists, seeing all that they had fought for endangered, threw themselves into the fray with their customary vigour. Their leader, the redoubtable Dr. Clifford, claimed that the proposals would put more than £ $\frac{1}{2}$ million into the pockets of the priests. In reply the National Society claimed that the Bill had

"been framed in a spirit of fairness to the Voluntary schools and with a desire to meet the religious difficulties with impartiality and justice."

Needless to say the columns of Hansard on the debate run along very much the same lines as previous education debates. Bryce was moved to remark, (49)

"This Bill is called a Bill to make further provision for education, but I have noticed that nearly all the speeches have been delivered upon questions which had comparatively little to do with educational policy, and had turned mainly upon points of theological and political controversy. There have been only two exceptions...."

The centre of the storm was the controversial Clause 27 which made provision for denominational Religious Instruction in Board Schools where sufficient parents demanded it. Lord George Hamilton defending the Clause as an extension to Anglican parents of Board School pupils that same freedom of choice which Nonconformists had elsewhere, said,

"of all the proposals in the Bill, that which had been received worst was that which was the greatest concession."

Such support was all in vain because the opposition to the Bill was so great that it was withdrawn. In the following year the Voluntary Schools Act was passed, which was a far narrower piece of legislation, setting up as it did Associations of Voluntary Schools to whom a Government grant of 5/- per head was given to distribute as they saw fit. The 17/6d grant limit was abolished and schools were made rate free. The Associations were designed to support the weaker schools by providing a wider organizational base. It was at best a temporary solution, the basic weaknesses of the denominational schools remained. Cardinal Vaughan was quite explicit,

"We must get rid of the reproach that our schools are charity schools, dependent upon casual alms, we want to have done with the whole sorry degrading business which makes the salaries of the teachers in denominational schools hang upon the success of this or that grinning comedian or upon the pious audacity of some fraudulent bazaar." (50)

In the Commons J.H. Yoxhall had pointed out just how perilous the income of many voluntary schools was, and how this was weakening the schools and damaging the educational system.

"Voluntary schools for many years have been leading an indigent existence, they have been living from hand to mouth, in a practically insolvent condition from year to year, and the most undignified expedients have been resorted to keep them alive. . . . It is discreditable that in the wealthiest country in the world, a country professing to be the most Christian in the world, our public elementary schools should have to depend on the earnings of merry-go-rounds, amateur nigger minstrels, childrens concerts and rag-bag and rummage sales." (51)

The difference in expenditure per pupil between Board and denominational schools had continued to widen. In 1890 it had been 9/- but by 1900 it was 11/6d. This average figure was greatly exceeded in many city areas where the education rate was sometimes over 1/- in the £. The results of such disparity were plain for all to see. Some School Boards had been very vigorous, introducing innovations in all spheres of education, curriculum changes, teacher training centres, higher building standards, special

schools for the handicapped, industrial schools for truants and higher elementary level education. (This last aspect of their work was the indirect cause of the 1902 Act). By contrast one clergyman admitted,

"The mischief of the present situation is that, in order to keep going our own Church schools, we are obliged to block whenever we can, the general advance of the education movement. Through no fault of her own the Church is compelled to ask about every extension of popular education and even about every improvement in the way of "plant" not, "Is it wise?" but always "Can I afford it". (52)

R. L. Morant, an official at the Department of Education, had come to the conclusion that the School Boards approach to secondary education would have to be radically altered. Morant had studied the educational systems of France and Switzerland and saw that the proposals of the Bryce Commission were basically sound. What was required was a Local Education Authority which could handle all aspects of education and which could come to some sort of working arrangement with the voluntary schools, ensuring their continued existence and efficiency. The 1888 Local Government Act had created the outline of such a system of local administrative bodies. These county councils and county boroughs had been given the task of supervising technical education and were clearly the only administrative units available which could possibly take over the task of the School Boards.

Although the results of many School Boards were impressive, the system suffered from a lack of co-operation and cohesion between the 2,500 separate School Boards. From an administrative point of view, as the Bryce report had shown, the field of education was chaotic. Not only did the Education Department have to deal directly with 2,500 School Boards but also more than 20,000 Voluntary Schools. Grants to schools could also be made, under the appropriate circumstances, by the Charity Commissioners, the Science and Art Department and the Board of Agriculture. A first step out of chaos

was taken in 1900 with the establishment of the Board of Education to control all aspects of education. It also meant that from now on education was properly represented in Parliament and in the Cabinet rather than being split up amongst several departments. The event which precipitated the passing of the 1902 Act was the Cockerton Judgement. Morant had passed into the hands of the secretary of the London County Council Technical Education Board his conclusions concerning the 1870 Act and the legality of the actions of the School Boards in going beyond the limits of the Act by providing secondary education. As a result of a dispute between the London School Board and the LCC Technical Education Board a test case was bought against the School Board by T. B. Cockerton, the official auditor. After a long legal battle the Court of Appeal ruled in 1901 in Cockerton's favour, thus rendering illegal any expenditure by School Boards outside the field of elementary education. A one clause Bill was rushed through Parliament allowing School Boards to continue their activities in this and was renewed in 1902, (the so called "Cockerton Acts," Education Act 1901 and the Education Acts, 1901 (Renewal) 1902). These Acts were resisted bitterly in Parliament, establishing as they did the principle that county and county borough councils were to be the controlling local authorities for education, (53) whilst of course, legalizing the existing situation. A certain Winston Churchill Member of Parliament said that the Bill

"was not even a pitched battle (over the education issue). It was only a reconnoitering patrol sent up along the line to obtain information and cover the front of the advancing army." (54)

The period from 1870 to the passing of the 1902 Act can be seen as the time when Nonconformists had their best opportunity to date of breaking the power of the Voluntary school system, especially in the urban areas, and bringing about its ultimate demise. The fact that they did not, or rather could not, do so is significant in assessing how strong a force in Society the Nonconformists were.

J.H.S. Kent commented;

"....the struggle between religious institutions in the towns over the education of the children of the poor was not primarily about education, but about social power: it was a contest for a social role in late Victorian cities between two groups for whom educational policy was a convenient and natural way of expressing conflict. While they fought one another for social and cultural control, however, the dominant culture slipped further and further out of the reach of both of them. In urban towns, between 1870 and 1902 Nonconformity certainly succeeded in weakening Anglicanism. (55)

The passing of the 1902 Act was to come as a bitter blow to the Nonconformist forces, rousing them to a final period of hectic activity in championing the cause of the Nonconformist conscience. The final outcome of it all suggests that Kent's above analysis is not without foundation.

Footnotes to preceding chapter

1870 - 1900 The mounting problems.

1. C. F. K. Brown, pg. 71. The Church's part in Education.
2. J. R. Murphy, The 1870 Education Act, pg. 68.
3. M. Cruickshank, pg. 40. Church and State in Education.
4. H. J. Burgess and P. A. Welsley, A Short History of the National Society 1811-1961. pg. 37
5. C. F. K. Brown, op cit pg. 71.
6. 4.12.01. Ed. 24. P.R.O. quoted Cruickshank, op cit pg. 70.
7. see above pg. 98 note 57.
8. Curtis op cit pg. 280.
9. British Journal of Educational Studies, N. J. Richards, Religious Controversies and the School Boards, 1870-1902. Vol 18. pg. 194.
10. Such slogans as "Vote for Bible education and save your rates" which the Manchester denominationalists used seems to indicate that sometimes the Nonconformist claims were not too wide of the mark.
11. Speech of 23rd March 1876 quoted Cruickshank op cit pg. 41.
12. Cruickshank op cit pg. 47.
13. See his article in British Journal of Educational Studies referred to in note 9 above.
14. John Morely op cit pg. 39.
15. Adams sees this in a different light.

"For several years the Manchester School Board had no school under its control. The Board did precisely the same work and occupied the same position which the Education Aid Society had done, with this difference, that instead of voluntary subscriptions the rates were used, and instead of persuasion a compulsory bye law was enforced. It was not until several years had passed that the Board asked for any right of inspection in the schools which were assisted. The Board was in fact merely a relief agency for denominational managers."

- F. Adams, The Elementary School Contest, pg. 255.
16. Cruickshank op cit pg. 42.
 17. F. Adams op cit pg. 256.
 18. This was one of the provisions of Lord Sandon's Act.
 19. A famous case occurred at Swansea where a Roman Catholic school was built in defiance of the local School Board because the Roman Catholics insisted on their prior right of making good any deficiency. After five years of legal wrangling the school was finally given a grant in 1888.
 20. J. Murphy, Church State and Schools in Britain 1800-1970. pg. 87 quoting R. Gregory, Elementary Education, pg. 167.
 21. Murphy, *ibid* pg. 67.
 22. T. A. Spalding. The Work of the London School Board. pg. 99. 2nd edition, 1900. Two amendments, one representing the "Bible reading only" and the other the totally secular approach were rejected by large majorities. Another such formula dating from early in the School Board era and reflecting the lengths to which it was felt necessary to go in order to observe the Cowper-Temple Clause runs as follows,

"That in schools managed by the School Board the Authorized Version of the Bible shall be read and portions of the text, selected by the principle teacher but subject from time to time to the direction of the Board, may be committed to memory by the scholars; in both cases without note or comment, but the principal teacher in charge of any school for the time being may give explanations of an historical biographical, or geographical nature necessary for the understanding of the narrative and may explain the modern and generally accepted meaning of any word or phrase, the sense of which has changed since the scriptural translation was made. That the following be the definition of the terms used in the resolution; Historical, pertaining to a narrative of events and facts recorded in the Bible; Geographical, relating to a knowledge of the positions on the surface of the earth and the natural features of the places mentioned or referred to in the Bible."

23. According to a report in 1888 out of 2225 School Boards only 7 in England and 50 in Wales (a Nonconformist stronghold) had banned every kind of Religious Instruction from their schools.
24. The immediate cause of the trouble was that a teacher accepted as correct a pupil's reply that the father of Jesus was Joseph. This was overheard by a member of the Board who took the matter further. Spalding, describing this period as "not an edifying episode in the Board's history" commented on the outcome;

"The net result of the whole episode was a verbal change in the resolutions of 1871. It is not too much to say that the teaching in Board Schools was in no way altered in consequence of it. And for such a result the Board was engaged for more than a year in an altercation which certainly brought it little credit. The attack on the religious teaching in Board Schools produced no effect because it was not supported by the people whose children received instruction in the schools. It was conducted by persons, of excellent intentions doubtless, who were convinced that parents ought to want such doctrines taught to their children as were set down in the circular. But there was no force of public opinion behind them and turmoil was the only result of their enterprise."

Spalding op cit pg. 99, and Minutes of London School Board 15/2/1894.

25. Mandell Creighton referred to these events as "somewhat unedifying" a masterly understatement (see below note 30).
26. For full details of this episode see, The London School Board Election of 1894. A study in Victorian religious controversy by J. E. B. Munson. British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 23 No 1. February 1975 pg. 7. Munson lists three things of note in this episode.
- 1) It discredited the School Board system to have such an undignified furor. (One observer likened the School Board debates to "not to put too fine a point on it - a tap room.")
 - 2) The Church of England began to be aware of the decline in funds for voluntary schools and of the need to reach the children in the Board schools, with dogmatic teaching, if wholesale undenominationalism was to be avoided.
 - 3) The teachers unions were anxious to enhance the professional

nature of their job - which involved rejecting clerical control and accepting secularized education. The controversy also helped to strengthen the unions as teachers realized that there was safety in numbers.

27. His argument was that whatever explanation was given by the teacher this was capable of being equated with the beliefs of one or other of the various denominations.
28. E. g. Dr. Rigg, C.H. Spurgeon and Samuel Morely.
29. In addition there were to be two lessons every week of Moral Instruction. So Cruickshank op cit pg. 45.
30. Mandell Creighton said "Churchmen are prepared to make considerable sacrifices in order to uphold their opinions", pg.10 Chp. 2. "Thoughts on Education" from an Address given on Nov. 30th 1893, on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of a new voluntary school.
31. Cross Commission Part III Chapter 1 section 45. pg. 60. Taken from Summary of Conclusions of Majority and Minority ... published by Liverpool Council of Education.
32. The opinion of Dr. H.W. Crosskey a prominent member of the League quoted J.Stuart MacLure op cit Educational Documents 1816 pg. 131.
33. ibid pg. 130.
34. British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 23 No 3, October 1975. S.G.Platten. "The conflict over the control of elementary education 1870 - 1902 and its effect upon the life and influence of the Church".
35. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1867-8. pg. 120 quoted in Education: Elementary Education 1780 - 1900, J. M. Goldstrom.
36. Spalding op cit. pg. 124.
37. Church schools later had a reputation for falling below minimum building standards for light, heat, sanitation and area per pupil. As late as the Butler Act of 1944 the Church had large numbers

- of "black-listed" schools falling below requirements.
38. Other "extravagances" of School Boards were such things as libraries, school prizes and certificates, museums and superannuation schemes for teachers. Revision of standards such as the new Code of 1889 also caused controversy, (this increased the square footage per pupil from 8 to 10) as did Acland's famous Circular of 1893 which brought to light some of the poor accommodation in voluntary schools.
 39. Sir Robert Ensor. England 1870-1914. Pg. 146.
 40. Ten shillings a year represented 3d. per week and almost $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of Anglican schools charged 4d. per week or more. Cruickshank op cit pg. 61.
 41. By 1890 almost 1,000 had been transferred.
 42. Roman Catholics were also suffering from this trend, which hit them even harder because of their more limited resources.
 43. "Churches and Children - A study in Controversies over the 1902 Education Act". A. Rodgers pg. 29, British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 8 1959/60.
 44. Cruickshank op cit pg. 62.
 45. School Board Chronicle 13/9/94. Also Church Quarterly Review 1902 pg. 212, speaking of 1902 Bill. "We hardly venture to expect the Bishops to take any decided step or openly to express their opinions. We have received singularly little assistance from them in the past, and need not hope for much in the future."
 46. Curtis op cit pg. 312.
 47. Murphy op cit pg. 82.
 48. ibid pg. 65.
 49. Hansard 4th series. Vol. 40 1896 Cols. 688/9.
 50. Snead Cox. Life of Cardinal Vaughan II Pg. 122.
 51. Hansard 4th Series. Vol. 40 1896 Col. 658.

52. A. Rogers op cit pg. 46. British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 8.
53. For a detailed account of the Cockerton Case see E.J.S. Eaglesham "From School Board to Local Authority" especially Chp. 12 pg. 134-142.
54. Hansard 4th Series. Vol. 47 1901 Col. 1394/5.
55. Rev. J.H.S. Kent, "The Role of Religion in the Cultural Structure of the Later Victorian City". Transactions of Royal Historical Society, 5th Series 1973, Vol. 23 Pg. 165/6.

Chapter Seven

1902 Restoration and Incorporation

At the start of the present century the situation of the Voluntary schools was grave. The short term effect of the recent Government financial aid had worn off and many schools were close to 'breaking point' (to use the phrase of the Bishop of Rochester). Figures produced by Morant in February 1902 showed that in 1900, 56% of denominational schools were losing money and the average for the three previous years was 45%. (1) On the other hand, the School Boards were in a delicate situation too. Their financial situation gave rise to no concern, but the scope of their operations did. The one clause Act legalizing School Board expenditure on nonelementary education was only a stay of execution, not eternal salvation. Yet another aspect of this complex situation was the growing realization that Britain was slipping back amongst the industrial leaders of the world, losing her leadership to countries which placed great store on education, (e. g. Germany and America). A cursory glance at the English educational system sufficed to show that even under the most favourable of circumstances it could not work well. Everywhere there was duplication, inefficiency, inadequate provision, (especially in secondary education), a surfeit of administrative bodies resulting in rivalries and disparities (especially between Board and Voluntary schools). Chamberlain in a speech defending the Balfour Bill said,

"We have a system which is no system at all, which is a state of anarchy and confusion... The authorities which collect the taxes or the rates, are not the authorities which spend the taxes or the rates. There is no efficient control over secular education.. (which) in a vast number of schools (is) starved inefficient owing to the inability of the managers... to provide the necessary funds. Who suffers by that? Not the managers but the children of the people... All these things constitute a national weakness and a national danger in view of the (industrial) competition to which we are subjected. (2)

Other outstanding problems included the low standards of many schools buildings, too many poorly qualified teachers and too many inadequately equipped schools. The whole system of education badly needed remoulding into a more efficient form. This new pattern had to be found, accepted and implemented in a short time.

There were many factors favouring reform at this particular time. The Anglican Church under the new Archbishop Temple had finally accepted the idea of rate aid, being driven to it out of economic necessity, and Anglicans could at last now present a united front with Roman Catholics over this issue. Another factor was that it was becoming increasingly clear that education's administrators could not continue to cope with their increased load for very long. The administrative situation was chaotic; expansion had brought great problems which only radical reform could solve. Finally, and conclusively, it was clear the School Board system had its defects. It had worked well where people had wanted it to work well, which meant that in some places it had not worked at all. The gaps in provision at elementary level were far surpassed by the glaring deficiencies at the secondary level, and at both levels standards were far too low, especially amongst the Voluntary Schools. The Dual System of 1870 had laid too much emphasis on the duality of the system, what was now required was some attempt to unify the educational system without destroying those powers and influences which had enabled it to develop and diversify.

A man who played a very influential part in the formation of the 1902 Act was Robert Morant, an educational administrator in the Board of Education. His study of education in other countries had provided him with the necessary experience to produce what England needed - a well integrated system of education. (3)

Murphy maintains that Morant was much influenced by the Fabian Socialist Sidney Webb, whose pamphlet "The Education Muddle and the Way Out" contained the idea central to the 1902 Act - that of the single local authority to deal with all aspects of education. (4)

This proposal meant the elimination of the School Boards and the incorporation of the Voluntary Schools into the system in some effective way. It is noteworthy that in reality much of the Nonconformist talk of eliminating or destroying the School Boards was rather misleading. In many cases those people who had served on the School Boards also became members of the new Local Education Authorities, so that the changeover was not as great a break as might have been expected. This was not, of course, generally accepted at the time by many Nonconformist members of the School Boards, who saw the new Local Education Authorities as a way of reducing their influence in favour of the denominational schools and their supporters.

The educational administrators had a powerful advocate in Morant, whose overall grasp of the ramifications of the complex aspects of the Bill's proposals was second to none. He alone, even while a relative junior in the Education Department, was chosen to advise the Government on details of the Bill, and he was able counter effectively the various ingenious suggestions of the Bill's opponents. The teachers, whose progressive unionisation was to make them an increasingly important force to be reckoned with, had yet to declare their hand, though they would naturally favour any proposals to increase the standing of their profession. The subsequent decision by the teachers' union to give their full support to the Bill was a significant factor in its success, and also a source of great disappointment to the Nonconformists.

The Anglicans at last made clear exactly what they wanted from the Government. In 1901 at a specially convened joint Convocation the Church made a list of demands which, on reflection, were quite close to the final proposals of the Government. The essential points for present consideration were that Anglicans wanted the State to pay all the teaching costs (except for Religious Instruction), in their schools, and they demanded the right of entry in to Board Schools to give denominational teaching, if the demand required it. Whilst the Church party was in full cry pressing their friends in Government

to help their Voluntary schools, the opposition was in a sorry state. For some time the Liberals had been a failing and divided force, and this had been reflected in their party's political fortunes. The Home Rule issue had split the party badly, some followed Chamberlain into an alliance with the Tories, others preferred to go out into the political wilderness where they were further devastated by leadership divisions and the Boer War issue. The education issue came as a great boon to this scattered and divided party, enabling them to rally their forces under the education banner, which had the useful characteristic of offending no section of the party at all and also of providing it with a valuable impetus stemming from indignation of offended Nonconformist consciences. K. M. Hughes comments.

"The truth was that the Liberal leaders looked upon the Bill as a great Aunt Sally, giving the opportunity for a destructive policy which would unite the party. Unity was badly needed for Asquith and Roseberry were waging silent war for leadership and there had been sharp differences over the Boer War." (5)

In contrast to this the Education Bill was the one Bill most likely to split the Government in two. In the balance of Tory/Liberal unionist sentiment due regard had to be given to the sentiments of the Nonconformists which were led by Chamberlain, whose record on education did not give the Voluntary schools much cause for joy.

In two very informative articles (6) Eric Eaglesham has given the background to two aspects of the 1902 Bill; its preparation and implementation. In the first of these the twin roles of Morant as creator and Balfour as the political pilot of the Bill come out very clearly. One crucial point was the interview which Morant had with Chamberlain at which he managed to persuade Chamberlain to drop his outright opposition to the Bill and to see some of its provisions in a new light. The extant records of the conversation show how Morant was able to answer all Chamberlain's points until he was driven to ask why, given that the Voluntary Schools were there to stay and they had to be helped, could not the

Government just increase the Exchequer grant? Morant's answer left Chamberlain no room for manoeuvre,

"Because your war (i. e. the Boer War) has made further recourse to State grants impossible." (7)

The outcome of this crucial interview was that Chamberlain gave the Bill his support, without which it could not have become law.

The Bill was a complex piece of controversial legislation and its passage through Parliament was prolonged and stormy. It took longer than any previous Bill in history (57 days) and was only finally forced through by use of the "Guillotine" procedure. The object of the Bill was clear - to bring under one local authority all state aided primary and secondary (although the word "secondary" did not appear in the Bill) education which would in turn be administered by one Government department. A side effect of this was the incorporation of the Voluntary schools into the new system, thus saving them from a long and painful death. Morant, in his usual perceptive manner, pinpointed the way of helping the Voluntary schools and achieving the desired revitalisation of the total educational system. In a memorandum to the Cabinet he wrote;

"The only way to 'get up steam' for passing any Education Bill at all in the teeth of School Board opposition will be to include in it some scheme for aiding denominational schools." (8)

This precisely is what the Bill did; by enlisting the support of the denominationalists the Government was able to pass a wide reaching scheme, rather than merely tinker with various isolated parts of this complex field. The full extent of the breadth and complexity of these proposals can be seen from J. M. Murphy's admirable precis of the main provisions of the Act. (9)

- 1) The councils of the counties and county boroughs became Local Education Authorities (as did also some of the larger borough and urban district councils, though with restricted powers). (10)
- 2) The Local Education Authorities took over in the field of elementary education the powers hitherto exercised by the School Boards and the school attendance committees, but they were also given control over the secular

education in voluntary schools.

3) The Local Education Authorities were empowered to 'take such steps as seemed to them desirable' (within certain financial limits and after consultation with the Board of Education) to supply, or aid the supply of education other than elementary and to promote the general co-ordination of all forms of education. They were hence enabled, among other things, to spend some rate income on secondary schools and training colleges, thus increasing the number of such establishments which were undenominational and available for Nonconformists.

4) It would be the duty of each Local Education Authority to "maintain and keep efficient" all public elementary schools in its area; in both voluntary and provided (i. e. the former Board Schools or "state") schools the cost of running the school and of providing instruction, secular and religious, would be met from Government grants and local rates. The managing bodies of voluntary schools would normally comprise not more than four members representing those providing the school and not more than two representing the local authority; these managers would have to "carry out any directions of the authority as to the secular instruction given" and the number and qualifications of the teachers to be employed. Teachers would be appointed and dismissed by the managers, though the authority's approval would be required except where dismissal was 'on grounds connected with the giving of Religious Instruction'. As a small concession to Nonconformists, managers were empowered to depart from the provisions of the trust deeds of a school by appointing teachers without reference to denominational beliefs (except in the case of a head teacher), and where there were more applicants than vacancies for posts as pupil teachers the appointments would be made by the authority.

5) In return for the rights to give denominational instruction and ensure the appointment of suitable teachers, the voluntary body would be obliged to provide the school building, keep the structure in good repair, and make such "alterations and improvements" in the buildings as might be "reasonably required" by the authority, but the latter would make good any damage which it considered due to "fair wear and tear".

6) The ultimate decision whether a new state or voluntary school would best meet the needs of an area would rest with the Board of Education which would "have regard to the interest of secular instruction, the wishes of the parents... and the economy of the rates; but, generally speaking, a school once recognized could not be declared "unnecessary" and be deprived of public funds, unless average attendance fell below thirty.

The chief provisions relating to religious instruction were as follows;

- 1) In a denominational school or college which received aid from the Local Authority no pupil might be compelled to receive Religious Instruction either in the school or elsewhere; the permitted times for Religious Instruction were no longer prescribed as being at the end and/or the beginning of the school meeting but must be "conveniently arranged for the purpose of allowing the withdrawal" of pupils where desired. This vaguer formula favoured those who wished to foster a distinctively denominational "atmosphere" throughout the school day.
- 2) In a "school college or hostel" provided by the Local Education Authority no "catechism or formulary distinctive of any particular religious denomination" should be taught; but the authority, at the request of parents, and under such conditions and at such times as it thought desirable, might permit "any Religious Instruction" to be given, provided that no "unfair preference" was given to any denominations and no expense was there by incurred by the Local Authority. (The practical difficulties of complying with these provisos will be appreciated).
- 3) The Kenyon-Slaney amendment provided the Religious Instruction in denominational schools must be in accordance with the trust deed and controlled by the managers as a whole (though the ruling whether the instruction was in fact so in accordance might continue to be given by the bishop of other superior ecclesiastical authority, where the trust deeds so prescribed)".

These long extracts from Murphy's excellent book shows how the scope of the Bill went far beyond merely helping denominational schools. It provided for an all-embracing system, with great possibilities for development and diversification by Local Education Authorities. Nor did the system eradicate the particular character of voluntary schools, who retained a great degree of their independence by a majority of foundation managers on the Managing Body.

First reactions to the Bill were favourable. (11) The Manchester Guardian approved of it and, most significantly, the National Union of Teachers gave its unanimous approval. This last is understandable when it is appreciated that the proposals would greatly improve the lot of the teacher in the Voluntary school and generally enhance the stability and status of the profession. (12) Anglican support was mixed, to say the least. The Primate called it "an honest and statesman like measure," but the High Churchmen were less enthusiastic;

"We will not pretend for a moment that it is a final settlement of our claim, nor adulate the Government because it offers us after so many years a moiety of that which is our right." (13)

The Church Quarterly Review was perhaps more typical of moderate Church opinion;

"We hasten to say that we have been agreeably surprised. With one great exception, which can certainly be remedied in Committee, the Bill may be pronounced a comprehensive and bold attempt to deal with National Education." (14)

The Cowper-Temple Clause was not to be tampered with, much to the disappointment of many Anglicans who had hoped that the Board Schools would be opened up to denominational teaching. Churchmen were beginning to realise that many of the nation's children were not being given what they regarded as adequate Religious Instruction in many schools, and the only way in which they could be reached was by allowing "denominational facilities" to the various denominations in all the schools in the country. This idea was to recur again over the next decade, but in the 1902 Bill it was passed over. The Church Quarterly Review commented;

"In many ways this is exceedingly wise. A great cause of controversy and of bitter opposition to the Bill is removed." (15)

That same article did, however, put its finger on a crucial point, the local option clause:

"We have left to the end one clause in the Bill which is of great importance; that which makes the adoption of the part of the Bill relating to Elementary Education optional. It is quite easy to conjecture the causes which may have led to the insertion of such a clause, but whatever they may be, the clause itself is bad." (16)

The "causes" to which the article referred were, quite simply, the consciences of the Liberal Unionists led by Chamberlain in the Government coalition. He had managed to insist on the inclusion of the "local option clause". This clause gave the new Local Education Authority the choice of adopting the relevant parts of

the Bill relating to Voluntary schools. In other words, Local Education Authorities could freely decide what action or aid (if any at all) was to be given by them to the Voluntary schools in their area. By this device Chamberlain had hoped to take the wind out of the sails of the inevitable Nonconformist opposition. He may sometimes have appeared to have been a hindrance rather than a help to the cause of education, but in all fairness to him he was in an extremely difficult political position, and he stuck gamely to the difficult task of reconciling Nonconformist opinion to the Bill. He was not optimistic either about passing the Bill or the influence of such an Act on their support;

"The political future seems to me an optimist by profession - most gloomy. I told you that your Education Bill would destroy your own Party. It has done so. Our best friends are leaving us by scores and hundreds and they will not come back. I do not think that the Tories like the situation but I suppose they will follow the Flag. The Liberal Unionist will not... If we go on, we shall only carry the Bill with great difficulty - and, when it is carried, we shall have sown the seeds of an agitation which will undoubtedly be successful in the long run." (17)

Chamberlain did stress the importance of the option clause, trying to ward off criticism of the Bill by his Nonconformist friends. In a letter to Dr. J.G. Glover, a prominent member of the National Educational League, Chamberlain, after noting the failure of the Birmingham experiment in attaching Religious Instruction to the end of a totally secular system, continued,

"I have assumed that the option given in the Bill to adopt part 3 will be generally exercised. As the Bill is drawn, however, the local authority may in any district in which the majority of ratepayers object to giving aid to Voluntary Schools, refuse to adopt this portion of the Bill and leave matters as they are at present. If they (i. e. the draughtsmen of the Bill) have been unable to exclude sectarianism altogether, that is due to the inevitable difficulties of the situation. The denominational schools exist, they provide accommodation at the present time for the great majority of the children at school, and, if reform is to wait until they have disappeared, not only will it be

so costly when it comes as to provoke a serious and most regrettable reaction." (18)

This letter, which was widely circulated in pamphlet form, managed to stem much of the early Nonconformist opposition to the Bill. Chamberlain's support for the Bill almost cost him his political life. (19) In the Committee stage the local option clause was struck out on a free vote, thus removing the main prop to Chamberlain's position. It was only his great powers of political persuasion which enabled him to avoid a deep party split. Balfour, who spoke against the local option clause, was under great pressure from the denominationalists, who feared the effect of such a clause on their schools. Balfour allowed a free vote and the margin (271-102) was a triumph for the Church and for commonsense. The local option clause would have complicated educational administration unnecessarily at a time of great expansion and strain as the new system was being set up. Its rejection marked the failure of the Nonconformist opposition to keep the denominational schools separate from those schools run by the State, and their incorporation in the total scheme ensured their continued existence. Their fate, if they had remained separate, would have been extinction at some future date when the Government of the day would decide that they were doing more harm than good. As it was they were incorporated into the new system, and yet they retained some of their independence by always having a 6 to 4 majority of foundation managers on the Board of Management. Another clause also aided the Voluntary schools, this compelled the Local Education Authorities to pay for the upkeep of school buildings for "fair wear and tear". Other changes in Committee also gave back to the Church educational associations various endowments which the Bill had originally provided should be made over to the Local Education Authority in lieu of rate aid. (20)

The reaction of the Nonconformists to these alterations was swift and sharp. In the country at large mass demonstrations and petitions were organised by Dr. Clifford and Dr. Hugh Price Hughes.

The climax of these was a great meeting on Woodhouse Moor near Leeds;

"There, from five separate platforms, the patriarchs of Nonconformity admonished and exhorted a vast concourse, assembled by special excursion trains from all over the country. The tides of emotion thus released rolled on, flooding into every part of the land. Not even Birmingham would be spared." (21)

There was no shortage of fine phrases containing misleading and inaccurate statements. Dr. Clifford's "Rome on the Rates" was one such war-cry, conveying a maximum of wrath with a minimum of reflection and a marked lack of accuracy. In the House of Commons Lloyd George began to make himself conspicuous with fiery speeches defending the Nonconformist conscience and warning of dire consequences. It was not difficult for someone as eloquent as he to make the most of the Nonconformist's grievances; their disabilities when they wished to enter the teaching profession; the fact that over 60,000 Civil Service jobs were closed to them because of Anglican patronage; the hardships imposed on their children in single school areas because of the few wayward Anglican clergymen who abused their position of trust for denominational gain. Lloyd-George quoted one instance;

"This is what a diocesan inspector of the Church schools wrote to the chief organ of the Church, the Guardian;

"Our syllabus is arranged so as to give denominational instruction. I always saw it was given, and always asked the children, chiefly the children of the Nonconformists questions bearing upon it. Thus, in fact, we trained the children of the Nonconformists to be children of the Church." (22)

Fortunately the Church had a powerful advocate in Lord Hugh Cecil. In a speech described by Chamberlain as "a lay sermon, but quite the finest thing he had ever heard" (23) Lord Hugh Cecil put the case for the Voluntary schools. He had the foresight to see beyond the current intersectarian squabbling to the real threat of the future - totally secular education.

"The danger is in throwing down all the educational machinery which really attaches children of any way of thinking to the beliefs of their parents, and so giving a clear field to the negative movement which we say is

the real peril of the future and of which the Nonconformists have as much reason to be afraid as we have." (24)

One further remark he made was perhaps less well considered than it might have been, but it bears repetition as indicating the importance the Church party placed on the closeness of the church/school link.

"A Board school is a school with only one door; the child goes in, learns a great deal that is valuable, and goes out again into the street. A church school, a Wesleyan school, or a Roman Catholic school are schools with two doors, and the other door leads on into the Church or chapel." (25)

This remark provoked the inevitable reply from Campbell Bannerman.

"What we say is that if a child goes into a school, he should go in through the open door and he should come out into the open street and then enter any church that his conscience or his inclination or his conviction may lead him to go in. He ought not to be beguiled, induced or coaxed to enter another." (26)

Pugh's article contains a valuable account of how wide a spectrum of Anglican response there was to the 1902 Act, stretching from the extreme Protestant wing who were alarmed at the spread of Romish practices to the extreme High Anglican epitomized by this speech by a certain prebendary Covington,

"The Act of 1870 has practically been the endowment of dissent. It has given the Nonconformist an education with which he is satisfied. He has closed his schools and put in his chapel pocket the money he has saved thereby... the Churchman, whose conscience forbids him to be satisfied with Board schools, is compelled to pay for non Church schools, secondly, to pay for Church schools and thirdly to see the schools he loves undermined by the unlimited and unchecked use of a rate which has now risen to 15d. in the £. The injustice is now to be remedied. But at the suggestion, the Nonconformist conscience is instantly up in arms to check any intrusion upon the sacred preserves of the rate payers pockets which in the course of 32 years it has come to regard as its own." (27)

Further details of the predictable and unedifying debates need not detain us. The Bill was forced through by the Government in its

entirety (apart from one notable alteration) by the unpopular use of the Guillotine procedure. The significant alteration was the acceptance by the Government at a late stage of an amendment by one of its supporters, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, which gave control of Religious Instruction to the managers as a whole rather than only the local clergyman. This was a way of reducing the power of the clergy - especially those few who made unreasonable demands on the consciences of pupils and teachers alike by their dictatorial attitudes. Hensley Henson put the matter in perspective;

"The silly and wicked intolerance of some unauthorised manuals and catechisms, published by a few Anglican clergymen, of no position or importance, are possibly regarded with an attention ludicrously out of proportion to their real significance." (28)

Unfortunately, not all clerics took a similar line, and a howl of protest went up from the Church party. By over-riding the provisions of the trust deed and vesting control of Religious Instruction in all the managers, the Government had dealt an effective blow at the unfortunate antics of the Ritualist priests in single school areas. It had touched a very sensitive nerve in some quarters, one cleric protested rather hysterically;

"The amendment is the greatest betrayal since the Crucifixion, I would have preferred the Colonel to have seduced my wife rather than come to Parliament with such a proposal." (29)

Despite such blandishments the Amendment was easily carried on a free vote, indicating how little influence the clergy had over Parliament even though their political allies were in power. (30)

With the passing of the Bill a great step forward was made for education, but the troubles were not yet over. The rate war, promised for so long by the Nonconformists began in earnest, especially in Wales, a traditional Nonconformist stronghold. Only stern action by the Government in the form of the Authorities Default Act of 1904 prevented the revolt from spreading. Not just

individuals but entire Authorities rebelled in one way or another, using various devious means to circumvent the spirit of the Act. The second of Eric Eaglesham's articles (see above page 142) deals in detail with the ingenious means used by the various Authorities, but the outcome was never seriously in doubt. The dissidents were only a vocal minority, and with the Liberal victory of 1906 in the general election the need for opposition came to an end. The exact extent to which the education issue contributed to the great Liberal revival culminating in their victory is not clear, but it certainly was a significant contributory factor. (31)

On reflection, the great furore surrounding the 1902 Act was the first of a series of attempts by Nonconformity to outmanoeuvre the power of the Establishment, the teachers, the administrators and the Church. Against such a combination and with complicating factors such as the existence and support for the Bill of the Liberal Unionists, it is not really suprising that they did not win. One more regrettable aspect of the furore was the part played by some clergy. Hensley Henson, in a rare incursion into the political arena wrote;

"In truth, the clergy of all Christian Churches are ill adapted for political controversy. Their professional training predisposes them toward abstract views of practical questions, their professional work is apt to develop a dictatorial temper and a rhetorical, not to say also a denunciatory habit of speech; and these are little likely to facilitate that reasonable and mutually conciliatory attitude of mind apart from which political discussion apt to degenerate into invective and even insult." (32)

Such carefully measured sentiments were not characteristic of the clergy as a whole, but in such moderate utterances lay the seeds of hope for a brighter future of denominational co-operation and of mutual self-help rather than the destructive revalries of previous years. Firstly Henson deals with the wilder claims of the Nonconformists;

"'The people of this country' says Dr. Clifford, 'are placed by this Act at the mercy of the priests' and yet

the only changes this Act effects are in the direction of reducing the position of the clergy in educational system of the country." (33)

then he points out the various dangers inherent in inter-denominational strife;

"Christian unity ... is the one essential condition of any solution to this obstinate educational problem, which shall avert from the nation the supreme calamity of secular schools, pure and simple. There can be no question ... that the extraordinary and unexpected bitterness of the Nonconformist opposition to the Education Act has given a marked impetus to the movement for merely secular schools. It is not the vigour of the Nonconformist objection but the bitterness which does this." (34)

He then appeals to the Nonconformists to break away from the old pattern of interdenominational rivalry and calls on all interested parties to put the interests of the children first, especially those who come from "morally poverty-stricken homes;"

"The question which merits principal attention is not how to secure denominational teaching for denominational children, but how to secure Christian teaching in any form for derelict children." (35)

He suggests that the way forward is for the denominations to agree on "fundamental Christian truth" and to construct an agreed syllabus on that so that it can be taught in all schools. This "undenomination-ism", as he reluctantly calls it, is much to be preferred to the risk of losing Religious Instruction altogether, which was the fervent hope of many who considered Religious Instruction to be the cause of so much trouble in schools.

"One of the worst effects of religious division has been the perverted zeal with which good men with excellent intentions laboured to make the parents suspect the worst of what ought to be the best element in the school system. And it seems obvious that unless better relations can be established, so that these obstinate suspicions could be replaced by a juster and more kindly feeling, there really is no reasonable probability that we can escape what I cannot help calling the supreme disaster of secular schools, pure and simple. There

is no inherent impossibility in finding a common platform of fundamental Christianity on which the mass of English Christians might meet, in drawing up a simple and efficient syllabus of religious teaching which would outrage no legitimate denominational preferences and yet would be of the greatest possible service to the children." (36)

Such "agreed syllabuses", born out of improved co-operation between the denominations, were still things of the future, but the more far sighted members of the Church, such as Hensly Henson, could see that prolonged hostilities could only result in a totally secular system. The Birmingham experiment had shown that Religious Instruction could only survive inside the curriculum as a whole, and so the only practical solution was some form of nondenominational Religious Instruction which the regular teachers could teach without offending anyone's conscience. There were those elements on both sides who resisted this solution, as the next chapter explains, but commonsense and its evident practicability, coupled with the gradual increase in denominational co-operation ensured that in time it was accepted by all but an unrepresentative but vocal minority.

The 1902 Act meant that the Church entered on a new phase of her educational activity, her role had altered with the passing of the Act. Through the agencies of Local Education Authorities the state was now in control of all aspects of school education (staffing, teaching, standards, curricula, teacher training) with the approval of the nation at large. Opinion had altered radically from the previous century when most right thinking people used to think that the state had no right to interfere with education. The Church, on the other hand, no longer held her pre-eminent position. The great responsibilities of the vast numbers of schools had been lifted from her shoulders, but with that went a great deal of her bargaining power. This is not to say that she was totally stripped, an unknown quantity was the powers and possible influence of the managers of the school, where the foundation always had a working majority. Nor was the Church totally relieved of all financial responsibilities, in fact in some ways her potential

liabilities had increased, as all structural alterations were the responsibility of the foundation. Platten summarises the position as follows;

"The 1902 Act saw the Church's battle move one step further away from religious domination of education. A religious sector appeared to be all that was left Historical inquiry seems to indicate that the Church's loss of control in education was symptomatic of a general trend whereby the Church's relationship with the state gradually altered. This trend can be seen to have its origin early in the nineteenth century. It began with the repeal of Church rates and the ending of Government finance for the Church. It continued with the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland and the opening up of the universities to Dissent. The loss of control in education was merely a later logical step in the decline of the Church's political influence. The retrenchment of Churchmen in their concept of the Church's part in education appears then, as the necessary reconciliation of their ideals to practical changes in the Church's functions. The Church henceforth, was to act as a very junior partner in the nation's schools. Its only real influence would be in its own remaining schools and colleges, and in consultations on the nature and direction of religious education." (37)

On balance, the Church had come out of the great adjustment quite well. The Kenyon Slaney clause was not the great disaster that some clergy would have had us believe and the incorporation of the Church schools into the overall system had ensured their ultimate survival, which is more than the Church could have done. In that sense anything which remained of the denominational ethos, and there was quite a lot, was a bonus over and above the mere continued existence of Church schools.

A new note in the educational field was the startling change in the attitude of the central administration to education in general. The new control and the new approach were characterised by the steady stream of Regulations and Memoranda issuing from Morant. The new note struck in these official utterances was widely welcomed;

"Anyone familiar with Primary Codes will not fail to recognize in this quotation the new tone, in amazing contrast with the formal and barren utterances of former years; and will welcome with gratitude the substitution of definite and ennobling ideals for the mere tabulation of an assorted collection of subjects of instruction." (38)

One result of all this new effort and involvement by the Government in education was that in a few years, after the initial effort of setting up the new system, the inadequacies of the Church's buildings began to become apparent. As standards slowly rose, the number of buildings which failed to meet them rose as well, and of the number the Church schools constituted an embarrassingly large percentage. In the early years of this century there was no great problem over this, but as the years went by the Churches were to feel more and more their problem of maintaining the buildings and keeping them up to standard. In the immediate future following the passing of the Act, attention was to be drawn from such mundane things as building standards to the more exciting spectacle of successive attempts by the Liberal majority in the House of Commons to "redress the balance" of the 1902 settlement more in favour of the Nonconformists. Only the threat of a constitutional crisis was able to avert the threat to the Voluntary schools which the 1902 Act had so carefully incorporated into the state system. It is to these attempts to alter the Act to which we must turn our attention, representing as they do the last attempt by organised Nonconformist forces to eradicate denominational schools.

Notes on preceding chapter

1902 Restoration and incorporation

1. Losses were, 1897 £140,000.
1899 £ 50,000
1900 £105,000

B. Sacks, Religious Issue in State schools of England and Wales.
Univ. of New Mexico Press. Pgs, 16ff.
2. Amery, Life of Joseph Chamberlain, Vol IV op cit 491/2.
3. J. M. Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain 1800 - 1970, pg. 86, see also Eaglesham, British Journal of Educational Studies 1960/1. Planning the Education Act of 1902 "Of all those concerned Morant had the greatest influence on the final form of the Education Bill of 1902". For more general background see also pgs. 91 - 263 of Sir Robert Morant by B. M. Allen 1934.
4. Printed in full pgs. 85 - 104 in "Education for National Efficiency" The contribution of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, by E. J. T. Brennan, London 1975.
5. K. M. Hughes, A Political Party and Education - Reflections on the Liberal Party's Educational policy 1867 - 1902. British Journal of Educational Studies pg. 123 Vol. 8.
6. British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 9 1960/1. "Planning the Education Bill of 1902", and British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 10 1962, "Implementing the Education Bill of 1902"
7. J. Amery, Life of Joseph Chamberlain Vol. 4 pg. 484, quoting B. M. Allen op cit pg. 168. Morant, Allen notes, considered that this interview was the greatest triumph of his life (pg. 169 *ibid*).
8. Allen op cit pg. 153.
9. Murphy op cit pg. 92/3.
10. These became known as Part III Authorities and they were responsible for elementary education only. They were finally abolished in the 1944 Act.

11. Amery, op cit pg. 489.
12. Cruickshank, Church and State in Education, pg. 105 footnote 1.
In a later debate J.M. Redmond quoted figures to show that teachers salaries had doubled in the years 1902 - 8.
Hansard Vol. 188 4th Series cols. 1706/7.
13. Church Times 23/5/02 quoted Cruickshank op cit 182.
14. Church Quarterly Review, April 1902 Article 11. "The New Education Bill" pg. 204.
15. ibid pg. 209.
16. ibid pg. 211.
17. J. Amery op cit pg. 496, quoting an extract from a letter of Chamberlain's to Devonshire dated 22nd Sept. 1902.
18. ibid pg. 491.
19. See the details of the crucial meeting of Oct. 9th in Amery ibid, pg. 498ff at which Chamberlain was attacked in his home town of Birmingham by his own supporters.
Amery comments;
"Chamberlain's victory over the Birmingham dissentients marked the turning point in the Education battle. The Liberal party and the extreme Nonconformists were not to be reconciled. But, henceforth, numbers of moderate men, otherwise supporters of the Government, decided to follow Birmingham's example and not press their opposition to the Bill beyond reasonable limits. The great reform was thus secured, and the Government survived a crisis which, in the test of an election, might have proved fatal." op cit 505/6.
20. George White. A Liberal Member of Parliament called these concessions "a distinct breach of faith on the part of the Government and a spirit of mean huckstering by friends of the Church which would disgrace Petticoat Lane or Seven Dials"
B. Sacks op cit pgs 14 and 27.
21. Amery op cit pg. 494.
22. Hansard Vol. 107 4th Series Col. 1089 8th May 1902.

23. Amery op cit 491 footnote 2 quoting pg. 84 of Memoirs of Sir Almeric Fitzroy.
24. Hansard Vol. 107 4th Series Col. 846 6th May 1902.
25. Hansard Vol 107 4th Series Col. 845 6th May 1902.
26. Hansard, 4th Series Vol. 115 Col. 1192-1203 as quoted D.R. Pugh. The Church and Education, Anglican Attitudes 1902. Journal Ecclesiastical History Vol. 23.
27. ibid. See also ibid pg. 228 for a list of 16 reasons put forward by the High Churchman Joseph Nunn rejecting the Bill as giving away too much to the State.
28. H. Hensley Henson "The Education Act and After" pg. 28 1903.
29. Sir Almeric Fitzroy op cit Vol 1. Nov. 27 pg. 112.
30. The motion was carried in the Lords after the right of appeal to the bishop was incorporated in the Bill and after a reminder from the Duke of Devonshire on behalf of the Government of the Church's past impotence in such matters. D.R. Pugh op cit pg. 231.
31. N.J. Richards states quite baldly.

"A major reason for the overwhelming Liberal victory in this election was the religious passion aroused by the Nonconformists after the 1902 Act."

N.J. Richards, "Education Bill of 1906 and the decline of political Nonconformity". Journal of Ecclesiastical History Vol. 23 pg. 50, No. 1972.

32. H. Hensley Henson. op cit pg. 6. The subtitle of this book is not without its significance; "An appeal addressed with all possible respect to Nonconformists, fellow guardians with English Churchmen of the National Christianity."
33. Pg. 25 ibid.
34. Pg. 37/8 ibid.
35. Pg. 54/5 ibid.

36. Pg. 68/9 *ibid.*
37. Platten op cit pg. 298 and 300 *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol 23.
38. R.A. Bray quoted in B.M. Allen op cit 214.

Chapter Eight

The Failure of the Liberals. 1906 - 1914

The consideration of these years in the educational sphere with which we are concerned falls neatly into two. On the one hand there are the early attempts to sabotage the 1902 Act by passive resistance followed by various Educational Bills of the Liberal Government with all their resultant furore. On the other hand the work of setting up the new system outlined by Morant was steadily going ahead. Almost unnoticed a whole new administrative system was coming to grips with the problems of the schools and more progress was achieved through persuasion and gentle pressure than anything the politicians could produce for all their fine speeches and flowing rhetoric.

Of rhetoric and speeches there was no lack in these years, especially as far as education was concerned. After the Bill became the Act of 1902 the passive resistance movement, led by the indefatigable Dr. Clifford, (1) held the headlines until the Liberal victory of 1906. With that victory, the organised Nonconformist opposition (or what was left of it) ceased in anticipation of a speedy "readjustment" of the educational balance. The new President of the Board of Education, Augustine Birrell was the son of a Baptist minister who had experienced first hand the problems of the Nonconformists in single school areas. (2) & (3). The Nonconformists had great hopes that the new President, with such a background, would give them the educational reforms they wanted. N.J. Richards recalls a remark of Balfour's reflecting the optimism of Nonconformists after their great electoral victory.

"I suppose that this is the first time in the history of our country since the Commonwealth, when the great Nonconformist party, always powerful, always big, and justly having a great weight in the councils of the nation, are, or conceive themselves to be, supreme." (3)

Not only the Nonconformists but also the new Labour group of Members of Parliament were pressing for educational reform. The Trades Union Council had passed a motion which included a model Education

Bill in the autumn of 1905 and this was accepted by the annual conference of the Labour Representation Committee in February 1906. It was explicitly secular in character and was presented to the Commons a week before Birrell's Bill was introduced. (4) Thus the Church was not only fighting the crushing Liberal majority but also the representatives of organised Labour. It is interesting to note that the Trades Union Council were in favour of secular education simply because of the apparent impossibility of finding any other solution. Keir Hardie put their point simply;

"The great majority of the Trades Union Council are, like myself, Christians, but we support the secular solution owing to the impossibility of finding a common denomination that all will accept." (5)

Over the next six years there was a growing agitation within the Labour movement which rendered the movement impotent over the religious issue in education, much to the great benefit of the Church. This agitation was led by two representatives of Catholic labour, James O'Grady and James Sexton. Their increasingly bitter resistance to the secular policy culminated in an incident in the 1911 Trades Union Congress when Sexton disrupted the proceedings in an attempt to put the Catholic case, shouting,

"You have no right to take the votes of Roman Catholics and thrust secular education down their throats." (6)

In spite of this interruption the secular motion was passed but the following year the Miners Federation proposed that the problem of secular education should not be discussed in view of the bitter passions it aroused. After a long debate this was passed and so the Roman Catholics had won a small but vital change of policy. (7) This topic was an extremely sensitive one for Labour and in years to come the Labour movement had further cause to respect the views of their Roman Catholic supporters over education when Catholic agitation was instrumental in causing the demise of the 1930 Education Bill.

Labour were not impressed by Birrell's Bill, the Social Democratic Federation said the Bill was,

"a mere attempt by the Liberals to evade the real question at issue in the interests of Nonconformity." (8)

It also, of course, was a suitable subject for the Labour group of Members of Parliament to show their political independence on. Later the same year the Trades Union Congress said that the Bill was "introduced to placate the denominations" and followed the Social Democratic Federation demand for a national system of education under full popular control, free and secular from primary school to university. (9)

The reality of the educational situation was that there were basically two types of denominational schools. Firstly there were those schools (all the Roman Catholic ones and some Anglican) which gave fully denominational instruction to a totally denominational intake. The second group of schools (most of the Anglican schools) accepted a wide variety of pupils and gave denominational teaching of a very wide range from mere Cowper-Temple teaching to full dogmatic instruction. The political reality of the situation was that both the Liberals and the Tories were anxious not to offend the Roman Catholic group of Irish Members of Parliament who were strongly in favour of their own denominational schools. Any solution had to take account of all these factors.

Birrell's Bill was the result of the inevitable compromise. It was politically and financially impossible to wipe the slate clean and start again from scratch. Denominational schools existed and somehow they had to be made acceptable to Nonconformists. Those denominational schools which attempted to create a denominational "atmosphere" (10) pervading all aspects of school life were more difficult to deal with than those which had kept denominational instruction to specific hours and insisted on a cleavage between secular and dogmatic teaching. In these latter, the Conscience Clause had always operated more efficiently than in the former, but even so, they were still denominational schools, owned and controlled by the denomination and still an affront to

the Nonconformist conscience. Of course there was always the radical solution of total secularization which did have its proponents, (11) but this would have meant going against the general trend of educational development and would have inevitably provoked a great adverse reaction.

The other radical alternative was to ensure that all children were taught the denominational religion of their parents. This solution was an administrator's nightmare involving a religious census and all the problems of the right of access and provision of adequate facilities. The teachers also objected strongly to outsiders coming in and teaching, (or attempting to teach) their "own" children just as much as they objected to any form of religious test for themselves. It was clear to Birrell that this alternative was not really feasible either.

The solution lay (if anywhere) in somehow putting the denominational schools under public control and abolishing denominational Religious Instruction within school hours and yet also providing the denominations with the opportunity to teach their respective flocks out of school hours. Also some sort of special arrangement had to be made to cover special categories of school which served one particular community (e. g. the Jewish schools and the Roman Catholic schools). Birrell's Bill was an attempt to do just that. Under his scheme all denominational schools were to be transferred to the Local Education Authorities (who would pay a rent for their use) and, (if the Local Education Authority decided to accept them) nondenominational Religious Instruction was to be given by the normal teachers in school hours. Two sorts of "facilities" were offered to the denominations in recompense for their losses. (12) Firstly, (in Clause 3) "ordinary facilities" were to be given to the majority of Anglican schools, which consisted of denominational instruction twice weekly outside school hours given by someone not on the staff, where the parents asked for it and where the Local Education Authority gave its consent. Secondly "extended facilities" (in Clause 4) consisted of daily denominational instruction which might, if the Local Education

Authority agreed, if 80% of the parents requested it, and if the school was in an urban area of more than 5,000 inhabitants, be given in school hours and by normal school teachers. This Clause 4 school was meant to cover the special categories of school mentioned above.(13) The aim of the Bill was to restrict the provision of denominational Religious Instruction to those schools where it was needed and, by the use of stringent conditions, eliminate the problems of single school areas.

Birrell's Bill did not have many supporters outside the Government. Asquith lent his support, saying it was designed to,

"Put an end to the Dual system created by the Act of 1902, to secure that every school maintained out of rates and taxes should be under the exclusive management and control of the representative local authority, to abolish religious tests and the obligation to give denominational teaching." (14)

He was not, however, followed by many of his party's supporters. As was mentioned above, organised Labour was hostile. (15) In addition many Nonconformists were hostile to Clause 4 schools. (16) Where, they asked, were the sweeping reforms of the system they had voted for? Here was denominational teaching on the rates and it was proposed by a Liberal Government full of Nonconformists and supported by Nonconformists. Images of the fiasco of the 1870's were conjured up, when the Liberals got out of step with their Nonconformist supporters. One prominent Nonconformist leader wrote to Birrell,

"Clause 4 sacrifices Nonconformists who did largely get the Government in, to Lancashire Catholics, who did not.... if Clause 4 is forced upon us, Nonconformist enthusiasm will have been killed." (17)

The passive resistance movement showed signs of life and a deputation was sent to Birrell. His argument that a compromise was necessary because of their rejection of the totally secular option was not well received. Many Nonconformists did realize that in order to rectify the mistakes of the 1902 Act and to create a lasting solution any new education bill could not ignore the religious beliefs of other groups, but the vast majority of them considered

that the Birrell Bill went too far towards the denominationalists. (18)

The denominationalists were violently opposed to the Bill. The Roman Catholics, calling the Bill "a new penal law" (19) considered the Clause 4 Schools a poor substitute for their present situation and the Anglicans strongly resented the "compulsory silencing" of the regular teacher and the wholesale confiscation of property bequeathed in the past by people with fixed ideas of what they were trying to do with their money. Birrell was subjected to much abuse, and was accused of starting a new religion "Birrellism". A remark of his in the Commons to the effect that,

"all minorities must suffer, it is the badge of their tribe". (20)

did not enhance his standing with some of his Government's supporters!

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson was uncharacteristically forthright in his condemnation of the Bill as "in principle unjust." (21) By contrast Dr. Know, Bishop of Manchester, was utterly characteristic in his colourful rejection of the Bill, advocating a policy of "no surrender." He revitalized the Church Schools Emergency League and organised a Whitweek demonstration of thirty-two trainloads of Churchmen in London to protest against the Bill. Comparing the Governments conditions to "racks and thumbscrews" he claimed that the terms of the Clause 3 school would only be satisfied if the authorities allowed the children to receive their Church instruction in the playground or on the street. In a manifesto his description of the Bill was as follows;

"It imposes religious tyranny it is nothing but a very thinly veiled Bill for secularising the schools. . . . it is a Bill of pure robbery and confiscation . . . your tea, your sugar, your tobacco, your beer and incomes are to be taxed that the children of the Church may be robbed of their Church education and that your schools, built with your own free contributions, may be made useless for your own requirements." (22)

In more measured tones but equally emphatically the Church Quarterly Review condemned the Bill as "fundamentally bad", maintaining that;

"the one thing the present Bill will not do and cannot do is to appease the present religious strife, it will only intensify it." (23)

There were over 1400 meetings against the Bill in three months and over $\frac{3}{4}$ million people signed petitions against it. In spite of such opposition the Bill proceeded to the Lords virtually unchanged. In the Lords the Archbishop spoke against the Bill in its present form.

"What does the Bill do? It takes 14,000 schools, with their trusts, and demolished them, not the mere wording of the trusts, but the very essence and pith of them. The characteristics which make a denominational school different from others are abolished and the school is handed over to the Local Education Authority, which may, if it likes, refuse to take it; or, if it does take it, may practically secularise it save for two hours in the week and may appoint teachers who are unwilling to give, or untrained to give, religious teaching, and, if religious teaching is given, and the teachers are willing to give it, no child need go to school until the religious lesson is over.... We are told that Local Education Authorities will not on any large scale destroy or even impair the system of religious teaching, but are we quite sure that that can be counted upon everywhere? Of course, no man will allege it of England as a whole, I am quite prepared to say that Local Education Authorities in the main will try to act fairly, and I would trust them generally, but the Bill binds them in one direction, to allow no denominational teaching and leaves them free in another to go as far in the secular direction as they like. If I am right, if it is really possible that these things can come about, surely it is childish to tell us, "Yes, they can do all that if they like, but Mr. Birrell hopes they won't." Does the security come to anything else?" (24)

This extensive quotation shows the full extent of the Archbishop's uncertainty. He, unlike some of the more extreme leaders of the Church, was prepared to meet the fair demands of the Government, but he was not prepared to lose the essential part of the church schools the right of the teacher to give denominational instruction. As G. K. Bell points out the Liberal peers were in a very weak position in the Upper House and the Tory majority had no difficulty in amending the Bill so extensively as to render it almost unrecognizable. (25)

There was a certain amount of political manoeuvring going on in all this, with Balfour very much in control. It was he who advised the Upper House not to reject the Bill outright but to amend it extensively, knowing that this would prove unacceptable to the Liberal government. The Liberals were indeed very angry at this "turning round" of the Bill and Birrell broadened his attack to question the whole position of the Upper House;

"What is the point of winning great electoral victories when you find on going a few yards down the lobbies of the House all the foes you routed in the open field, installed, established, and apparently immovable, mutilating all your work and substituting something quite different." (26)

When the "miserable, mangled, tortured, twisted tertium quid" (as Birrell described the amended Bill) returned to the Commons there was a great upsurge of Nonconformist feeling. Dr. Clifford wrote to the Times urging the creation of new Liberal peers to overrule the "episcopal oligarchy" (27) A constitutional crisis seemed imminent and, in an attempt to find a way round "the serious state of affairs which would arise were a conflict to take place between the House of Lords and the House of Commons", (28) the King, Edward VII, wrote to the Prime Minister asking him to negotiate directly with the Archbishop. The Liberals began to make concessions on many points previously considered vital, meeting all the Roman Catholic objections to Clause 4 schools and all the Anglican objections (except the problems of the single school areas), all of which seriously alarmed their already agitated Nonconformist supporters.

Balfour accused the Government of adopting an "insulting procedure" by altering the Bill so drastically, but in reality he was only playing the Bill out. During the last stages of the Lord's debate over whether or not to insist on their original amendments and thus reach an impasse with the Commons the Government indicated that they were prepared to make even more concessions, but Balfour was adamant. There was to be no compromise. Bell records a

conversation of the Archbishop with Lord St. Aldwyn who admitted;

"Our real difficulty lies in the fact that the leader of the Party does not want a peaceable solution." (29)

Cruickshank comments;

"It was Balfour, who, with cool and ruthless calculation, was directing operations. He was well aware that the great mass of the electorate were becoming increasingly apathetical and indifferent to religious controversy. His rejection of last minute overtures was an act of defiance, a deliberate challenge to the Government to appeal to the country. "They will not dissolve" he said "they know better." He was right." (30)

Balfour was also well aware of the fact that the Liberals were in a weak position over the Birrell Bill. Neither the Labour nor the Irish Members of Parliament supported it and consequently it was not a suitable issue on which to do battle with the Upper House.

The insistence of the Lords on their amendments meant the end of the Bill. (The Bill was dropped in December). Campbell-Bannerman issued a warning that the Government would not tolerate such blatant partisanship by the Lords and that the resources of the Commons were not exhausted.

"A way must be found, and a way will be found by which the will of the people expressed through their elected representatives, will be made to prevail." (31)

The failure of Birrell's Bill has been seen by some commentators as a significant milestone on the road to the destruction of the Liberal party in general and the death of political nonconformity as a live force in particular;

"The defeat of this Bill marked, more than any other single event, the death of political nonconformity which in turn did much to weaken the Liberal party in the pre World War 1 period." (32)

The fate of the next two education Bills only served to strengthen the Liberal's resolve to do something about the Upper House. It seemed as if it were impossible to find a solution to the problem. Birrell's successor, McKenna, introduced a one clause Bill in February of 1907 which made the managers of non-provided schools

financially liable for the provision of denominational Religious Instruction. The Bill was opposed by the National Society as unjust and by the Nonconformists as not going far enough, so it was quickly dropped. A year later McKenna attempted to deal with the problem by compulsorily transferring all denominational schools in single school areas to the Local Education Authority. Such schools might give denominational instruction out of school hours providing the teachers were volunteers from outside the school. All the other denominational schools could either transfer themselves to the Local Education Authority or "contract out" and receive a direct Government grant of 47/- per head which could be supplemented by charging fees.

It was not well received. The Roman Catholics condemned it and Randall Davidson said his objections to it were "insuperable". The Church Quarterly Review, describing it as a "harsh" measure compared the positions of the Anglican and Nonconformist parent;

"Supposing that a parent wishes his child to have Church teaching, he will probably not get it unless he is willing to pay fees for the education of his child. The Nonconformist will get exactly the teaching he wants without those fees. Moreover the other parent will have to pay rates for the teaching of the Nonconformist child." (33)

The Nonconformists could not bring themselves to give the measure their unqualified support, one of them remarked;

"The provision for "contracting out" contents no-one, not even those it would placate; it frustrates the ambition of a national system; it perpetuates the old mischievous duality." (34)

Perhaps the most telling criticism came from the Fabians, a notable Socialist pressure group with no particular educational axe to grind, who described it as;

"Unique among the many Education Bills of the past 50 years, in not containing a single clause which even professes to make the schools better or local Government more efficient." (35)

Fortunately for all concerned the Bill perished in the reorganization of the Government which followed the death of Campbell-Bannerman. It had in any case been overtaken by events. (36) If McKenna's Bill had been passed it would have been a step backwards towards the disintegration of the school system. Those Church schools which contracted out would have found it extremely difficult to maintain standards and the struggle for survival by the Church schools would have taken on a new note of bitterness as bazaars and school pence once again became the financial lifeline of the schools.

It is interesting to note that at this time an extraordinarily acute analysis of the situation was provided by one Theodore Rothstein in "Justice", the journal of the Social Democratic Federation. (37) Rothstein regarded the Forster Act as supporting the Nonconformist view and the 1902 Act as restoring the Church to her former position. Under the 1870 Act Nonconformity, or something so similar as to be wholly acceptable to them, could be taught at Board Schools at no expense to Nonconformists, but when the Church of England wanted the same provisions in the 1902 Act the Nonconformists discovered their "conscience". The Anglicans regarded Cowper Temple teaching as essentially Nonconformist and maintained that if Nonconformist teaching could be rate supported why could not Anglican teaching be treated similarly? The Act of 1902 had given them this and the Bills of 1906 and 1907 sought to remove it. This was what provoked such strenuous opposition from the Church.

The explosive nature of the education issue led the new President of the Board of Education, Runciman, to adopt a totally new approach. This was to attempt to find a solution by quiet diplomacy with the objective of presenting a Bill to Parliament virtually as a *fait accompli* with all sides in the dispute supporting the Bill.

After many months of negotiation, details of which need not detain us here, Runciman considered he had found a workable compromise

between the Archbishop and the Nonconformists. (38) Both sides had made concessions, which in the light of the previous histrionics were almost revolutionary. He had persuaded the Nonconformists to relax the Cowper Temple clause and permit denominational facilities in all public elementary schools. On the other side he had persuaded the Anglicans to give up their schools in single school areas to the Local Education Authorities. A point not finally settled but agreed in principle was that there would be a small number of schools who would be allowed to contract out and receive direct Government aid. This last point was the Achilles heel of the agreement. The number of contracting out schools had to be low to appease the Nonconformists but the financial conditions attached to contracting out had to be generous, to appease the Anglicans. Runciman promised the Archbishop that the conditions would be generous but, much to his dismay, when the Bill was published the Archbishop saw that they were anything but generous. Runciman, who had arranged everything else, had blundered over the financial details. He was, admittedly, in a difficult position. If he made the contracting out terms too attractive, too many schools would contract out and that would upset the balance. Another point was the parlous situation of the Roman Catholics, who had been virtually ignored by Runciman until the negotiations were completed. Their schools, all of which would of course have contracted out, would have been at a serious disadvantage under the new scheme.

Runciman had clearly underestimated the opposition to his proposals. His blunder of the financial aspects had put the Archbishop in a difficult position. On all sides his handling of the negotiations on behalf of the Church was criticised and he felt, with a certain amount of justification that Runciman had let him down over this. (39) Bishop Knox condemned the agreement as "the peace of death" (40) and the "School Guardian", the National Society's paper maintained that acceptance of such a Bill would be "a colossal surrender."

The Roman Catholics attacked the Bill as spelling death to their schools, separating them off from the rest of the system and condemning them to a slow and painful starvation. Many Nonconformists objected that the Church had actually gained ground during the course of the negotiations and many teachers objected to the extended rights of entry and the institution of a separate class of non-provided schools with all the dangers of loss of pay and status and pension rights which that might entail. Behind all that was also the fear that pressure might be brought to bear on teachers to give denominational teaching, in spite of all the assurances to the contrary.

With so many opponents it is not surprising that the Bill only lasted 17 days. The coup de grace was given by a meeting of the Anglican Representative Council on December 3rd. The Archbishop spoke in favour of the Bill, urging acceptance as it represented the best agreement which could be negotiated under the circumstances;

"Some 550 Church of England Schools closed in the last three years within the same three years there has been an increase of 1,056 Council Schools . . . What about the Church's care for those children? Such transfers of children will for obvious reasons be greatly accelerated in the next few years. And at such a moment we are offered the opportunity - which may never recur - of securing by law that in every elementary school in the country - present and future - the right to give denominational teaching shall have a permanent place." (41)

In spite of this cogent argument a motion hostile to the Bill was passed by the Houses of the Clergy (73 to 35) and the Laity (113 to 46) with only the Bishops in favour (3 to 18) of the Bill. Four days after the Bill was withdrawn as it could no longer claim to be an agreed measure. This greatly disappointed the Archbishop;

"I am not ashamed to confess that I have never experienced a more heavy and thorough disappointment." (42)

Burgess, admitting the responsibility of the National Society as one of the prominent agents in the Bill's demise, defends the policy of the Society;

"It would be a mistake to condemn the Society's policy during these years as obstructive and negative. Again and again . . . it reaffirmed its willingness to negotiate a settlement based on 'the principles of justice, religious equality and parental right.'" (43)

Cruickshank has a poor opinion of Runciman's Bill too;

"His Bill did not offer a Statesmanlike solution to the problem of dual control and was in fact hardly worth saving. The "facilities" it offered would have caused resentment and confusion in large numbers of schools while contracting out would have brought perpetual poverty to those which stood apart." (44)

After the failure of three successive Presidents with their respective Education Bills the Liberals made no further effort to solve the educational problem and concentrated on other aspects of their programme such as pensions, unemployment insurance, housing and of course, the Parliament Act to curb the power of the House of Lords. B. Sacks records that in 1913 and 1914 many Nonconformists wanted a concentrated attack on the problem of the single school area, but the new President, Pease, preferred to wait until after the next election and bring in a bold measure then. (45)

All in all the Liberals had not had a successful time in their efforts in the educational field. Apart from an administrative adjustment to ease the problems of Nonconformists who wished to become teachers their policies had all failed. (46) They had succeeded in arousing the wrath of their opponents, frustrating the wishes of their supporters and producing absolutely nothing on the Statute Book. Moreover the years of bitter dispute had produced a weariness with the topic which enabled the more conciliatory spirits on both sides to be heard. In 1910 the Education Settlement Committee, representing all strands of opinion published a report called "Towards Educational Peace." (47) The Government, however, did not want to take up the opportunity of trying for a fourth time to settle the matter and so the Balfour Act of 1902 remained unscathed, in spite of all the efforts to the contrary, until after the war, which put an end to all chance of educational legislation for a while, and which gave the country in general and the Churches in particular something else to think about.

Notes on preceding chapter.

1906 - 1914 The Failure of the Liberals

1. To be fair to Dr. Clifford his activities sprang from a deeply held conviction, however much his words and actions might sometimes seem to indicate otherwise, as the following extract shows;

"How I wish this Education question were out of the way. But it is the fight of the hour. It is the Eternal fight between the intolerant and grasping holders of privilege and the incalculable human soul which is at stake, and the one thing I am glad of is, that I know that I am fighting for that human soul and not for any sectarian privilege."

pg. 128 "Dr. John Clifford. Life, Letters and Reminiscences"
Sir James Marchant. London 1924.

2. Birrell held strong views on proselytising. He once wrote;

"One has only to read what the clergy say in their own church organs to see that they regard "their" schools as missionary enterprises, as the best means of reclaiming the masses to true views of Church, authority and sacramental grace."

B. Sacks, Religious Issue in State schools of England and Wales,
Pg. 31. New Mexico Press.

He described himself as

"A Nonconformist born and bred, as a man nurtured in Nonconformist history and Nonconformist traditions."

Hansard 4th Series Vol 104. Col. 1024.

3. N.J. Richards op cit. pg. 51 quoting the Times of 7th May 1906.
4. Birrell's Bill was introduced on 9th April 1906 and this led to the Trades Union Congress's Bill being dropped.
5. Brian Simon, Education and the Labour Movement 1870 - 1920.
Lawrence & Wishart. Pg. 260. Studies in Education Series.
6. ibid pg. 277.

7. Some commentators (e.g. Ralph Morely) interpreted the Miners Motion in terms of taking the secular education policy as read (because it had been passed so many times before) rather than discuss it and cause trouble each year.
8. Simon, op. cit pg. 260
9. ibid.
10. The idea of a "religious atmosphere" in a school had long been put forward by High Church Anglicans, much to the irritation of the Nonconformists. Dr. Clifford quoted a "well known parliamentary rhymster";

"All things on earth we have endowed,
Church, army, land and beer,
And now our statesmen cry aloud,
Endow the atmosphere!"

Journal of Ecclesiastical History pg. 219 Vol. 23, July 1972.
D.R. Pugh. "The Church and Education: Anglican attitudes 1902"
11. E.g. The Moral Instruction League, Secular Education League, the Independent Labour Party and Social Democratic Federation and (at this stage) the Trades Union Congress.
12. The terminology used here is taken from Cruickshank op cit pg.93.
13. There were only 12 Jewish schools, ibid note 3.
14. "Fifty Years of Parliament" Asquith. 1926. Vol II pg. 43, quoted Simon, op cit pg. 259.
15. see above Pg 162.
16. Dr. Clifford maintained that there should be "no statutory foothold for sectarian privilege in the State school system."
G.K. Bell, Randall Davidson Pg. 514.
17. N.J.Richards op cit pg. 54 British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 23 1972.
18. ibid pg. 51
19. The Tablet 12/4/06.
20. Hansard 4th Series Vol. 155 Col. 1033.

21. G. K. Bell, Randall Davidson Vol. 1 Pg. 518 op cit
22. ibid Pg. 519.
23. Church Quarterly Review "Education and Politics" 1906 article VIII.
24. Bell op cit pg. 521 quoting a speech by the Archbishop to the Lords on 1st. August 1906.
25. ibid 522/3
26. From a speech at Bristol 13/11/06 quoted Cruickshank op cit pg. 99.
27. Times 27/4/06.
28. Letter of 25th November 1906 from King Edward VII to Campbell Bannermann, quoted Bell op cit pg. 524.
29. ibid pg. 528.
30. Cruickshank op cit pg. 102.
31. Hansard 4th Series Vol. 167 Col. 1740.
32. N. J. Richards "The Education Bill of 1906 and the decline of Political Nonconformity" Journal of Ecclesiastical History Vol 23 No. 1 pg. 49, Jan. 1972.
33. Church Quarterly Review. "The Education Bill 1908" pg. 23 1908.
34. ibid pg. 7.
35. Cruickshank op cit pg. 105.
36. The Bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. A. G. Edwards had, with the apparent approval of some members of the Government produced a Bill which included most of McKenna's ideas but also which added some new ones. . . . It was never taken up. (see text).
37. Justice. 7th March 1908 quoted B. Simon op cit pg. 275 footnote 2.
38. For details see Cruickshank op cit pgs. 105 - 107.
39. In a letter to Runciman on Nov. 21st 1908 the Archbishop makes it clear how silly he has been made to look and his position undermined.

"I ought not perhaps to shrink from telling you that I have been laughed at by more than one friend for this confidence (that the financial terms would be generous) - "a simple Simon negotiating with people who are not simple Simons at all" - and so forth. I have simply reiterated, that foolish or not, I had complete confidence in what you said."

Bell op cit pg. 537. After the failure of the Bill these two remained on the best of terms.

40. Church Times 27/11/08. Cruickshank op cit pg. 108.
41. Bell op cit pg. 538.
42. ibid pg. 539. Asquith was similarly inclined, calling it "the bitterest disappointment of my entire political career."
Hansard 4th Series Vol 198 Col. 102.
43. Burgess and Welsby. A Short History of the National Society 1811-1961 pg. 54.
44. Cruickshank op cit pg. 111.
45. B.J.Sacks op cit pgs. 76/77.
46. In 1908 an agreement was reached with the Colleges whereby they agreed to admit up to 50% of their intake without regard to the student teachers' denomination. This and other new regulations were not difficult to evade and in reality things stayed much as they were before.
47. Their scheme was also published in a remarkable volume called "The Religious Question in Public Education" edited by Riley Sadler and Jackson. This consisted of 12 schemes selected from almost 100 different schemes sent in in reply to a letter by Athelston Riley to the Times and other papers asking for suggestions to solve the religious impasse in education. The response and the publication of such a volume indicate how much goodwill there was around and a willingness to compromise in spite of all the bitterness that had gone before. Needless to say most of the schemes were unacceptable to the extremes on

either side. Riley had become somewhat more conciliatory since his article on the London School Board in the 1890s. He wrote in the Times,

"Had I as a parent the hard choice between Board School Undenominationalism and a Wesleyan school, I would prefer the latter as a guarantee of my child being taught by Christian teachers".

B. Sacks op cit pg. 86.

Chapter Nine

1918 - 1939 Unfulfilled Ideals

The shock which the First World War administered to the self esteem of the nation had many very tangible effects. The surprise of early defeats by a superior enemy and the realization that in some ways England lagged far behind other European countries all combined to produce the idea that, when the war was won, things would be changed to make Britain a better country. Chief among these ideas of improvements was that of educational reform. This urge to improve things, to make the country a better place for future generations appeared again in the Second World War and resulted in the Butler Act of 1944. It is perhaps a characteristic national reaction to the traumas of international conflict to plan for a better future, implying that the present struggle is worthwhile and that there will be a future for the nation after the conflict is won.

In 1916 H.A.L. Fisher, a distinguished scholar and administrator was appointed President of the Board of Education, by Lloyd George. He was to remain there, in spite of all temptations, (1) until his resignation in 1922 following the demise of Lloyd George. In his six years Fisher was able to achieve considerable progress on paper, but financial stringencies prevented many of his schemes from coming to fruition.

Fisher realised that the terrible carnage of the war would have various effects. Firstly, while the war was still on he could make plans in relative peace, unhindered by the day to day interruptions of Cabinet meetings and the time-consuming trivia of normal political life. (2) Secondly, and more importantly, there was a great upsurge of interest in popular education. Fisher made a series of speeches throughout the country expounding his plans for educational reform and, in general, he was very well received. (3) Thirdly, denominational differences had sharply declined. Bell comments;

"There was a far more cordial feeling between the representatives of the different Churches, and this grew still stronger in the course of the conversations on Christian Unity which followed the Appeal to All Christian People issued by the Lambeth Conference in 1920." (4)

The great loss of opportunities and talent incurred by the war had to be replaced in some way. The best way to do this was to ensure that those who had talents and ability received the sort of education which suited them best, be it academically or technically oriented. The transient prosperity produced by the high war time wages had raised hopes of secondary education for their children among many parents. Fisher knew that the time for advance had come.

"I was sensible from the first that while the war lasted reforms could be obtained... which would be impossible to realize in the critical atmosphere of peace. I resolved to move forward at a hard gallop and along the whole front." (5)

On taking up office he had been promised by Lloyd George that money would be made available to pay for educational reform. He found that in 1917 Lloyd George kept his word and overruled Treasury objections to his plan to finance public elementary education, by a system of percentage grants in aid of approved local expenditure. Fisher's improvements were carried out in three main areas. Firstly, he had to improve the status of the profession, secondly he had to improve educational administration and thirdly he had to expand the existing educational system to cater for the greatly increased demand for post-elementary education. In doing all this he had to take care not to offend any of the parties involved, especially the Churches, the teachers and the administrators, a delicate operation by any standards!

The teaching profession was poorly paid at the end of the war as their salary increases had not matched the rise in prices. The number of new teachers fell from 11,000 in 1906 to 4,300 in 1912 and, in spite of various measures, the position of the teacher and the

numbers of new entrants to the profession still continued to decline. (6)
It was not merely a matter of salary as C.E.Losbey was at pains to point out;

"The public must take a hand, because unless and until there is an alternation in the general attitude towards teachers it will not be possible to attract to the profession a reasonably good pick of the manhood of the nation.... let me give an example... A young man is attracted to the teaching profession ... he secures a post in a grammar school and finds himself in a small country town. He soon discovers that he ranks lower in the social scale than the local attorney when he has been in residence for a year or so the village squire may conceivably invite him to lunch. He however would consider it something approaching social sacrilige to ask him to dinner. The vicar may press him to teach in his Sunday school. He will not, however, exhibit the same anxiety to take him to the bosom of his family." (7)

Financial matters were greatly improved by the Teacher's Superannuation Act of 1918 and the setting up of the Burnham Committee in 1919. (8) This latter produced an agreed set of teachers salary scales which came into force in 1921, ending the means whereby wealthy Authorities could tempt the best teachers by offering higher salaries. Thus Fisher was able to elevate teaching to a career financially comparable to banking, local government or the civil service and he considerably improved the quality of the new entrants to the profession. Although these advances were almost immediately reduced by the "Geddes Axe" they nevertheless represented an "earnest of intent" on Fisher's part.

He did not however have so much success with his other ventures. Consideration of the details of the 1918 Act need not concern us except to say that in its final form it was not as Fisher had originally planned. The centralizing tendencies of his 1917 Bill and the plan to abolish the part III Authorities had produced fierce opposition and, (9) in Fisher's words;

"I bowed to the storm. The measure was stripped of every feature which might make it obnoxious to the public bodies." (10)

His administrative reforms were thus considerably restricted and his other educational reforms were also largely stillborn. The 1918 Act provided for the establishment of central schools and day continuation schools, abolished all elementary school fees and all exemptions from the leaving age of 14 and envisaged the raising of this to 15. It also strengthened the Local Education Authorities by increasing the number of services they could provide and by reforming the grant system, to permit not less than 50% of the cost of education to come from central sources. The most important sections of the Act dealt with compulsory part-time education, but the system which they produced was a fragile plant which soon shrivelled and died in the cold winds of the slump and general indifference. (11)

In all this Fisher was most anxious to avoid rekindling the religious issue. He realized the great value in getting the 1918 Bill through and assured the Churches;

"The Bill does not deal with the question of Religious Instruction nor is the position of the voluntary schools affected except by some clauses of minor importance, which may be classed administrative provisions. They would undoubtedly conduce to convenient and efficient administration, but if they prove highly controversial they can be dropped without affecting the rest of the Bill." (12)

In the event the Bill did become law and the great reorganization began. However, it soon became clear that, far from actively participating in the reorganization, the denominations were finding it very difficult to maintain their existing schools. The post-elementary aspects of the Act required maximum utilization of buildings and many Local Education Authorities found that denominational managers could not extend their buildings to provide for the improved practical teaching for senior pupils. This inability to participate in reorganization had a paralyzing effect on many of the Local Education Authority's schemes. In 1919 Fisher, bearing in mind the harmonious negotiations with the Churches over his Act of the previous year, decided to remove this hindrance by abolishing the Dual System, (which, as all admitted, was financially

wasteful and administratively awkward). In the days of post war restrictions a possible economy was not to be dismissed lightly. Fisher wrote,

"There is so much waste involved in the continuance of the aDual System that I do not wish to discourage attempts to explore every means of putting an end to it." (13)

Fisher had received encouragement from the National Society who agreed that, in certain circumstances, children could be transferred to a Council school provided they received Religious Instruction "in accordance with the wishes of their parents and at the hands of suitable teachers." (14) The National Society had in fact found itself in a very difficult situation, subscriptions were falling but existing commitments continued to increase, not allowing for the vast expenditure now envisaged in Fisher's reorganization. With remarkable candour the National Society admitted;

"So long as the Dual system of education obtains there cannot be that full utilization of resources in buildings and its teachers which is needed." (15)

In the ensuing negotiations Fisher found that, with one or two notable exceptions, (16) the Anglicans seemed to favour giving up their schools in return for Religious Instruction (either denominational or general, as appropriate) given by regular teachers in all schools. The National Society had suggested the Scottish system of strictly denominational schools to cater for all denominations, but Fisher rejected the idea after due consideration, coming back to the idea of having a very small number of schools (mostly Roman Catholic) contracting out. (17) Fisher realized the risks he was running in reopening the issue, but he was hopeful that the passage of time and the intervening war might have changed things. (18) For the Church of England this was true to a large extent. Church schools were declining in numbers and the Church was becoming increasingly aware of the growing number of its children in provided schools. (19) There was a distinct danger of being slowly

squeezed out of the system altogether - indeed this was what many Nonconformists fervently hoped for. They objected strongly to the proposals Fisher produced, and, led by the inevitable Dr. Clifford, began to intervene in crucial bye-elections over this issue - much to the Government's embarrassment. Cruickshank comments;

"In the weeks that followed it was clear that members of the old wing of Nonconformity had learnt and forgotten nothing. The Christian World talked suspiciously of "the collection of coupons by parsons" and declared "the price"(the sacrifice of the Cowper Temple Clause) is too big to pay. The Dual system is disappearing. Gradually, but surely the voluntary schools are going under and that is why the Church wants to make the bargain." (20)

This was, as usual, only partially true. The Church's schools, as Fisher later pointed out, were "going under" at a rate of roughly 100 per year and would not become finally extinct for more than a century. So it was hard to maintain, as many Nonconformists did, that the Church schools were waiting to fall into the laps of the Local Education Authorities "like so many ripe plums." (21) Fisher was unable to dissuade the Nonconformists from this optimistic viewpoint and in May 1920 the Education Committee of the Evangelical Free Churches condemned his proposals. This was a great pity in many ways, Fisher's proposals were not unlike many of the ideas contained in the rejected Liberal Bill, and they offered a real opportunity of progress in reorganization by the Local Education Authorities. Fisher had suggested that all nonprovided schools should be handed over to the Local Education Authorities in return for which denominational facilities were to be made available in all Local Education Authority schools. The Nonconformists did not like the breaching of the by now almost sacrosanct Cowper Temple Clause and the teachers were also implacably opposed to any wholesale extension of the right of entry, regarding it as a threat to their professional integrity.

Many hard line Anglicans were also very unhappy at the prospect of giving up all their schools. In addition the Roman Catholics were against Fisher's proposals. As had been previously the case, the Roman Catholics had not been consulted in any detail of the negotiations, because until agreement had been reached with the Anglicans and the Nonconformists there was no point in troubling the Roman Catholics with proposals which stood no chance of the larger body's approval. As might be expected, the Roman Catholics were very unhappy about this and were very apprehensive lest some sort of agreement be reached in which their position had not been adequately represented and safeguarded. (22)

Fisher's proposals foundered on the denominational rocks but, significantly, the mood of the Churches was changing. (23) The Anglicans were now willing to negotiate some change, even to the extent of considering handing over their schools. The High Church element was also in a more realistic mood which was reflected in the Church Times;

"...the old sectarian strife must be forgotten, for the issue has changed. In bygone days it was whether one or another form of Christianity would get the best of a bargain. Now the issue is whether Christianity or secularism shall be the future creed of England." (24)

and

"The proposals put forward by Mr. Fisher are on sound lines and such as the Church will be able to accept."

The predictions of Lord Hugh Cecil and Hensley Henson were coming perilously close to reality. (25) Even so, many Churchmen still clung to old ideas and the old Lancashire based Church Schools Emergency League was revived. The Guardian regretted such action as;

"An organised effort not to secure satisfactory terms in the event of any change, not to suggest any alternative plan, but simply to oppose any change and let things drift." (26)

Fisher resigned in 1922 with his proposals for the abolition of the Dual system destroyed and his plans for great educational reform and reorganization paralyzed by lack of Government money and lack

of both money and co-operation from the Churches. The National Society finally killed all hope of any immediate reconciliation when at the Annual Meeting of 1923 the following Amendment to a motion approving negotiations with the Government on the basis of the Archbishop's famous Three Principles (27) was passed by a majority of ten;

"The National Society considers it is urgently necessary that the authorities of the Church should be respectfully invited to abandon the policy of negotiation for the surrender of Church schools, and to aid the Society by putting forth a strong appeal to all Church people to maintain Church schools and training colleges..." (28)

Thus Fisher's hopes ended in ruin, broken like so many of his predecessor's plans on the barrier reefs of interdenominational rivalry and factional dispute. To be fair to him his task was made much harder than that of his predecessors by the fact that there were now at least six competing interests at work on any proposal, the Anglicans, the Roman Catholics, the Nonconformists, the Local Education Authorities, the teachers, and central government, all of which were more highly organised than before and able to wield their influence more effectively in the light of the general apathy towards religion in general and denominationalism in education in particular on the part of the majority of the population. Arranging a compromise acceptable to all these parties was impossible, and even by the end of 1920 Fisher could foresee his ultimate failure;

"It seems to me most doubtful whether it will ever be possible that the religious problem in our schools can be solved without inciting a violent controversy, and though there are few sacrifices which I would not make to get rid of the Dual System, I am not prepared to invite a raging tearing controversy, on the religious question." (29)

In reality Fisher's great educational advances were to a great extent obscured by the severe financial problems which occurred in the 1920's and went on into the 1930's. (30) Brian Simon considers that Fisher performed quite creditably in defending his Department against the most vicious of the proposed cuts in expenditure, (31) although Dean enters the caveat that, since his personal position and integrity inside the Government was very strong,

"He might have used (this) more successfully in the 1922 struggles to save his educational programme." (32)

In the event Fisher was glad to go. He felt that he had not had the support from representatives of organised labour which his efforts had deserved and he was deeply unhappy about the effects of the Geddes cuts. (33) Shortly after a particularly hard-hitting deputation from the National Union of Women Teachers he had written to his wife:

"My strong impression is that I shall have to go... It seems to me that economies will be insisted upon which it would be most repugnant to me to put into force apart from the question of obligation." (34)

With his departure the denominational issue was dropped for a while and all expansion and reorganization came to a halt because of national economic problems. In some ways this was no bad thing because in the interim between Fisher and the next attempt at a settlement by Trevelyan in 1930 "men of goodwill" on all sides were able to get together in the lull and give some leads as to how progress might be made.

One such lead was the production by Cambridgeshire of an Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education, which was drawn up by the Local Education Authorities, the teachers, and denominational representatives (excluding Roman Catholics). This lead was followed by other Local Education Authorities and Agreed Syllabus instruction eventually became the norm under the Butler Act of 1944. One result of this development was an increase in the quality and standing of Religious Instruction in schools and a continuing decrease in denominational tension.

Various other ways were found to help overcome the problems of reorganisation in the Dual System. The West Riding made an agreement in 1926 with the local diocesan authorities by which two periods a week of religious instruction could be denominational

(subject to a Conscience Clause) and the rest was to be according to an Agreed Syllabus. (35) In return for this managers transferred their schools to the Local Education Authority who could reorganize them. Another way round the problem was the Anson byelaw which enabled children to be withdrawn for denominational instruction at their parent's written request. By this device, which many Local Education Authorities adopted, older pupils at a large central school could be withdrawn for denominational instruction elsewhere.

However, as financial crises came and went the Church found it increasingly difficult to meet her financial commitments. Burgess records the economies effected by the National Society in the 1920's and early 1930's. By 1937 the situation was so bad that capital resources were being utilized to balance the books.

It was not that there was a slackening in the demand for education - rather the contrary in fact - but that, in national terms, it was now all too plain, as judged by the financial demise of the National Society, that voluntarism in education could not cope even with that diminishing portion of the educational cake which the State had left it. The plight of the National Society also reflected all too clearly the general decline in the level of public interest (and commitment) to the ideals on which the voluntary schools were based. Only the Roman Catholics were able to stand out against the trend and were in fact slowly increasing the numbers of their schools. Over against the ideals of the voluntary schools a new set of ideals held the field. These were expressed in Board of Education Circulars and more especially so in the Hadow report "The Education of the Adolescent" (36) The rising power of the Labour party also meant increased pressure for educational expansion. This was best expressed in R.H. Tawney's policy documents (part of the Labour party manifesto) "Secondary Education for All." (37) On top of all these pressures for expansion and change came the embarrassment of the Board of Education's Black List of schools which were either

A) incapable of improvement and unsuitable for further recognition
or

B) requiring extensive alterations in order to bring them up to the required standard.

This List included 151 Church schools in Category A and 107 in Category B. (38) Over the next six years (1925 - 1931), as Selby-Bigge reports, the Church did somewhat better than the Local Education Authorities in improving her substandard schools, but she was by no means able to eradicate them all. (39)

Under these circumstances it is hardly surprising that the managers of many Church schools could not cope. The plain fact of the matter was that the settlement of 1902 did not provide enough financial assistance for the major works which Fisher's Act envisaged and the Hadow Report's acceptance implied. Other problems also arose in the form of the advent of the non-parochial school.

Under Hadow the old parish school which catered for all ages was to be superceded by two separate phases of education; primary up to 11 and post primary for 11-14 (and ultimately 15). Many Churchmen were reluctant to co-operate with Local Education Authorities when they realized that they would lose their senior pupils to a large central secondary school, and the prospect of utilizing the Anson Byelaw did not always calm their fears.

There was also a considerable amount of disagreement within the Church as to the best way forward. This was exemplified by the National Society's unexpected adoption of a hard line in 1923 (see above page and in the sudden death of the idea then current of a Bill enabling the Local Education Authorities to make "once for all" grants to denominational schools without requiring their transfer to the Authority. Negotiations over this were well advanced when the Church Assembly went totally contrary to the general drift of events and sentiment by accepting a strongly denominational report of its Education Subcommittee in 1926. (40) On the opposite tack in the following year the National Society accepted the Hadow Report with all its implications for educational expansion. A year later a committee under Sir Henry Hadow set

up by the two Archbishops in 1924 finally submitted its report - needless to say it was divided. The majority report wanted the Church to concentrate on Teacher Training Colleges and was prepared to transfer the schools to the Local Education Authorities, but the minority wanted to keep these schools and in fact asked for more state aid to expand the Dual system. These last two events had combined to revive the prospect of an Enabling Bill, but all hope of this was cut short by the general election of 1929.

If the Anglicans were divided, the Roman Catholics were by contrast absolutely solid in their demand for more state aid. J.H.F. Peile, in a somewhat caustic review of the Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Religious Education castigates the majority report as woolly and idealistic. He sums up the position as follows;

"We may safely leave the Romans to look after themselves. They know what they want and mean to get it; and they will get it, and let us say honestly, deserve to get it by being single minded. They are enjoying to the full the advantages of being a minority Church which knows its own mind; while the Church of England suffers from having to own everybody who is not anything else." (41)

They even went to the extent of putting up clergy in local elections to fight for this issue. Murphy describes the complex situation very well, pointing out that under the circumstances;

"It was extremely difficult for the political parties to know how to act." (42)

Action finally came in the form of Sir Charles Trevelyan, the new President of the Board of Education under the Labour Government. However, even then the circumstances did not augur well. The Government had no overall majority and the Tory majority in the Upper House meant that the Lords would be opposed to the Raising of the School Leaving Age without offering any assistance to the voluntary schools. However, the Labour Party were committed to the provision of universal free secondary education, although Trevelyan knew that he would have to rely on Liberal support to bring about any moves in that direction. Labour were also a little nervous about the problems associated with the Raising of the School

leaving age to 15 (although many of their supporters were already demanding 16). (43) Under the severe economic circumstances of the slump of the early 1930's Trevelyan was able to urge early implementation of the Raising of the School Leaving Age as a means of reducing unemployment;

"In the opinion of large numbers of people it is quite worth hastening to get 400,000 children out of the labour market at a time of unemployment like this." (44)

Trevelyan's Bill (the Education (School Attendance) Bill), introduced in October 1929 provoked considerable protest. Trouble arose within the Labour party's rank and file over the issue of any form of means test for maintenance payments for the upkeep of children in the last year at school. In the main the Labour party rejected the idea, whilst the Treasury (in the form of Snowden, the Chancellor of the Exchequer) and the Local Education Authorities were in favour of some form of means test. Trevelyan succumbed to party pressure and proposed generous grants;

"We must be fairly liberal in order to make it probable that those who need the allowance will not be refused." (45)

However, the Local Education Authorities began to bring pressure on him to delay the introduction of the Raising of the School Leaving Age, pointing out all their problems which could not be overcome at short notice. On top of this came further opposition from industrialists who feared the effects of losing cheap young labour. Faced with all this resistance Trevelyan dropped the Bill. It had been a hastily contrived affair and contained no hint of how the voluntary schools might cope with the problems of Raising of the School Leaving Age and reorganization. As soon as the decision to raise the school leaving age had been taken in Cabinet, Trevelyan had opened his negotiations with the Churches, which continued alongside the public launching of his Bill. He realized that this would not be an easy task, and in a sense his hands were to a certain extent tied. In the election Labour candidates had received a good deal of Catholic support, which only served to complicate Trevelyan's task because

"A good many of our candidates went a long way to promising what Catholics demanded." (46)

His proposals, published as a White Paper, (47) envisaged Local Education Authority grants to help denominational managers with any of the costs involved in reorganization. As a quid pro quo the Local Education Authorities were to appoint all the teachers, with consultation taking place with the managers over teachers involved with denominational instruction. Also there was to be right of entry in Council schools to which Church pupils had been transferred as a result of reorganization. The teachers, not surprisingly, were hostile to these proposals, raising as they did all the old questions of religious tests for teachers and professional objections to the right of entry. Trevelyan, under the influence of the Bishop of Pella's advice, thought that Roman Catholic objections to the scheme were not too great. Cardinal Bourne found it necessary to correct the record;

"I thought it right to make it plain that the views of the Bishop of Pella would not be taken as representing the views of himself and the hierarchy generally." (48)

Not only did the Roman Catholics object to the imminent loss of control of their schools, the Nonconformists objected too, realizing that at the end of it all the Voluntary schools would still be there, and in a stronger position (or so they thought). They saw the proposals as;

"Too generous a concern to subsidize Anglican and Roman Catholic interest which could perpetuate a dual system rather than overcome it once and for all." (49)

The campaign against Trevelyan's proposals began to take on dangerous proportions, with each extreme provoking the other to more aggressive denunciations. Trevelyan had incorporated his proposals into a Bill in May 1930 (the Non-Provided Elementary Schools Bill), but opposition to this was so great that it was withdrawn. At the beginning of the following Parliamentary session, Trevelyan, under pressure to achieve positive results, reintroduced his original Bill (Education (School Attendance) Bill) which covered

the Raising of the School Leaving Age. He soon realized that the opposition from within and outside the Government was so great that unless he could come up with some acceptable proposals to help the denominational schools the Bill would be defeated. Consultations were held with the various parties and, not without apprehension in Government circles, (50) the proposals were published. (51) The arrangements he concluded were generous to say the least. Local Education Authorities were to be allowed to contribute 50-75% of the cost of reorganizing Church schools; two systems of appointing "reserved teachers" (those teachers giving denominational Religious Education) were suggested; undenominational Religious Education was to be given in all single school areas and the Anson byelaw was to be made compulsory everywhere. The Anglicans, the Roman Catholics and the teachers accepted these proposals but the Nonconformists objected violently because they feared it would strengthen denominational schools. While all these consultations had been going on Trevelyan's School Attendance Bill had come up against a major obstacle in the form of the Scurr Amendment. This proposed postponement of the operation of the School Attendance Bill until there was agreement over financial aid to the Churches and in any case until 1st September 1931 at least (i.e. at least a year's postponement). Scurr's Amendment was passed and the Lords promptly threw out the Bill, (52) because it contained no agreed financial assistance for voluntary schools. With the failure of this Bill Trevelyan's other efforts sank without trace and within a month he had resigned. He felt that he had not been supported by the Labour party, especially those who put their Catholic religion before politics, and he refused to give any more concessions to the Liberals. Assessments of him were varied; one commentator wrote;

"He did not handle the matter well, he resigned a few days later with a letter blaming everyone but himself." (53)

Two months earlier the Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald, had warned Trevelyan;

"We have been putting all sorts of peoples' backs up recently one way and another and I do not want a first class education row flaring up in this country. Should there be a hitch, everybody will blame somebody else, but in the end we shall be left with the squalling infant in our arms." (54)

This is precisely what in fact transpired. The Labour Government declined to provoke a constitutional crisis over the Education Bill and so Trevelyan went the way of so many of his predecessors.

Dean comments;

"The effect of the failure of the legislation on the Government's position ought not to be minimized. It had been one of its main planks and had been widely welcomed when it was first introduced. Now it was thrown out by the action of the Government's own supporters, whose example was likely to be taken up by Maton's group to attack measures they did not like ... After 1931 Labour's thinking on educational matters tended to stand still...." (55)

Trevelyan's efforts were not entirely wasted however. The conditions he negotiated for financial assistance formed the basis of the agreement which was reached by the new President Mr. Oliver Stanley under the very strong "National Government" in 1936. This is indicative of how much personal tact and political will counted in such matters - qualities which were to come to the fore again in the prelude to the 1944 Act. The 1936 Act was very much a case of being all things to all men. The Nonconformists demanded that any aid to voluntary schools should only be of a temporary nature to cope with the existing crisis. This was met by the decision to limit the time period of the Act to three years, which also had the useful side effect of stimulating both the denominations and the Local Education Authorities to action. The Act provided for grants of 50-75% help with the costs of reorganisation and also broke new ground in that grants were to be made available for the provision of new nonprovided senior schools. In addition the Raising of the School Leaving Age was to be fixed for 1st September 1939 - but unfortunately on that date attention was concentrated on events elsewhere, which effectively

postponed its introduction. The 1936 Act was a balance between all parties concerned. The Anglicans especially would have liked to gain access to their children in Council schools, (56) but the teachers were against any attempts to increase the number of reserved teachers or to introduce the right of entry into Council schools. In spite of disappointments on all sides the Bill, after one or two minor hitches became law. (57)

It had taken 34 years and a great many failures to negotiate this alteration in the 1902 Act. In the interim it is unfortunately true to say that the people who suffered most by the squabbles of the denominations were the children in their schools. Denominational rivalries were still strong enough to cause serious trouble and the 1936 Act provided one such instance in Liverpool, where the Local Education Authority, despite severe overcrowding caused by a constant influx of Irish Catholics, refused to co-operate with the Roman Catholic authorities in providing grants as outlined in the 1936 Act. The final outcome, after direct action by central Government to bring the Local Education Authority into line, was a special Act of Parliament (Senior Public Elementary schools (Liverpool) Act) which permitted the Local Education Authority to build schools and then let them to the denominational managers.

It was, however, only a temporary measure and in 1938 the Spens Report provided further cause for anxiety in Church circles over the future. (58) The Spens report made explicit what was implicit in many of Hadow's proposals; that there should be a break in education at 11, with children in primary schools up to that age going on to one of three types of secondary school as suited their capabilities (grammar, technical and modern, all with "parity of esteem").

Clearly, if the Churches were to take part in this new floruit of secondary education some further agreement would have to be reached with the Government. However, before the situation became critical Adolf Hitler's action had initiated another world wide conflict and, for a time, public interest was otherwise engaged. This was only for a while as the Second World War was to see the passing of the 1944 Education Act, which finally grasped the nettle of the voluntary schools' situation.

Notes on preceding chapter

1918 - 1939 Unfulfilled ideals

1. He was offered a post at the Foreign Office but declined it. A measure of the esteem in which he was held is that when a rumour of the proposed change reached the ears of the teachers they immediately made strong representations to Lloyd George to keep Fisher at the Board of Education.

"An unfinished Autobiography" H.L. Fisher, Oxford University Press 1940, pg. 119.

See also W.D. Dean, British Journal of Educational Studies,

The development of the 1918 Education Act, Vol. 18 1970 pg. 261.

"When he finally left office in 1922 the permanent officials showered their praise on him..." He cared and others did not; McKenna, Runciman, Henderson, Crewe, Fisher. There is not much more to be said".

2. "My first year of office was almost entirely devoted to the works of my department. Cabinet Government was in abeyance.... It was therefore possible for me to concentrate upon the tasks of my office to an extent which after the resumption of normal cabinet government in 1918 was wholly out of the question. This was well for there was much educational work to be done and little time in which to do it. The was was my opportunity."

Fisher ibid pg. 103.

3. His reception was especially warm amongst many of the workers - notably the Bristol dockers. He wrote;

"I have never encounterezed such enthusiasm. They did what I have never seen before or since, rose to their feet two or three times in the course of my speech and cheered themselves hoarse. The prospect of wider opportunities which the new plan for education might open to the disinherited filled them with enthusiasm."

Fisher ibid pg. 106/7.

4. Bell, Randall Davidson, Vol II pg. 1125.
5. Fisher op cit pg. 103.
6. Figures quoted pg. 61 "The State and Education in England and Wales 1833 - 1968" J.J. & A.J. Bagley Macmillan 1968.

7. "Our misdirected schools" C. E. Loseby in The Nineteenth Century and After. Vol 23. pg 279. This was not a new problem. Even in the seventeenth century Henry Peacham complained

"Most gentlemen will give better wages and deal more bountifully with a fellow who can teach a dog or reclaim a hawk, than with an honest learned well qualified man to bring up his children."

Bagley & Bagley op cit pg. 60.

8. Originally this was a noncontributory scheme but under the Geddes Axe the teachers had to pay 5% of their salary from 1922 onwards.
9. This refers to part III of the 1902 Act by which borough councils with a population of 10,000 plus, and urban districts with a population of 20,000 plus became Local Education Authorities for elementary education only. This provision only caused unnecessary administrative complications.
10. Fisher op cit pg. 107.
11. The single exception to this was Rugby where they continued for some years. The scheme was unpopular with some employers who sometimes refused to employ a young person from a Local Education Authority operating the scheme. For details of problems see S.J. Curtis pg. 347, History of Education.
12. W.B. Dean op cit, British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 18 Pg. 268, quoting a memorandum of Fisher's dated May 1917.
13. *ibid*, pg. 269.
14. National Society publication, The Education Act 1918 quoted Cruickshank, Church & State in English Education, pg. 115.
15. Annual report of National Society 1920 quoted Burgess op cit pg. 56.
16. Bishop Knox of Manchester at first opposed Fisher's proposals but later relented so far as to propose a motion supporting them.
17. For his reasons see Cruickshank's admirable précis op cit pg. 112.
18. He later wrote

"If I had consulted my own reputation, I should have let it alone- but I felt it my duty at all events to afford a fresh opportunity for its exploration"

op cit pg. 114.

19. Archbishop Davidson said to his diocesan conference;

"I have come to the pretty sure conclusion that, taking England and Wales as a whole, for every Church of England child in our schools, we have two Church of England children in provided schools."

Also Sir Frederick Holiday speaking to the Annual General Meeting of the National Society in 1923, (speaking as a well known High Churchman)

"Will an exclusive consideration for these schools, without any due regard for the needs of the millions of children who are outside them, bring upon them the judgement, 'He that will save his life shall lose it?'"

Bell op cit Vol II pg. 1133.

20. *ibid* pg. 118.

21. *ibid*.

22. Tablet 3/4/20.

23. His proposals were included in a private members Bill sponsored by Mr. Thomas Davies in the Education Act Amendment Bill, but the measure was dropped due to opposition.

24. Cruickshank op cit pg. 119 quoting Church Times of 12/12/19 and 30/4/20, also Murphy op cit pg. 102.

25. See above pg.150 (note 24) and 153 (notes 34 & 35).

26. 5/1/23 Cruickshank op cit pg. 120.

27. These were to be the basis of any approved scheme between the Anglican and Congregational Churches, (the latter had already accepted them).

- a) That Religious Instruction subject to a Conscience Clause, should be given in all schools.
- b) That it should be undertaken by those who could do it competently and conscientiously.
- c) That its character should be neither vague nor indefinite but sound instruction in the Christian faith.

28. quoted Burgess and Welsby, pg. 57. A short History of the National Society 1811 - 1961.

29. Quoted Cruickshank op cit 119.
30. It is interesting to note that in those troubled times many saw education as a means of providing stability in society. See H.W. Household's article "For the Avoidance of Revolution - the right education for the worker's child." The Nineteenth Century & After January 1923 Vol. 23 pgs. 8-15.
31. See B.Simon, The Politics of Educational Reform 1920 - 1940 Lawrence & Wishart 1974 Chp. 1 pg. 15 - 64.
32. Concluding sentence of Dean op cit British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol 18 pg. 276.
33. ibid see especially pg. 265.
34. Simon op cit pg. 42 footnote 3 quoting Dean op cit pg. 275.
35. A note on the Ministry file by "SG" says this worked well and withdrawals from denominational instruction had been relatively few. Quoted M.A. Travis, Dual System Reform (in England & Wales) 1941 - 1944. M.A. Thesis University of London. Pg. 26 note 2, 1950.
36. See especially Circulars 1325, 1334, 1339 (1924) and 1325, 1358 (1925) quoted Cruickshank op cit pg. 123. The Hadow report was published in 1926.
37. Produced in 1922.
38. Burgess & Welsby, op cit pg. 55.
39. Sir Amherst Selby-Bigge Vol. 110, The Nineteenth Century and After, "Voluntary Schools" pg. 10. He records that in 1931 there were still 119 Church schools in category A but points out that 55.28% of the church's schools originally in the B category remained as apposed to a figure of 68.76 for provided schools. By contrast B.Simon states that as late as 1938 78% of all rural schools remained unreorganised all age schools - many of which were Church schools, op cit pg. 191.

40. Their report, which seemed generally distrustful of the Local Education Authorities, asked for new denominational schools to be provided by the Local Education Authorities and suggested the setting up of local Religious Education Committees to supervise Religious Education in all provided schools. They also asked for the right of entry into all provided secondary schools for denominational Religious Instruction. Cruickshank op cit pg. 126 and Murphy, Church State and Schools in Britain 1870 - 1970 pg.106.
41. J.H.F.Peile Art V "Church Assembly" Church Quarterly Review January 1930 pg. 290.
42. Murphy op cit pg. 107.
43. See D.W. Dean, The Difficulties of a Labour Educational Policy, the failure of the Trevelyan Bill 1929-31" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol 17 1969 pg. 289. Problems were anticipated over the amount of maintenance grant and the method of its payment, i.e. would there be a means test?
44. ibid 290.
45. ibid 292.
46. ibid 294.
47. Published in White Paper Cmd. 3551.4
48. ibid 295.
49. Simon op cit pg. 164.
50. See Macdonald's letter quoted below note 54 pg.195.
51. W.P. Cmd 3786.
52. It was rejected by the Lords on 18th February 1931, after being passed by the Commons on 21st January 1931.
53. Agnes Hamilton pg. 354 "Arthur Henderson" quoted Dean op cit pg. 229.
54. Cruickshank, op cit pg. 121 quoting a letter to Trevelyan 24/12/30.
55. Dean op cit, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol 17 pg.299.

56. They were thinking of the famous Dorset letter of 1928 in which the Board told Dorset Local Education Authority that the question of the right of entry in some council schools which Dorset had permitted was beyond the scope of the Board's administration. This reply caused much concern among teachers lest evasion of the Cowper Temple Clause became wholesale.
57. Roman Catholic agitation which provoked a Nonconformist reaction endangered the Bill for a while as did two amendments by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Lang, which upset the teachers, but eventually these were removed. For details see Cruickshank op cit pg. 133.
58. Its full title was "The Report of the Consultative Committee on Education" - chaired by Sir Will Spens - hence the name.

Chapter Ten

The 1944 Act - the recasting of the Dual System

In many ways the second World War was a great boon to the educational work of the Church of England. It was plain to all that in the late 1930's the Church was not shaping up to the opportunity provided by the 1936 Act. In the three years grace allowed by that Act Roman Catholics submitted proposals for 289 new senior schools whilst the much larger and richer Anglican community could only muster 230 applications. (1) Even this was only scratching the surface of the Anglican problem of a large number (2) of senior children still in old all-age Church schools with no prospect of any improvement by reorganization. These proposals did not materialise until after the war when the Government honoured its pledge made at the beginning of the 1940's to give sympathetic consideration to the agreements made under the 1936 Act but which were halted by the war, (these proposals became the "Special Agreement" Schools of the 1944 Act).

The "great boon" to the Church wrought by the war was the great revival of interest in education which the social dislocation and war time national self assessment produced. As in the first World War people began to plan for the future and the general public became more aware of the short-comings of pre-war British society. Public discussion of values and priorities within society often came back to the sort of education given in the nation's schools. All through the years 1940 - 1944 there was a slow but steady quickening of public interest in educational reform. One significant factor behind this was the effects of evacuation of the cities. Iremonger writes;

"But there were others whose arrival in the English countryside was greeted with pity and disgust. Who were these boys and girls - half-fed; half-clothed; less than half-taught, complete strangers to the most elementary social discipline and the ordinary decencies of a civilized home. Only one answer was possible. They were the products of the free institutions of which Britons are bidden to think with pride....Anyhow, one duty was clear, even the vaguest altruist felt that something ought to be done about it; the more precise fastened on the word Education, and the cry was taken up throughout the country." (3)

One indication of the strength of this movement was the fact that a leader in the Times (of which the following is an extract) was reprinted and sold over half a million copies. The "religious element" was quite marked;

"Yet if the war has emphasized the deficiencies of our present educational system, something more than war-time expedients will be needed to remedy them. More than before it has become clear that the healthy life of a nation must be based on spiritual principles. For many years we have been living on spiritual capital, on traditions inherited from the past, instead of providing for the future. Christianity cannot be imbibed from the air. It is not a philosophy but a religion which must dwindle unless the facts on which it is founded are taught. It is upon such lines, with a bold disregard of obsolete controversies that our State scheme of education needs to be recast." (4)

In many ways the time was ripe for such a "recasting" of the educational system. In 1941 R.A. Butler became President of the Board of Education and brought to it his immense patience, tact and perseverance which finally bore fruit in the 1944 Act. The Free Churches were led by Dr. Scott Lidgett, who, though an old man, wielded his not inconsiderable influence in favour of the final settlement. The Anglicans had in Archbishop Temple a realist who was able to take the pressures of the extremists upon himself and, by the judicious choice of words, was able to carry most of them with him until the pattern of events had rendered their position impossible. Finally, and perhaps crucially, the Roman Catholics were led in the later stages of the Bill by a new Archbishop of Westminster, Dr. Griffin, whose acceptance of the later financial manoeuvres was essential to the success of the Bill.

Even so Butler was in no way unaware of the pitfalls which waylaid a President who attempted to alter the status quo. Quoting Omar Khayyan, he saw in his predecessors

"How Sultan after Sultan with his pomp
Abode his hour and went his destined way"

leaving

"their skeletons and their bones on the long desert route." (5)

The problem which faced Butler was, given that the State could not buy out or seize (6) denominational schools, how could they be brought into the State system and their standards raised and maintained? The problem of outdated denominational school buildings was also quite urgent. In general most of them were old and many, especially in the countryside, were too small. (7) The plain fact was that, on the whole, Provided schools were better than denominational schools (in material terms) and, as the pace of denominational building and rebuilding had progressively slackened since the 1902 Act, (8) there was not much prospect of this great disparity diminishing. Other problems for Butler besides small inefficient outdated units, included the inability of non-provided school managers to cooperate with reorganization due to lack of money; the problems involved with the managers' right to appoint staff; (9) the problem of having more than 10,000 headships restricted to Anglicans and, of course, the ever present problem of the Single School Areas (estimated at about 4,000).

As might have been expected the Nonconformists (or Free Churchmen as they were then collectively known) were solidly in favour of ending the Dual System and abolishing religious tests for teachers. (10) They were supported in this by most of the administrators who objected to the duplication and lack of control which the Dual System produced. (11) The teachers were also against the Dual System and especially opposed any more "religious tests" and any "right of entry" to any nonteachers. They therefore supported the Cowper Temple Clause and wanted to curtail the powers of the managers of Voluntary schools. (12) In an interesting recapitulation of previous events the Trades Union Congress declared itself against denominational schools in 1942, but subsequently local agitation by Roman Catholic Trade Unionists was able to nullify quite effectively the influence of this decision. (13)

On the other side stood the Roman Catholics. They were still strongly in favour of the Dual System and advocated not merely its retention but also its expansion. They were firm in their resolve

to keep their schools and were encouraged to do so by the Papal Encyclical *Divin illius Magistri* of 1929, which stated quite clearly;

"It is clear that there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end.... Both by right and in fact the mission to educate belongs pre-eminently to the Church." (14)

Subsequent statements by the English hierarchy reflected the general attitude of "no surrender" current in Roman Catholic thought.

The largest group of denominational schools was of course the Anglican one, but as usual, the Anglicans were divided as to what should happen to them. The success of the 1944 Act stemmed from the fact that Butler at last managed to detach the main body of Anglican opinion from the Roman Catholics position of "no surrender", and by so doing he was able to gain the desired settlement. Not surprisingly the Roman Catholics felt out on a limb and their protestations against this state of affairs and the results it produced were a marked feature of the passing of the Bill. Butler's task was made easier by dissension within the Anglican ranks. The facts of the Anglican situation were unpalatable to say the least. In this century the number of Anglican schools had declined from 12,000 to 9,000 and she was now educating only 22% of the nation's children (compared to 40% at the start of the century).

In many ways the main body of Anglican opinion had moved closer to the Free Church position on education. The general consensus seemed to be that Church schools, though valuable, were not as indispensable as previous generations had believed. There was still a vocal High Church element pressing for more money and more schools for the Church, but they were weaker than in previous contests. Many Churchmen still set great store by the association of church and school and by the general Christian "atmosphere" of voluntary schools, but there was less insistence on strict dogmatic teaching. Dean Inge's famous words summed up the prevailing attitude;

"Religion is caught rather than taught; it is the religious teacher, not the religious lesson, that helps the pupil to believe." (15)

Thus many Churchmen now favoured the adoption of Agreed Syllabuses and they were becoming more aware of the Church's responsibility to her children in Provided Schools. This feeling had even penetrated the National Society to such an extent that doubts began to be expressed as to the wisdom of the Church's existing strategy. Canon Braley thought it was possible

"For the Church to spend her money much more profitably - that she ought to go out for something bigger and wider than can be obtained by clinging to the present denominational position." (16)

Money was also a major problem for the Church. The cost of reorganising her primary schools was estimated in 1942 at more than £40,000,000. (17) Given that this was an impossible sum for her to raise and given that many Agreed Syllabuses were working well, (18) why should the Church strain every effort to maintain bricks and mortar when this seemed to be unnecessary? The danger, as many saw it, was not merely that the Church would lose her schools, but that the nation was turning to paganism. One correspondent in the Times wrote;

"I have many friends in the Free Churches and I believe no men are more anxious to arrest the slide into national paganism which the present system stimulates. We have had our lesson and a terrible responsibility will rest on this generation if they do not profit by it. We hear a lot about the new England after the war; the first question is, 'Is it to be Christian or pagan?'". (19)

Into this maelstrom of conflicting currents and eddies Butler decided to launch his frail craft of educational reform. Dr. Scott Lidgett had already warned that there were "submerged rocks" which might wreck his chances of success, but Butler had decided that reform could be achieved by a judicious balancing of gains and losses for all concerned, which none would like but all would hesitate to destroy for the sake of the general good.

Behind all the public pressures of the various groups Butler realised that there existed in England a more positive attitude to religion than of late. The consciousness that England was still, at heart, a Christian country was brought more to the surface by the crisis of

the war. Barker characterised this feeling in his phrase "respect for religion" • a combination of;

"Vague uncertainties, real sympathy and good feeling mingled with a large measure of indifference and ignorance." (20)

Parents seemed to think that Religious Instruction was a good thing for their children, although the reasons behind this were not always very clearly articulated beyond the general idea that it was good to teach them right and wrong. (21) This feeling which Barker refers to was largely concealed by a general public undemonstrativeness about religion which, even allowing for temporary wartime religious fervour, had grown steadily ever since the start of the century. This public indifference caused many to shake their heads and say that the country was turning to paganism. An awkward side effect of this public indifference was that the highly vocal and active religious pressure groups in the educational sphere appeared to be of greater importance than they actually were. As is often the case, the deafening silence of the vast majority meant that to a large extent vocal minorities held the field. (22)

In the context of "total war" where two entire nations and ideologies came into direct conflict the situation arose in which the two systems totalitarianism and democracy were inevitably compared. This searching comparison led men to realise the deficiencies of the present and plan for a better future. In a reaction against totalitarianism the stress in England fell heavily on "full democracy". This meant that the future citizens needed to be educated to be able to fulfil their role in post war England. Butler hoped that the "war time spirit" which drew the nation closer together meant that the nation would

"Spread its wings and plane over many of the rugged crags which had hitherto held up the columns of advance." (23)

His predecessor, Ramsbotham, had been largely responsible for the production by the Board in 1941 of a broad scheme of educational reform, known as the Green Book, entitled "Education after the War."

Although it dealt with many aspects of education, attention became centred largely on Chapter IX which dealt with the Dual System.

The Green Book certainly achieved its avowed aim of stimulating discussion and debate. The authors of the book had realised that it was impossible to scrap the Dual System altogether. Apart from the trouble it would cause, such a wholesale take over of church schools would lead to the Roman Catholics demanding special treatment and the Anglicans demanding the ending of the Cowper Temple Clause. Thus, however desirable it might appear on administrative grounds such a solution was not within "l'art du possible" as Butler himself used to say. The Green Book scheme attempted to bring the voluntary schools under close Local Education Authority control and yet at the same time permit them a residue of independence. Thus the advantages of the Dual System would remain whilst its great drawbacks would be eliminated.

The starting premises of the Green Book scheme were that reorganisation had to be completed; that the School Leaving Age had to be raised; all secondary schools had to be brought up to proper standard and that standards for primary schools had to be raised as well. In order to achieve this the denominational schools would clearly need extra financial assistance but they would have to agree to

"Such extended public control as is necessary, not simply to secure a quid pro quo, but to ensure the effective and economical organization and development of both primary and secondary education." (24)

In practical terms it was envisaged that all the financial liabilities of nonprovided primary schools should pass to the Local Education Authorities who would also appoint the teachers (except those "reserved" teachers who were to take denominational Religious Instruction). The status quo was to continue with regard to nonprovided secondary schools except that if managers could not raise the funds necessary for improvements then the schools would be subject to a similar arrangement to that for primary schools.

On the question of Religious Instruction the Green Book was able to take up and use a previous development stemming from the Anglicans. Shortly after the Times' leader mentioned above (25) the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Wales, with the approval of the leaders of the Free Churches issued a joint appeal to

"Strengthen our foundations by securing that effective Christian education should be given in all our schools to the children, the future citizens of our country."

The statement also made reference to children in nonchurch schools - something which indicated the growing concern in the Church for these children -

"We regard our own Church schools as a trust which should be preserved for the sake of the ideals for which they stand. At the same time we most gladly bear witness to the admirable Christian teaching often given by teachers in provided schools. Our one desire is that in all types of schools this teaching should be secured and made effective." (26)

The statement contained some recommendations which later came to be known as the Archbishops' Five Points and they were included in the Green Book scheme. They were;

- a) Universal Religious Instruction, subject to a Conscience Clause.
- b) Religious Instruction was to count as an optional subject for the teachers Certificate.
- c) The school timetable was to be constructed in such a way so as to allow the teaching of Religious Instruction at any time, so that teachers might specialize in the subject.
- d) Religious Instruction was to be inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectors or "some other duly authorised person".
- e) The school day was to begin with an act of worship.

These proposals were approved by the Church Assembly in June and thus became official Church policy. (27) Butler's immediate reaction was one of wariness, he promised nothing except to look at them but he was

"Glad to note the spirit in which the deputation had approached the problems." (28)

A leader in the Times two days later reflected rising hopes that something at last might be done.

"In the past the wholly reasonable reply of successive Governments has been, "First compose your differences and place an agreed scheme in our hands, then legislation will be practicable." "Today the condition had been fulfilled and the sequel should follow." (29)

The Green Book scheme, whilst including the Five Points, envisaged statutory Religious Instruction in all provided schools in the shape of Agreed Syllabus instruction (which was to be inspected.) In nonprovided schools Agreed Syllabus instruction was to be available to parents who desired it for their children.

Many of the administrative bodies were against the proposals, (30) so was the Trades Union Congress, which was very strong in its defence of the apparently threatened Cowper Temple Clause. The Roman Catholics were hostile and pressed for a solution on the lines of the Scottish Solution. (The "Scottish Solution" involved the Local Education Authority owning or renting all the schools in which denominational instruction was given by regular teachers according to the ecclesiastical tradition of each school. There was thus no Dual System, but the demand for denominational instruction was catered for by each Local Education Authority, even to the extent of building a new denominational school on the rates). The Free Churches were also against the Green Book scheme and passed the following two propositions of Dr. Scott Lidgett;

"That the Evangelical Free Churches of the country have for years been opposed to the continuation of the Dual System and that therefore the Committee cannot concur in its perpetuation" (i. e. under the Green Book scheme)

and

"That under the Dual System it is impossible to attain complete equality." (31)

Only the Anglicans supported the scheme, and even they were lukewarm and divided.

Clearly the "sequel" the Times hoped for could not merely be a Bill

based on the Green Book proposals.

Butler realised that a new approach would have to be found to meet the objections to the Green Book and so in the spring of 1942 he produced new proposals which were to be the basis of the final agreement. The new scheme, called the White Memorandum, offered all denominational schools a choice of two alternatives. The first was for denominational schools to be handed over to the Local Education Authorities, who would take over all financial responsibilities. The School would be used as a Local Education Authority school, there was to be no provision of denominational Religious Instruction, but if parents so wished they could withdraw their children from school for that purpose at a set time. In addition denominations could use the buildings on a Sunday and on a weekday when the Local Education Authority did not require it. Finally, this was to be compulsory for all denominational schools in Single School Areas. The second alternative, (which later became the "voluntary aided" category of the 1944 Act) provided that, if managers could find 50% of the costs of alterations and improvements the Government would contribute the rest through the Local Education Authority. Subject to Local Education Authority approval on educational grounds, the Managers would continue to appoint and dismiss teachers and control Religious Instruction. On a more general scale the Cowper Temple Clause was to be extended to all secondary schools (thus standardizing provision for Religious Instruction in primary and secondary schools) and the Local Education Authority was to be given overall control of the development of schools in their area with powers to close redundant schools or alter their nature as the need arose, (subject of course to the President's final ruling on appeal).

The first alternative was great disappointment to the Anglicans, who objected strongly to the proposed compulsory transfer of schools in single school areas. Butler was not insensitive on this point and stated publicly;

"To apply compulsion for the sake of unification of

administration would be neither equitable nor in accordance with our national tradition." (32)

On the other hand the Free Churches welcomed the White Memorandum, especially the removal of the longstanding grievance of the single school areas. Dr. Scott Lidgett even suggested that where an effective choice of schools existed, the Free Churches would not object to a 50% Exchequer grant to denominational schools. This contrasted strongly with his statement of the previous year warning Butler of the dangers ahead;

"By sunken rocks I mean that if the Church of England and particularly the Roman Catholics are going to get any more money than that provided by the 1902 Act, the tide will run out." (33)

The danger for Butler now lay in the possibility that the proposals might be rejected by the Anglicans. Initial reactions were not encouraging; Lord Selbourne followed up a hasty telephone message with an interview where he said plainly that he considered;

"The Church had only got five minging points and was being made to give up all her schools." (34)

General opinion on the Anglican side was that the Green Book proposals had been more favourable to them than the White Memorandum's were. The Memorandum was one of the first documents to be dealt by the new Archbishop of Canterbury, (Dr. William Temple). He delivered a speech to the National Society shortly after his appointment entitled "Our Trust and Our Task" in which he appeared to be taking a hard line on Church schools, coming out strongly in their defence;

"If we wish to avoid Totalitarianism there is merit in the very duality of the Dual System." (35)

Whilst admitting the strength of some of the Free Church's complaints, he was strongly against

"The wholesale surrender or transfer of Church Schools."

Dr. Temple later referred to this speech in terms which

indicated that his position was not quite so hard and fast as his delighted audience were intended to think;

"I was doing a rather elaborate egg dance and some of the eggs are such that it is most important not to break because the smell would be awful." (36)

He certainly succeeded in carrying the High Church element with him. The Church Times praised his "Trumpet Call" and Butler considered his speech "not very helpful under the circumstances". However, The President was able to make significant progress when he met Dr. Temple and Dr. Kirk (the Bishop of Oxford and a High Churchman). He presented the Archbishop with some very embarrassing statistics concerning the age of Church schools and the fact that so many of them were not reorganised. Butler records that these had the desired effect;

"These statistics visibly impressed His Grace, who has confirmed to me since in conversation that it was on this occasion that he realised the Government were in earnest about education reconstruction and that he would have to do his best to wean his flock from their distaste at the White Paper and the alleged threat to their schools." (37)

This was precisely what the Archbishop set about doing. Just over a month later he was able to give Butler a draft report by the National Society which offered the Government some concessions, notably that Agreed Syllabus Religious Instruction should be given in all Church of England schools (not just those in single school areas) which could be supplemented with denominational instruction provided by the managers if they so desired. The appointment of teachers (except for reserved teachers) would rest with the Local Education Authority and the managers would pay "a proportionate contribution" for repairs and improvements to top up Exchequer grants. The Archbishop was attempting to modify a National Society demand for a right of entry for clergy and so this issue was not yet formally introduced. Butler reacted favourably to this confidential interim report and attempted to meet the National Society's requests.

Meanwhile in public Temple was preparing the ground, calling the

Church's attention to the need to have a realistic approach to the Education problem.

"Our main business is not surely to be fighting a rearguard action in perpetual retreat until we are driven off the field by the competition of the resources of the State, but to take care that we are interpenetrating with our influence all that the State itself is doing." (38)

Thus the "eggdance" was continuing in public but in private Temple had no doubts about the position held by the die hards. He regarded them as "detached from reality" and wrote to Butler;

"I have felt all through that what the Bishop of Oxford and his friends have been urging might have been the right policy to adopt (i. e. the Scottish system) in the middle of the last century when the whole thing was starting and consequently also in 1870 it was already too late." (39)

Positive steps came in September 1942 when the National Society formally submitted their memorandum to Butler before it was presented to the Church Assembly. Butler took this opportunity to explain fully the implications of two options in the (now revised) White Memorandum. The deputation expressed its concern over the method of appointing Headmasters and Butler agreed to try to devise a scheme which would avoid a religious test and yet ensure that the Headmaster would be in sympathy with the traditions of the school. Further progress was made when the Church Assembly accepted the Interim Report of the National Society, though a concession was made to the disaffected, notably the bishops of Chichester and Oxford, in the setting up of a Committee to investigate various suggested alternatives, especially the Scottish solution. This Committee reported in favour of the original Interim Report and the Assembly accepted it for the second and final time in March 1943. Even so, it was a close run thing. The impression among many Churchmen was that Butler and Temple had it all previously arranged. In debate Temple had revealed to the Church Assembly the statistics which Butler had produced concerning the backwardness of many Church schools and he appealed to members to support the motion as;

"A wise adjustment to the situation in which we find ourselves." (40)

Later Lord Selbourne wrote to Butler,

"After that debate I don't think Temple could possibly carry the Church in conceding anything else." (41)

In July 1943 the long awaited White Paper on Educational Reconstruction was published. The exact details need not detain us here but the bulk of the proposals were acceptable to the Free Churches and the Anglicans. (42) The Times' leader spoke optimistically of

"The unmistakable trend of the public discussion of educational reform which has been going on with rising intensity during the past two years has made it certain that little if any opposition will be raised to most of the proposals in the White Paper." (43)

There was a great deal of truth in this statement. With one exception all the parties, religious and secular, had accepted the proposals. Only the Roman Catholics objected on the grounds that the financial proposals were inadequate. When he introduced the Bill Butler attempted to spike the guns of the Roman Catholic supporters. If their demands had been met, he said;

"We should have alienated beyond recall certain partners in the field of education who are indispensable, namely the authorities, the Free Churches and the teachers." (44)

The Roman Catholics were not so easily fobbed off. In January Butler had met Cardinal Hinsley who had asked for a 75% grant which Butler had refused. The Cardinal had said that he hoped they would find a solution but;

"We should never be able to stop a section of the Roman Catholic community from shouting."

In the months that followed there was no evidence that any effort at all was being made to "stop the shouting". Far from it, the hierarchy were in fact loudest in their protestations over the Bill. A typical example is this extract from a letter by Dr. Downey the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool to the Times;

"In the midst of the din of contending parties we Catholics plead as we have been pleading for over seventy years, for simple justice. We are prepared to fight for it by any legitimate means at our disposal and to go on fighting for it until we attain our end. Of one thing our opponents may rest assured, we shall never cede our schools or retire from the educational field. We were in that field first long before the State and we refuse to leave it at any man's bidding. We will be true to our own proud tradition." (45)

The tenacity and unity of Roman Catholic opposition so impressed Butler that he made a special trip to Scotland to see for himself how the Scottish system worked. After due consideration he came to the same conclusion as many previous inquiries and rejected the idea that it could ever be successfully applied in England. (46) In spite of this the Roman Catholics continued to agitate against the financial provisions. They were not concerned about bricks and mortar but only about the preservation of a wholly Catholic ethos in their schools;

"Take the buildings, take everything you want, but in the school under the new arrangement every teacher must be a Catholic and the child must have all its education in a Catholic atmosphere." (47)

The hierarchy made it perfectly clear that their protestations were no mere show. In Pastoral letters the faithful were urged to fight the threat to the Church schools and Parents Associations were formed to unite action. The Roman Catholic Trade Unionists were busy sabotaging the Trade Union Congress's Memorandum against Voluntary schools at local branch meetings by organising its rejection. Members of Parliament were lobbied and put under pressure in their constituencies, letters and petitions were organized and written, and funds raised to pay for the presentation of the Catholic case to the general public. It was suggested that the Roman Catholic agitation lay behind the non-appearance of any motion denouncing denominational schools at the June Labour Party Annual Conference. (48) The campaign was so efficient that the Government reacted by circularizing Members of Parliament with information entitled "Roman Catholics and Education" to help

them answer any questions from constituents. It also published various statistics and gave details of the Scottish system and reasons why it had been rejected for England. (49)

The Anglican side was not without its dissenters, but Dr. Temple was able to lead from the front after the White Paper had been published. He made his position crystal clear, referring to it as a "glorious opportunity" for the Church. He accepted that there were one or two things he would like to see changed, but he was not prepared to jeopardise the whole carefully balanced structure by insisting on them. He issued the following warning to the narrow minded in his flock;

"Above all let us not give the impression that our concern as church people is only with the adjustment of the Dual System. We ought as Christians to be concerned about the whole of educational progress. I am quite sure that the raising of the school leaving age will of itself do more to make permanent the religious influence of the school than anything that can be done with directly denominational purpose." (50)

Others took a different view. The Church Times commented on Temple's acceptance of the White Paper proposals;

"Temple and Cowper - Temple have kissed each other".

and started to organise opposition in the form of the Church Education League. (51) The aims of the League were to obtain higher Exchequer grants to aid denominational schools and to secure the opportunity for denominational teaching to be given to Anglican children in provided schools. However, despite all its bluster, the Church Assembly had approved the scheme twice and so there was little prospect of any significant alteration of policy in favour of the League's views. (52)

The Free Churches were also becoming more restive as the Roman Catholic campaign became more uncompromising. They were particularly sensitive over the single school areas and the suggestion in section 39 of the White Paper that denominational teaching could be given in some isolated secondary schools (53) Travis comments;

"On the whole the Free Churches were prepared to accept the compromise of the White Paper, but it was clear that any attempt to squeeze better terms for denominational schools would endanger a Nonconformist revolt." (54)

The general atmosphere of negotiations became less cordial as the Roman Catholic press campaign got under way. Sir Frederick Mander of the National Union of Teachers warned the Catholics at a rowdy meeting;

"Unless you Catholics are careful what you say, you will cause such a wave of feeling in this country that all your nonprovided schools will be swept away altogether." (55)

Butler was equally frank when he warned the Archbishop of Birmingham about the Catholic agitation and its possible results. He also said

"I am quite certain the Bill will be passed and that your agitators will be left high and dry."

The dispute with the Roman Catholics was solely over money. The Catholic community was very apprehensive at being saddled with the task of raising large amounts of money far beyond their powers. Added to this was the unknown factor of rising costs and rising standards. In addition they were concerned that in future all new Catholic secondary schools would have to be financed solely out of denominational funds. (56) Even allowing for the proposed 50% grant for denominational schools they would still be very short of money. Lord Rankeillour put their case very neatly;

"If what used to cost £500 now costs £1,200, it is not much consolation to be told that we are to be allowed £600." (57)

There was a real danger that the rising feelings on all sides might endanger the settlement Butler had worked out. On December 10th in a long main article the Times pressed for a quick decision;

"The time for a settlement is now or never." (58)

This article set out in great detail the carefully balanced structure of gains and losses for both sides;

"More specifically the supporters of denominational schools gain the following points;

- a) They are offered a 50% Exchequer grant towards the capital cost of bringing their buildings and plant up to date. This is entirely new and even applies to the single school areas.
- b) Even in those schools which become controlled schools religious teaching under the provision of the trust deed is to be available on certain days for children whose parents desire it.

They are asked to concede the following;

- a) A large proportion of their schools will in practice have to be surrendered. How large a proportion cannot be known in advance but most people expect that the majority of Church of England schools will go. There will be small chance of their playing any part in the extension of education by the building of new schools, since no grant in aid from public funds will be available.
- b) The restrictions of the Cowper Temple clause will be extended to post primary education.

The opponents of the Dual System gain the following points;

- 1) The number of denominational schools will be greatly reduced.
- 2) The fact that a school is a denominational school is no longer to be an obstacle to reorganization.

They are asked to concede the following;

- 1) New public money is to be spent on denominational schools which find an equal amount without any increase in public control.
- 2) Even in single school areas there is to be no clean sweep!

This able precis of the situation was well timed. Five days later Butler presented the Education Bill to the Commons. Slight alterations had been made to the White Paper proposals to meet the specific points raised in discussion. (59)

It was a broad ranging measure which gave the Minister of Education (60) overall responsibility for education in England and Wales, with the Local Education Authorities being instructed to perform their duties "under his direction and control". (61) The existing complicated system of overlapping school age groupings were all swept away and replaced by a single continuous process of three stages;

"The statutory system of public education shall be organised in three progressive stages to be known as primary education, secondary education and further education." (Section 7)

The Local Education Authorities were charged with

"The spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout those stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of their area."

There were to be basically two different types of schools, "County schools" (formerly called Provided schools and established by the Local Education Authorities) and "Voluntary schools" (formerly called Non-Provided schools and established by denominational bodies). (62) This latter category was subdivided into three, Voluntary Aided, Voluntary Controlled and Special Agreement schools. Denominational schools could opt for either Controlled or Aided status, Special Agreement schools were the result of the 1936 Act and represented the delayed fruition of plans approved under the three year limit of that Act but on which progress had been halted because of the war. They were virtually the same as Aided schools as far as financial and denominational matters were concerned.

In Controlled schools all financial responsibilities devolved upon the Local Education Authority which appointed two-thirds of the managers, the denomination appointing the remainder. Religious Instruction was in accordance with the Agreed Syllabus but denominational instruction could be given by reserved teachers on not more than two periods per week if parents wished. The staff were to be appointed by the Local Education Authority and the headmaster was not to be a reserved teacher, but the denomination was allowed to express its views on the appointment of the headmaster and reserved teachers. In Aided schools the denomination appointed two-thirds of the managers, who, as a whole, were responsible for any necessary improvements, external repairs or new buildings. To assist them in this task the Exchequer was to provide a 50% grant; all other costs were

to be met by the Local Education Authority. Religious Instruction and daily worship were to be fully denominational. The existing power of the managers of Voluntary schools to influence staff appointments were retained, and a teacher appointed to give denominational Religious Instruction could be dismissed by the governors of Unaided schools if he failed to do so "efficiently and suitably". Both Aided and Controlled schools remained the property of the denomination and in all schools there was to be the statutory right of parents to withdraw their children from worship and/or Religious Instruction. The school leaving age was to be raised to 15 (63) and parents became legally obliged to see that their children received an "efficient full time education". Various ancillary services (e.g. school meals, medicals, transport, scholarships for higher education) became the responsibility of the Local Education Authorities, and the principle of a parent's right to have his wishes taken into consideration over the choice of school for his child was accepted.

The Times praised the Bill warmly, calling it;

"A masterpiece of compromise and an inspiring embodiment of educational advance." (64)

All the parties involved welcomed the general advance envisaged by the Bill but the Roman Catholics were still unsatisfied with the financial provisions. The hierarchy stated bluntly;

"We have never accepted, do not accept and never shall accept the Bill as it now stands." (65)

At the other end of the spectrum Hensley Henson Bishop of Durham was engagingly frank;

"It is quite certain that there is no general demand for distinctive denominational teaching among the parents of the children who attend the State schools. Personally I much regret that Mr. Butler did not "grasp the nettle" by making an end of the Dual System but it is too late now to raise that issue. The Bill is drafted. Its rejection would be a great disaster not only for national education but also for national Christianity.

Dissident minorities cannot reasonably expect to have their distinctive requirements satisfied in a genuinely national scheme." (66)

The relatively untroubled passage of the Bill through the Commons was due in no small way to Butler's personal skill and diplomacy and to the very careful preparation he and Chuter Ede had done. The acrimonious overtones of previous debates on this subject were entirely absent, indeed the section which took up most Parliamentary time concerned the abolition of the Part III

authorities, a topic with no denominational connections at all. (67) Butler was very anxious to get the Bill through and so he accepted more than 50 amendments to ease it on its way. He described his position as:

"Very like being on the bridge of a big ship and steering that ship, without respite, past pointed rocks and round submerged reefs. If the weather or the form of people's tempers had been rather worse, I would have had a more unpleasant time; as it was the only occasion when I had to summon the whole Government to my aid was when an attempt was made to bring quite a side issue into the Education Bill itself." (68)

Butler was concerned to offer some positive help to the Roman Catholics and their financial problems, which, he hoped, would reduce the effect of their press campaign. He rejected repeated suggestions that the grant be raised to 75% but, once he had secured that the Anglicans intended to retain very few Voluntary Aided schools and that the Free Churches had no objection, he floated the idea of long term loans from the Government to the denominations. In this, as in all such matters, Butler insisted that the denominations were to be treated equally, but he envisaged that this device was mainly for the benefit of the Roman Catholics. His suggestion was well received by the new Archbishop of Westminster, Dr. Griffin. The financial details were

worked out, accepted by the Cabinet and shown to the Archbishop. (69) Butler had expressed anxiety at the adverse effect of Catholic agitation, but shortly after his discussions with Dr. Griffin he

acknowledged:

"The handsome withdrawal of certain methods of propaganda," (70)

on the part of the Roman Catholics. In the interim the new Archbishop had made it clear that the hierarchy had accepted the idea of a loan;

"If we cannot obtain full justice, at least it should be possible for us to enter into the national scheme of educational reconstruction." (71)

The loan provisions inserted into the Bill took the wind out of many extremists' sails and, with one or two minor adjustments, the Bill passed through all its stages to become law.

Many diverse factors had combined to produce this final success. The decline of religious belief in general and militant nonconformity in particular; public apathy over voluntary schools; the timely appointments of Dr. Temple and Dr. Griffin and the longevity of Dr. Scott Lidgett; the war-time interest in social reform and forward planning; the happy combination in the Commons of Butler and Ede - all these had worked together to produce the 1944 Act. The Act was a triumph of commonsense and compromise and it provided a basis for new educational advance. This basis, Butler said,

"Does violence to no man's conscience.... gives opportunity to every man's individuality, and upon that structure there can be built a system of education which will make the world a better place and life a worthier thing." (72)

Thus, in spite of all that had been said against it, the Dual System remained and even flourished under the Butler Act. It was a different sort of Dual System after the Act, the role of the denominations had changed again - especially that of the Church of England. She claimed to be a "partner in education" with the State but it was to become a progressively more and more one sided partnership. However, out of what might have been a total disaster the Church had salvaged some of her pride and her schools and had even managed to persuade the State to legislate for compulsory

Religious Instruction - the only subject in the entire curriculum which was legally compulsory. The new status for Religious Instruction, coupled with the fact that teachers at training colleges could now specialise in it, did much to provide impetus to a great improvement in the teaching of the subject after the Act. It was an accepted part of the school curriculum, an external examination subject for School Certificate and later O and A levels, and it could be examined by Her Majesty's Inspectors.

The question which now was raised was "would the Church face up to the task?" It was said that the Butler Act presented the Church with a "glorious opportunity," but it was by no means clear on past performance that the Church would take it up. Things were changing in education faster than ever before; the Butler Act was merely the first of a series of adjustments to the educational system. Could and would the Church adapt herself to these changes or would she fade from the scene as some previous denominations had done after the 1870 Act?

Notes on preceding Chapter

The 1944 Act, the recasting of the Dual System

1. These figures exclude Liverpool, which, under the separate Settlement, intended to provide approximately 12,000 more places for Roman Catholics. Figure taken from para 49 White Paper "Educational Reconstruction" Cmd. 6458. For these new Anglican senior schools the impoverished National Society could only offer some of its members a grant of £200.
2. The exact figure was 312,628 taken from the Ministry of Education file. Note 3, pg. 14. M.A. Travis "Dual system Reform in England and Wales 1941-44". M.A. Thesis University of London 1950.
3. F.A. Iremonger, "William Temple, His Life and Letters." Oxford University Press 1948. Pg. 569/70.
4. Leader in the Times 17/2/40. "Religion and National Life."
5. Hansard Vol. 399 Col. 2257 (Butler's first speech as President of the Board of Education). Churchill also wrote to Butler warning him of the dangers of stirring up old embers. He wrote;

"We cannot have any Party politics in wartime"

and he was afraid that the religious issue in education

"would raise these in a most acute form."

Letter to R.A. Butler 13/9/40 Travis pg. 48 op cit. Later he was persuaded by Butler's progress to let developments reach a legislative stage and even to broadcast to the nation including educational reform in a description of how things would be better in post war Britain.
6. Butler confessed that what really killed the White Memorandum was the compulsory transfer of schools it contained. Many saw this as "the beginning of the compulsory transfer of real estate". Minutes of meeting with the Education Committee of the Free Church Federal Council 22/3/48 Ministry of Education file quoted Travis op cit pg. 90 note 1.

7. There were in 1941; 1,713 voluntary departments with less than 30 pupils
 3,024 voluntary departments with less than 40 pupils (of which only 76 were Roman Catholic, the rest being Anglican).

In 1938 there were 10,553 nonprovided elementary schools of which 9,683 were more than 40 years old. Figures quoted Travis op cit pg. 16/7 from Ministry of Education file.

8. Between 1902 and 1938 only 582 nonprovided schools had been built and only 288 rebuilt. *ibid.*
9. E.g. the Local Education Authority could not make a teacher move from a school where he was redundant through lack of numbers to another school where he was needed.
10. See the article in the Times Educational Supplement 25/10/41.
11. E.g. the Association of Directors and the Secretaries of Education, and the Association of Education Committees both strongly advocated the ending of the Dual System with all its "administrative dualism and all its harmful consequences."
12. Their position is made clear in "Educational Reconstruction" published in 1942 by the National Union of Teachers, "the Managers, as a body, should have status not of principals, but of agents of the Local Education Authority."
13. On Roman Catholic agitation see above pg. 216ff
14. Travis op cit pg. 30. Papal influence was also felt later when Butler protested about Roman Catholic agitation to the Apostolic delegate Monsignor Godfrey. He was told that the Pope approved of the firm stand being taken in England in defence of Roman Catholic schools and that it was likely that Roman Catholic pressure would increase rather than decline. Travis op cit pg.185.
15. Dean Inge, Pg. 38 Speculum Animae.
16. "A policy in Religious Education" Canon E.F. Braley pg. 75.

17. Note by the Parliamentary secretary Chute Ede to R.A. Butler 22/4/42 quoted Travis pg. 25 op cit.
18. The Cambridge Syllabus was used by more than 100 Local Education Authorities according to Lord Sanky, Hansard (Lords) Vol 121, Col. 875.
19. Letter to the Times 22/2/41.
20. "Character of England" ed. Barker Pg. 83, quoted Travis op cit Pg. 35.
21. See Hansard Vol 396 Col. 488.
22. See the comment of the Workers Educational Association to the Green Book proposals; they considered that the Board were;
- "Inspired by too great a tenderness to the vested interests concerned and too great attention to a small but vocal body of opinion which is not necessarily that of the parents and of the general public."
- Minutes of meeting 2/1/42 Ed. File Travis pg. 67.
23. R.A. Butler in a speech to the National Union of Teachers conference in 1942. The Times 10/4/42.
24. Green Book para 128 pg. 56 - this control extended to giving the Local Education Authorities powers, subject to the Board's approval, to close redundant schools.
25. See pg 204 above note 4.
26. The Times 13/2/41. Together with a leader entitled "A step forward" the Times gave the statement "a warm welcome and the fullest practical support."
27. Not all commentators at that time saw the Archbishops Five Points in the same rosy light. H. C. Dent wrote;
- "The Five Points did no more than resuscitate all the age old controversies concerning religious instruction in schools .. No intervention could, indeed, have been more ill conceived or ill timed. There was every reason to believe that the controversies about religious instruction had worn themselves out and were at long last peacefully dying a natural death."
- "Education in Transmission" pg. 191 Kegan & Paul Pub. 1944.

28. Times 16/8/41. This deputation, consisting of representatives of all the major Churches except the Roman Catholics, was the first occasion that united proposals had been put to the Government by the Churches.
29. Times Leader "A unique deputation" 19/8/41.
30. E.g. the County Councils Association, the Association of Education Committees, the Association of Directors and Secretaries of Education, the Association of Municipal Corporation, the Workers Educational Association.
31. Quoted Travis op cit pg. 85.
32. Times 10/4/42.
33. Travis op cit pg. 85.
34. Ibid pg. 86.
35. "Our Trust and Our Task" Pg. 8 delivered to National Society, 3rd June 1942.
36. Iremonger op cit pg. 572.
37. Butler described this as the "hot interview" because he took the offensive, because the room was blacked out and very warm and because Dr. Kirk was one of the "hottest" bishops in favour of Church Schools.
38. Iremonger op cit pg. 571.
39. Ibid pg. 572.
40. Church Assembly Proceedings Vol. 29 No 2, 296-9.
41. Cruickshank op cit pg. 156
42. See letter to Times 10/5/43 signed by Anglican and Free Church leaders.
43. Times Leader "A landmark in Education" 17th July 1943.
44. Hansard Series Vol 391 Col. 1836.
45. Times 18th October 1943.

46. For a summary of the reasons see Travis, op cit pgs. 141/2.
The National Union of Teachers also rejected the Scottish solution.
47. Quoted Travis pg. 138 from an interview between the Bishop of Pella and Mr. Chuter Ede 1/1/43.
48. So the Catholic Herald 25/6/43.
49. Local Members of Parliament were under considerable pressure from Roman Catholics. E.g. A pamphlet was sent out in Middlesborough by the Middlesborough District Council of Catholic Action entitled "The Catholic Education Problem ... addresses presented to the Members of Parliament for Middlesborough by a deputation of Catholic laymen." The laity were very active - especially though such organisations as the Sword of the Spirit.
50. Iremonger op cit pg. 573. On another occasion he put it more crudely;
- "I believe our Lord is much more interested in raising the school leaving age to 16 than in acquiring an Agreed Syllabus".
- ibid pg. 575.
51. Their main leaders were the Bishops of Oxford, Gloucester and St. Albans.
52. See above November 1942 and February 1943, pg 215.
53. It was denounced by W.J. Rowland in the Christian World as "the thin end of the wedge" in violating the Cowper Temple Clause. 9/9/43. The Trades Union Congress and National Union of Teachers were also very suspicious of this provision.
54. Op cit pg. 176.
55. Catholic Herald 17/9/43.
56. Some areas were already heavily in debt e.g. the Salford Diocese School debt was nearly £300,000.
57. Hansard Lords Vol. 128 Col. 1025.

58. Times 10/12/43.
59. Notable amongst these was the Transfer concession (designed mainly with Roman Catholics in mind) that if a denomination lost X places by Local Education Authority closure the 50% grant would be payable towards the cost of a new school (for the same population) for not more than X pupils in another locality.
60. The title "President of the Board of Education" was changed to "Minister of Education" by an amendment in the Committee stage of the 1944 Act.
61. Section 1 of the Act. J. Stuart Maclure pg. 223. Education Documents 1816 to present day.
62. In addition primary schools catering for the 2-5 age range were termed "nursery" and schools for handicapped were termed "Special" schools.
63. The Minister had powers to delay it for a maximum of two years. It was raised in 1949. There was also a provision for it to be raised to 16 (Clause 35) "as soon as it became practicable." This did not happen until 1972.
64. 17/13/43.
65. The Tablet 8/1/44.
66. Letter to the Times 23/12/43.
67. H. C. Dent "The Education Act 1944" University London Press Pg. 9. Butler compromised on this to a certain extent.
68. Note from R.A. Butler's personal archives quoted Travis Pg. 167. This "side issue" was Equal Pay.
69. $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ over 30 to 40 years to be arranged jointly through the Diocese and the managers on a strictly business footing.
70. Hansard Vol. 398 Col. 1911.
71. The Tablet 19/2/44.
72. Hansard Vol. 399 Col. 2265.

Chapter Eleven

1944 Onwards, the Fading Power

Developments since 1944 have rather tended to force the Church's hand. The pace of social, financial and educational development has been so great that in many ways the Church has fallen short of the great ideal laid before her eyes in 1944 merely by failing to adjust quickly enough. It must be said that these years have proved to be extraordinarily difficult for all the denominations and also for education authorities, in that constant demands for raising standards or reorganisation have not always been accompanied by the offer of the necessary financial assistance to meet these demands. One thing is clear - the decline of the Anglican sector in schools has been the sharpest. In spite of all the difficulties the Roman Catholic community have maintained a resolute policy and a steady increase in the numbers of their school places, indicating that "where there is a will there is a way".

Immediately after the war was over the planning of the long awaited educational expansion began. Local Education Authorities were invited to submit plans for their areas and Voluntary schools invited to choose between Aided and Controlled status. The National Society urged all its schools to accept Aided status on the grounds that it would be possible, if circumstances made it necessary, to change from Aided to Controlled status. The reverse procedure was not however possible. This resulted in a larger number of Anglican Aided schools than had originally been intended by the architects of the Act but many of them were "Aided-pending-closure", especially in the rural areas. Many small schools were closed down, (Butler referred to it as the "slaughter of the innocents") in the interests of efficiency. However, thanks to a Departmental circular (1) the number of rural primary schools closed was kept down by stressing that each school should be regarded on its merits, because, at primary level, the need to produce large educational units was not so great as at the

secondary level. Minor alterations in the 1946 Education Act gave the Local Education Authorities wider scope in their treatment of displaced pupils in voluntary schools and marginally improved the position of the denominations.

However, apart from the above mentioned Act, everything after the war seemed to be working against the denominations. The very high standards imposed on school buildings by the 1945 Building Regulations and the sharp increase in building costs combined to hamper their efforts to reorganise their schools. The pre-war cost of a pupil place had been £50-£60 but by 1949 it had risen to £195 for a primary and £320 for a secondary place. (2)

This sharp rise induced the Roman Catholics to start a campaign for more money in 1949. Their point was quite simple; in the negotiations over the Bill their liabilities had been estimated at £10 million and now it had risen to £50 million. The position of the Anglican church was of course very similar, but the Church did not press the point quite so hard as the Roman Catholics. After a poor initial response both parties in the run up to the 1951 election indicated that they were prepared to assist in some way.

Help finally came in the form of the 1953 Education (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act which widened the definition of misplaced pupils and went beyond the 1946 Act in allowing Local Education Authorities, under certain circumstances, to establish new Controlled schools. (3) A significant feature was that this was accepted by both political parties as a non-controversial measure.

Another factor which hampered the Churches was the sudden increase in the school population (a rise of $\frac{1}{2}$ million 1947-9). (4) Government grants were not available for new schools and many of the Church's old schools were badly sited to cope with recent movements of population and new housing developments. By 1954 it was clear that the reorganisation of the Church's many rural schools was too slow. (5) There were still far too many senior children in all age schools. Indirect pressure on the Church via

the Local Education Authorities from the Government did improve things slightly but the situation was far from ideal.

In both urban and rural areas it became increasingly clear that, unless more aid was forthcoming, the denominations could not possibly meet their commitments. The Roman Catholics in particular were extremely vocal in pressing their claims for a 75% grant for both existing and new schools. This was understandable in view of the Roman Catholic desire to increase the number of their schools to cater for their increasing school population. (6) The Anglicans on the other hand were not seeking to expand but merely to retain their existing number and the status quo. Many Nonconformists and Anglicans objected strongly to Roman Catholic demands for grants for new schools, but in the end an agreement was reached in 1959 whereby 75% grants would be available for all categories of secondary school where the school catered mainly for the products of existing voluntary primary schools. (7) Burgess comments;

"What is perhaps of the greatest significance about the Act (of 1959) is the fact that it represented an endorsement of the Dual System by the Government and by Parliament as a whole, for the measure went through as an all party measure without division." (8)

The moderate conduct of the negotiating parties contrasted strongly with previous occasions. The Times commented;

"The temperate tone in which the churches have so far advanced their arguments and the disinclinations of politicians to step in augur well for the fulfillment of the last condition. (i.e. that "the controversy is not again conducted at Dr. Clifford's tempo.") (9)

The characteristic pattern of these years was a slow decline in the number of Anglican schools and a slow increase in the number of Roman Catholic schools. (10) The latter increase was in the rapidly growing urban areas whilst the former's decrease was in the slowly emptying rural areas. A scheme started in 1949 in some dioceses called the Barchester Scheme did help to reduce the

Anglican losses somewhat. Under this scheme managers paid funds into a central diocesan pool (which could be augmented by other diocesan income) and in return they were able to claim money from the pool as need arose, thus spreading the load between many schools and over many years. The effectiveness of the scheme was reduced by the early number of large claims which circumstances dictated. (11)

Things were not only changing on the financial front. In 1959 there came official recognition from the Free Churches of the changed circumstances relating to denominational education. The tone and content of the statement were quite explicit and stand in marked contrast to the acrimonious harpings of previous conflicts;

"It is certain that the year 1959 has marked a definite change in the nature of the education problem... The Free Churches saw that their ideal of a nonsectarian Christian education for all children would never become acceptable to either Roman Catholics or Anglicans. And Christians of every church recognized with great anxiety that increasing numbers of children are growing up with no real contact with a church of any kind. The great majority of English people ... live like pagans, belonging to no worshipping community, though perhaps vaguely considering themselves to be Christians. Fifty years ago the situation was not nearly so grave as it is today..... it could reasonably be hoped that non sectarian Christian teaching in day school would be followed by active linking with a worshipping community ... That is no longer true. The Roman Catholics and the Anglicans are quite justified in being anxious about the education of their own and other children, and Free Churchmen must face the situation as it now is." (12)

The decline of interdenominational rivalry and the spreading influence of the ecumenical movement meant that the churches began to co-operate in education.

In the 1960's joint voluntary schools were built and Free Church representatives were invited to sit on the Boards of Management of Anglican schools in Single school areas. On an official level the Anglican and Free Churches combined their educational policy committees to form the Central Joint Education Policy Committee

of the Church of England and the Free Church Federal Council. There was a general drawing together in adversity of the non Roman Catholic denominations in defence of their commitment to a specifically Christian element in education. In the 1970's this spirit of co-operation spread to Roman Catholics and resulted in joint Anglican and Roman Catholic schools. (13)

Further financial assistance for voluntary schools came in 1967 when the Labour Government, with the consent of all parties, introduced an 80% grant on all school buildings, both proposed and existing, primary and secondary, - thus meeting the longstanding Roman Catholic demand for a grant to cover all new secondary schools. Murphy records the comment of the Government spokesman at the time;

"Most Roman Catholics had wanted 85%, but this would have inevitably called into question... the whole distinction between the controlled and the voluntary aided school. No one wants to reopen this major question now. " (14)

On a more general level of the educational changes of the 1960's the position of the denominations in the schools system was increasingly challenged. This was in no small way bound up with the radical reappraisal which was going on into the aims and objective of Religious Education. The work of men such as Goldman, Loukes, Alves, Cox and J.W.D. Smith raised the question of what exactly Religious Education ought to be. (15) Should it be dogmatic or confessional, or experiential? Was the role of the Religious Education teacher that of an educator, apologist or evangelist, should he be dispassionate or committed in his approach, should he seek to proselytise or merely inform? This ferment of questions threw up a question mark in some peoples' minds about the role of the churches in the schools. Even those who approved of the church's involvement in schools wondered if the churches were going about it in the right way by straining every sinew to keep their church schools. Researchers in America produced evidence purporting to show that attendance at a

Roman Catholic school had less influence on subsequent religious observance than the influence of the home had. This seemed to some to put in doubt the Roman Catholic strategy of striving to provide a place in a Roman Catholic school for each Roman Catholic child. (16)

On the Anglican side a report was commissioned in 1967 by the National Society and the Church of England Board of Education to inquire into "Religious Education in schools". The outcome of all this was the Durham report on Religious Education called "The Fourth R". (17) Whilst dealing with the position of Religious Education in schools the report also considered the role of church schools and their *raison d'etre*. The final report reflected the conflicting cross currents of the times, containing evidence from diverse organisations. (18) Amongst its many recommendations were the replacement of the provisions of the 1944 Act concerning Religious Education with something more explicit and flexible; the termination of the method of drawing up and adopting Agreed Syllabuses; the promotion of Certificate courses in Religious Education to produce an adequate supply of specialist teachers; (19) two inquiries to be held immediately, one into the role of the diocesan director of education (20) and the other into the problems of financing church schools with a view to formulating some common policy. (21)

This last point was a major part of the report (as it relates to the subject of this thesis) highlighting as it did the general ignorance about the financing of church schools (except for the known fact that the Anglican sector in schools had shrunk to about 11%). It rejected the wholesale adoption of Controlled status as a way out of financial problems and pressed for the retention of the Dual System (22) in general and Aided status in particular,

"As a way of expressing (the Church's) concern for the general education of all children and young people rather than as a means of giving denominational instruction." (23)

On the evidence the Commission received it was clear that the Church's role in schools and colleges would continue, but on an ever declining scale. There was a great need for detailed information from the dioceses about the state of church schools, (24) plans for the future, financial resources, and necessary commitments. It was clear that, unlike the Roman Catholic church, the Anglicans had a most unwieldy spread of schools resulting from the piecemeal policies of various dioceses. There was a large number of primary schools without the corresponding number of suitably sited secondary schools to receive the primary school pupils. Some dioceses had opted for Controlled status, others for Aided, others had an ad hoc policy, all of which combined to make a rather complicated and unsatisfactory situation.

The main danger to the continued role of the Church as a "partner in education" with the State, was (and is), the severe financial problem of the Church. Since 1944 problems like population growth and shift, educational reorganisation and innovation (middle schools, 6th form colleges, comprehensive schools, nursery schools etc) had all been progressively overshadowed by the underlying financial weakness of the Church. (25) The increase in building costs had continued unabated and, worst of all, inflation had been running at an unprecedented level. In addition to this, restrictions on educational expenditure by many Local Education Authorities had delayed the completion of agreed plans for developments. Thus when an agreed project was finally completed, the Church's portion of the costs had often been considerably increased by the long delay, wreaking havoc with estimates and budgets. To add to all these problems the raising of the school leaving age to 16 was finally implemented in autumn 1972 and this involved extra expenditure in secondary schools on buildings, which of course was an extra drain on Church resources.

In 1972 grave concern over the Church's ability to finance present and future commitments was expressed in a Board of Education Report to the General Synod "Crisis in Church schools". (26) The report detailed the increasing cost of individual projects and

showed how, although expenditure remained high on capital projects, the same amount of money was paying for fewer major works. It was specifically noted that a Church School might need to be altered significantly to meet new circumstances and it was often a case of paying for the new development or losing the school altogether, including the original investment of Church money, (in the sense that it would become a Controlled school). (27) The point was forcibly made with examples that the existence of Church aided schools carried with it continued and unforeseen financial liabilities. The most serious aspect of the report was the gloomy outlook for the future. Working on the basis of 7% inflation it was estimated that the Church needed to find approximately £15 million over the next 15 years to bring existing schools up to standard and to fulfill diocesan expectations. (28) It was estimated that only £4 million would be available from resources over that period of time. The report further concluded, subject to various statistical factors (29) (one of which was a constant rate of inflation of 7% from which the increased cost to the Church would be about 4%) that;

"On the basis of these assumptions and allowing for help from those central funds already described, the estimated cost to the dioceses will rise from £1,025,000 in 1972 to £1,523,000 in 1982 and to £1,983,000 in 1990... By cost to the diocese is meant calls on parochial sources and diocesan central funds. The extreme urgency of the present situation is evident from the foregoing." (30)

The report recommended serious consideration by the Diocesan Education Committees of the plan of the Oxford Diocesan Council for Education. This involved drawing up a plan for all the church schools in the diocese which put them into one of four categories (31) so that when financial considerations forced a reduction in commitments, such a reduction would be planned rather than ad hoc. In other words, the plan drew up the order in which church schools should be jettisoned by the diocese, leaving the best "mix" of best schools until last. By the implementation of such a plan the Diocese hoped to

"Bring home to any outside observer the intention of the Church to have a representative presence in the system in accordance with the sociological realities of our time." (32)

A subsequent progress report produced in 1974 (33) revealed that many dioceses did not have long term (10 + years) plans and that many were doubtful that their assets would meet their present and expected commitments, without even considering any unforeseen new liabilities. Various financial measures were strongly urged to garner for church schools every last penny of money available, but it was recognised that more losses were inevitable. (34)

The Anglican Church was not alone in her financial difficulties. The Roman Catholic church was also experiencing severe financial problems and a joint approach was made to the Government for an increase in the grant. The representations of the churches did not go unheeded and in a written reply on the 30th July 1974 Mr. Prentice stated that the Government were to raise the grant to 85% to assist the existing 9,000 Voluntary schools at a cost of about £1.5 million. (35) This was received with scarcely a murmur by the Commons. However, in a later statement the Association of Metropolitan Authorities gave voice to their irritation over Voluntary schools and the problems they caused educational administrators. The Association was annoyed that such a "handout" had been made without consultation and because

"Such large handouts should not have been promised without some quid pro quo by Voluntary schools such as limitation on educational grounds of their control of admission." (36)

Yet again the size of the Church's contributions to her schools was the subject of comment. How much smaller could this become without being merely derisory? One Opposition spokesman at the time reminded the churches that this increase could not go on unchecked;

"We welcome the recently increased grant to the Voluntary schools, but perhaps I might sound a note of warning. To seek much higher financial aid than this, could in the future constitute a threat to the independence of Church schools." (37)

The present situation (February 1977) of the Church continues to be one of extreme financial embarrassment. (38) A prolonged

period of inflation of more than 20% per annum has devastated the Churches finances. Many dioceses are having to cut their budgets, some are reducing the numbers of their full time clergy. Under such circumstances it is not likely that many dioceses can afford to retain all their schools, especially if large items of expenditure occur, let alone significantly increase their numbers. The words of the Durham Report are being fulfilled;

"It is likely that we shall have to face the prospect that the Church's proportionate contribution to the maintained system will continue to decline, and at a more rapid rate than in the last seven years." (39)

Not that closures of Church schools were without their compensations. In the last few years it has become plain that revenue from the sale of school sites is a major source of income for the Churches' educational work, but this brings its own problems as well. The declining number of school children has hastened the closure and sale of some old or badly sited schools and the question some dioceses are now having to ask is; what can be properly done with the money raised from these sales if the diocesan building programme is complete? Another problem is the reluctance of local parish communities (both Anglican and Roman Catholic) to accept closure of "their" Church school, especially where this means the money raised will be transferred to the central diocesan authority for possible use elsewhere in diocesan educational work. In addition, the Voluntary school supporters have been caught up in the complexities of much recent employment legislation. Such Acts as the Employment Protection Act 1975, Sex Discrimination Act 1975, Trades Union and Labour Relations Act 1974 have considerably increased the dependence of Diocesan Educational Committees on the professional advice provided by the National Society and the Board of Education. (40) The legal responsibilities of Diocesan Educational Committees and managers have thus increased considerably and are yet another burden for the Voluntary schools.

The Church now has a mere toehold in the school system and it is clear that this will not increase but rather continue to dwindle slowly unless the Church takes some positive steps. (41) The role

of the Church has changed considerably since the heady days of 1944. The powers of the Local Educational Authorities and of central government have increased whilst the Church's influence has waned to such an extent that some find it hard to regard her as still being a partner. (42) The transition from being the dominating influence in the field to her present state of relative insignificance has been a long and difficult one for the Church. The changes in the Church's fortunes in education have in many ways mirrored the changes going on in society in general and in the Church in particular. The rationale which lies behind the Church's involvement in schools has undergone significant revision since the early days of the nineteenth Century, and it is to a consideration of this development of the Church's role in these years which we now must turn.

Notes on the preceding chapter

1944 onwards, the fading power.

1. This urged Local Education Authorities to consider carefully before closing down small rural primary schools.
2. M.A. Cruickshank, "A History of the Dual System in England and Wales" PhD Thesis University of Leeds 1955. Pg. 382. Figures quoted by Parliamentary Secretary 22nd March 1951.
3. Report 1953. Cmd 9155. It often made sense to close many small Church schools in a country area and replace them with one new (Church) school. Pg. 13, see also Cruickshank "Church & State etc." Pg. 172.
4. PP Report 1947 Cmd 7426 and 1949 Cmd 7957. See also Cruickshank op cit pg. 171 note 2.
5. 200,000 ibid pg. 172.
6. Cruickshank records that the original estimate of £9 million for Roman Catholic schools had been revised upwards to £29 million in 1951 and £60 million in 1959.
7. Times 23/1/59 and 19/6/59. This was agreed in the context of a great five year expansion plan covering the provision of teacher training and school places. See the Government White Paper "Secondary Education for all". Interestingly enough the centre of the debate was not the future of Voluntary schools but the question of comprehensive schools.
8. Burgess and Welsby pg. 69. The History of the National Society 1811 - 1961. Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge & National Society.
9. Times 23/1/59.
10. For details of Church Schools 1945-62 see Appendix B.
11. Further assistance came in the form of the Church Schools (Assistance by Church Commissioners) Measure in which the Church Assembly allowed the Church Commissioners to make grants or loans for school building. Burgess & Welsby op cit pg. 68.

12. Free Church Federal Council Education Policy Committee Report 1959 pg. 1 quoted in Murphy pg. 122. Church State & Schools in Britain 1870-1970.
13. For example the joint Roman Catholic/Anglican school in Redhill, hailed in the Church Times as "a unity landmark". (27/2/76)
14. Murphy ibid pg. 124 quoting Hansard 724 cols.918, 923.
15. See for example R. E. Goldman, Readiness for Religion; J. W. D. Smith, Religious Education in a secular setting; C. Alves, Religion and the secondary school; H. Loukes, Teenage Religion; Schools Council Working Paper no. 36 Religious education in secondary schools; and many others.
16. For details of this research see Religious Education ed. Dom Philip Jebb. DLT 1968 (8th Downside symposium). His conclusion is quite simple,

"In short I conclude that the empirical basis of the strategy of providing a place in a Catholic school for all Catholic children is extremely doubtful. The hypothesis has failed to stand up to testing."

In a postscript he refers to the work of Greely & Rossi in the United States;

"The conclusion seems inescapable. Catholic schools had an impact only on those who came from families in which one parent received communion every week. Their "success" is almost limited to these families but among such families it is impressive ... The school apparently reinforces the work of the home.... unless religious devotion in the home reaches a certain level, value oriented schooling will have little or no effect on adult behaviour but once the religiousness of the home reaches a critical point the additional effect of the school will grow very rapidly."

op cit pg. 220 A. E. W. Spencer "An evaluation of Roman Catholic Education Policy in England 1900 - 60".

- 17. So called because Ian Ramsey, Bishop of Durham, was Chairman of the Commission.
- 18. For details see *ibid* Appendix A pg. 297 for list.
- 19. The DES and the British Council of Churches produced a report on the numbers of Religious Education teachers in training, which showed that over 60% of all Religious Education teachers in secondary schools had never studied the subject. See "The Recruitment, Employment and Training of teachers of Religious Education" 1971.
- 20. This came out in 1971 in the report of the Carlisle Commission "Partners in Education." National Society and Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- 21. On this see below the General Synod Report "Crisis in Church Schools" pg. 126.
- 22. Recommendation 33 pg. 281.
- 23. " 31 pg. 281.
- 24. " 35 pg. 281.
- 25. Paradoxically, another future threat is that of shrinking school numbers - forcing the closing of some schools.
- 26. Crisis in Church Schools GS (Misc) 17, 1972.
- 27. *ibid* pgs 7 & 8.
- 28. The total of the Schools Committee of the Church of England Board of Education in November 1971 was £12,884,000. At the time of writing the report in 1972 this had been revised upwards to £18 million, working on 7% inflation over the next 15 years.
- 29. These were a)"that the proportion of pupils in Aided primary and secondary schools will remain the same" and b) "that total numbers of pupils in Aided schools will retain their proportion to total numbers of pupils in all maintained schools". *ibid* pg. 9. c) "that the increased cost attributable to inflation will run at 4% per annum."
- 30. *ibid* pg. 10.

31. These were; *ibid* pg. 16
- A. Schools in larger centres of population, all secondary schools and schools with new buildings housing fairly large numbers of pupils.
- B. Schools of medium size in large parishes and in market towns.
- C. Schools housed in new buildings or schools in remodelled buildings which the diocese would like to see continue, but which it could no longer support financially.
- D. Schools which, if needing considerable expenditure on enlargement, replacement or maintenance, ought not to be retained as Aided schools."
32. *ibid* pg. 17.
33. "Crisis in Church Schools Progress report I" GS (Misc) 28th January 1974.
34. Such measures included the revision of any income to educational trusts from renting out buildings to Local Education Authorities; the transfer of redundant church schools to the diocese before selling them, so that money raised from the sale can be used by the diocese for other church schools. (as allowed for by Section 86 of the 1944 Act and section 2 of the 1973 Act).
For detailed information on replies to the questionnaire and recommendations see pg. 8 and 11 of GS (Misc) 28.
35. See Times Education Supplement 2/8/74.
36. *ibid* 27/9/74. quoting from AMA press statement.
37. Norman St. John Stevas as reported in TES 23/8/74.
38. The Roman Catholic Church has its problems as well. A recent press statement (Daily Telegraph 23/2/77) revealed that the Diocese of Westminster alone is £6 million in debt. The cost of a new primary place is now £600 and secondary £1300.
39. Durham Report pg. 244(para 506.) The Fourth R pub 1971 NS & SPCK

40. Other such Acts include the Race Relations Act, Equal Pay Act, Health and Safety at Work Act 1974.
41. Something around 10% of pupils in all maintained schools. For detailed statistics see Appendix. In the independent sector there are currently 128 schools which are of Anglican foundation, (including 24 direct grant going independent). Schools 1977. pg 210ff. Publ. Truman and Knightly Educational Trust. Anglican influence in the independent sector remains proportionately far greater than in the maintained sector.
42. See the recent suggestion by William Van Straubenzee, a Church Commissioner and former Shadow Secretary for Education, that voluntary schools should cease to be denominational but become interdenominational Christian schools. (Sunday Times 11/3/77).

Chapter Twelve

The changing role of the Church

The task of this final chapter is essentially twofold. Firstly, it is intended to be a review of the changing role of the Church in the period studied above, tracing developments in the Church's position from the early 1800's until today. This takes place in the first instance on the relatively simple plane of a brief resume of the events of the period. In any such recapitulation the groundwork has already been done in detail, but it is hoped that the brief overall view of the period will show up the changes in the Church's role in sharp relief. Secondly, an attempt will be made to trace the development of the Church's role in terms of the changes occurring in the "rationale" given by Churchmen for their involvement in schools. There is to a certain extent an interaction between these two elements, but whilst the former can be outlined fairly clearly the latter is much more difficult to pin down. It is always easier to report the "state of the game" than to explain clearly why the various players are actually involved.'

At the beginning of this period it would be fair to say that, in national terms, there was very little educational provision at all. What little there was was dominated by the Church of England, but there were small groups of schools run by other bodies, which effectively prevented the Anglican Church from claiming a total monopoly. In the expansion which took place up to 1830 the Church played the dominant part. Behind the facade of the great flurry of activity there lay a fatal flaw, as least as far as the established Church was concerned. From the outset there was dissension both inside and outside the Church as to what the role of Church and State should be on this issue. The outward sign of this division was the question of nondenominational versus denominational instruction in schools. This raised basic issues such as, the object of schooling, the role of the teacher, the control of the curriculum and the school, and of course, the role and position of the clergy. Outside the

Church other interested parties put their views forward very effectively, adding to the general confusion. Indeed, the very existence of the two Voluntary Societies only served to underline the divisions over education in society.

Nevertheless by the time the State took its first hesitant step in 1833 the predominantly Anglican National Society was by far the larger of the two Voluntary Societies. Up to this point the role of the Church had been that of the provider (but not the sole provider) of the nation's schools. This was in the face of a body of opinion which held that educating the poor was a thing of dubious value - a view which receded only slowly in the face of changing circumstances. The significance of the first State grant to the Voluntary Societies was that it indicated that there was a growing realisation that schools and schooling were important matters. The question was; were they too important to be left in the hands of the Church (or the State) alone?

The answer to this question was both yes and no. Through the activities of Kay Shuttleworth and the Committee of Council on education the Government made it quite clear that, whatever the theorists might be saying, Government influence in education was there to stay and grow. On the other side in the 1840's the sudden upsurge of Voluntaryist sentiment swelled the ranks of the Voluntary Societies and others concerned with school provision (with or without Government aid). (1) A side effect of this sudden increase in activity was the long struggle of the State to establish its right to some degree of control over schools accepting State aid, - a matter that some Churchmen resisted to the uttermost, representing as it did in their eyes a fundamental point of principle, - i. e. who controlled the schools?

In the period 1840 - 1870 the tide of events flowed relentlessly against the Church. Not only was the Church suspected of Romanism, it was shown to be firmly under the rule of Parliament. It also became clear in the 1851 census that its support had been so far

eroded as to reduce it to merely the largest of the sects.

In education her position as the major provider of schools remained unassailable in statistical terms, but it was increasingly questioned by hostile groups and progressively hemmed about by administrative regulations. As the need for Government financial support grew with the growth of the school system, so the hand of the State was strengthened. The Revised Code, whatever else it did, made the schools accountable to outside authority in a way they had never been before. Even so, all the efforts of the Church and the other bodies were in vain in the sense that it became clear that voluntary effort could not meet the increasing demand for schools. This, combined with the fact that it was becoming clear that public opinion was ceasing to regard education as an essentially spiritual matter (and therefore the preserve of the churches) but rather stressing the material benefits of education (and hence the preserve of the State or local effort), all combined to make some revision of the system inevitable. The debate for the 1870 Act was not should the school system be expanded (as thirty years previously) but how should expansion take place? Mere expansion of the existing system would have bolstered the claims of those who saw education as the preserve of the Churches. In any case, such a course was politically not possible, the Government were committed to a policy of "opening up" education, wresting control of it from the unrepresentative churches and putting it in the hands of elected bodies.

In the event the 1870 Act was a political compromise.

Contemporary opinion at first hailed it as a victory for the Church and her supporters. That it was not so can be seen clearly from subsequent events. R. Shannon comments;

"The Church's victory however, as it proved, was Pyrrhic. The failure to "get on the rates" was in the end decisive. The Act of 1870 envisaged Board Schools as merely "filling in the gaps", in fact... by the end of the century the Board School had... established itself as a parallel and equal educational system." (2)

The Act marked a watershed in the role of the Church in schools. No longer was she the major provider of schools and recipient of Government money. Education was no longer regarded just as her legitimate activity, it now was open to School Boards to set up rival institutions. All the earlier theories about the Church as the national provider of education and about the indivisibility of education were overridden in the settlement. The Dual System was a severe loss to the Church in that it was made clear to all that schools were a matter for public control and interest. From this point on (after an initial rise) the number of Church schools was to decline steadily until the present day. (3) The new partner in the Dual System very quickly established the dominant role in the partnership and it was clear that in any future adjustment of the system the Church would be hard put to maintain her position against any hostile Government. All serious consideration of a national school system solely under the Church was henceforth dropped. The preoccupation for the Church for the next 100 years was to be how to defend and preserve her schools. In the ensuing struggle the larger question of the Church's duty to all schools went unanswered or even unasked for a long time. As things turned out it was fortunate for the Church that the next major revision of the system was undertaken by a Government sympathetic to the plight of the Church schools. It was a "plight" too by that stage. From being the first in the field the Church had slipped back to being a hindrance to educational advance. The nub of the problem was the Church's lack of money and waning support for Church schools in the face of perfectly satisfactory (or even superior) Board schools, which had already been paid for anyway through the rates. There was a serious imbalance between the two partners and their ability to fulfil their commitments, but the public influence of the Church was still sufficient to have a decisive influence on the formation of Government policy. The trend of all future developments was to reduce the Church's commitments and

to increase those of the State. Even the generous provisions of the 1902 Act were ultimately to prove inadequate in the light of rising educational expectations and falling support for Church schools. It was only the political value of the education issue in conjunction with residual support for the Church in the Upper House which was able to frustrate the efforts of the Liberals in 1907 - 9, even at the risk of a constitutional crisis.

The period up to the 1944 Act was one in which the Church's support and financial position continued to decline. It must be admitted that the existence of denominational schools made educational progress very difficult in this period. The churches were in desperate need of more financial assistance but they were unwilling to cede any more power to the State to control their schools. On the other hand, the State could not simply buy up the sizeable number of Church schools, but some improvements were imperative in the light of educational reorganisation.

The Act of 1944 was an attempt to set off in a new direction under the device of a new version of the Dual System. As previous experience had indicated, the problems which occupied the minds of Butler and the other chief negotiators did not strike an answering chord in the public at large. The issue of Church schools had declined in terms of political sensitivity and importance. It was not yet dead but the fire and fury of former years had gone. By this time the position of the Church had altered out of all recognition (in practical terms) even from 1902. The Church now found herself faced with an increasingly apathetic public. Church attendance declined and support for Church schools weakened still further. The sharp rise in costs and lack of public support meant that the Church had to go to central government to ask for more assistance. The "partnership" was also becoming more complex. The influence of the teachers and of Local Education Authority administrators was growing, education was becoming an "industry". In those times of expansion the Church was often put in the difficult

position of seeming unable to find the money for improvements and yet also unwilling to hand over her schools to the Local Education Authorities. It all came down to a matter of money, the costs of maintaining her section of the growing school population was too much for the Church.

In the 30 years following the Butler Act the role of the Church as a "partner" has shrunk in quantitative terms to such an extent that many now question the continued existence of the present system. (4) Some have sought to defend the Church's present position in terms of the qualitative contribution Church schools can make to a school system which threatens to become more and more monolithic and uniform. Overall it is clear that not only has the Church been unable to keep up her place in the expansion of the school system which has taken place since the end of the war, but she has rather suffered a reverse greater than that which followed the 1870 Act.

In retrospect it is clear that the Church's policy over the past hundred years has been influenced by four interrelated factors. Firstly, there is the problem of the sheer size of the schools system, and with it the vast amounts of money involved. It is clear with hindsight that the Church on her own could not have catered for the needs of the country in the way in which she intended to at the outset. State assistance was needed from very early on and by the time of Forster's Act it was evident that Voluntaryism in education had failed. From then on the only point at issue was the size and nature of State assistance and the degree of control over schools which it should have in return. But even by 1870 these questions had to a large extent been answered in practice by the bitter disputes of previous years in which a modus vivendi had eventually been struck. The rapid growth of education, especially in the post war years of the present century, would not have been possible if the schools had been the financial responsibility of the Church alone. (As it was expansion and modernisation were difficult enough because of the Church's limited financial involvement). It came to be recognised that schooling was too large and too important an issue to be left to the Church alone and from that

recognition in the late nineteenth century stemmed the decline of the Church in schools.

Secondly, there were from the very beginning of our period very deep and significant divisions of opinion in the Church about her role in the schools and about what exactly education was. Was it essentially secular or religious? This question still remains unanswered in many minds, because if it is "religious" this poses the further question of how it is religious. Some saw her role as controlling all education (seeing it as necessarily a "religious" thing) in her capacity as the Established Church of the realm: 'the nation's Church must clearly look after the nation's education.' Others wanted a wholly State run system with religious instruction given by the various denominations at the end of the school day and on Sundays. Yet again other Churchmen argued for State schools with denominational teaching given at set times by the teachers, whilst others pressed for a nondenominational version of the same arrangement. Some became sickened by all the controversy and wanted a wholly secular State system. With all these varying views it is not surprising that the Church at times appeared to speak with more than one voice and have a somewhat erratic policy! It is not without significance that the much smaller but more consistent and singleminded Roman Catholic community has managed over the years to achieve much more in comparison with the much larger Anglican Church.

Thirdly, there has been a marked decline in the power of and support for the Church. From a position of virtually unassailable strength at the start of this period it has declined to a political force of little significance and, in political terms, some would claim, has been overtaken by the Roman Catholic community. The decline of the country parson and the city clergy has been paralleled in the decline of the influence of the Church's hierarchy. (5) The Church, though maintaining its constitutional position against considerable odds, has in real terms suffered a severe loss of power, prestige and support. The powers of the old fashioned "Establishment" have passed

away although the framework remains intact. (6) Thus when it comes to the issue of schools the voice of the Church carries much less weight than it did in former years and is often ignored. (7)

Fourthly, and perhaps crucially, this period has seen a remarkable development in the concept and function of government, both local and central. The powers of local and central government today and the scope of their responsibilities far exceed anything the Victorians would have felt proper. The laissez faire attitude of so much of the nineteenth century reflected a strong belief that the less government interfered with an individual the better.

Voluntaryism was rooted in such ideas and schools were not the only area of voluntaryist activity; public health, hospitals, roads, etc, were all matters to be dealt with on a local "ad hoc" basis, often by the expedient of setting up a local committee to deal with the problem. State 'control' of education, through the medium of the School Boards was merely one way in which the growing needs of society were catered for. Given such disparity of resources between the Church and State and . . . given that from 1870 onwards the State was officially neutral in its attitude to the Church and schools, it is not surprising that as the power of local and central government developed the influence of the Church declined correspondingly. This fourth factor is perhaps the most important influence behind the social and educational changes of our period, bringing about a gradual but all pervasive alteration to the generally accepted opinions of society. It is to this slow change that we now, with special reference to the Church school, must turn our attention.

The great changes which have come about since the start of the nineteenth century in the way in which the Church has been involved in the English school system have been accompanied by a corresponding shift in thought of Churchmen over Church schools. The rationale of a Church school given in the Durham Report of 1970 contrasts strongly with attitudes prevalent in the early 1800's amongst Anglicans.

To say that there was (or is) a single rationale explaining why the Church is involved in schools is a great oversimplification. As was

usual with the Church of England policies were pursued and supported by various groups for a variety of reasons, and the lack of any specifically Anglican "philosophy of education" (in strong contrast to the Roman Catholics) was a reflection of the fact that the Church of England was in many ways an umbrella organisation spanning views of wide diversity. It is in the relative dominance at a given time of one of many Anglican "philosophies of education" that the key to the development of thought is to be found. There was a wide range of opinion about the role and rationale of the Church school even up to the present day, and there are divisions in the Church over her role in the schools.

In the early 1800's, when the Church dominated the educational scene, the justification of the Church's position derived from the fact that she was the Established Church and as such dispensed any education to the nation's children. It was true that the existence of the dissenting academies denied her a monopoly such as she had had in earlier years. Even so it was accepted by most people that "schooling" came within the domain of the Church, as it was essentially a religious matter. Vaughan and Archer assess the situation admirably;

"This argument was not part of any specifically Anglican educational philosophy. Indeed the plurality of theological interpretations co-existing within the Church from its origin was a deterrent to the formulation of any theories likely to prove divisive or to uncover existing divisions in its midst. The essence of Anglican compromise was to leave unspoken the assumptions which, if expressed, might turn out not to be shared. Such an approach was facilitated by the absence of controversy on the educational role of the church, since no other group endeavoured to compete with the clergy as providers of national instruction." (8)

It is clear that as long as schooling was regarded as a relatively unimportant (or even slightly suspect) matter which affected only a tiny proportion of the child population, then the issue of the Church's role as a serious political issue did not arise. Even when there was disagreement (normally with the Dissenters) it was by and large

accepted that schooling was part of the activity of the churches, argument only occurring over whether the Established Church had a right and duty to educate all the nation's children. The minority groups (Jews, Roman Catholics, Quakers, and later on Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists) accepted at least for a while the general view that if any particular church wanted to instruct their children in a particular way, then the proper thing to do was to build their own schools and get on with it themselves.

However, in the existence of the Dissenting Academies lay the seeds of future dispute. The challenge to the Church's dominance came from without and within. Outside the Church a strong body of opinion developed in the first half of the eighteenth century which supported the line of the British and Foreign Schools Society - i.e. that schooling should be religious, but undenominational. In addition to this a small but vocal group pressed the claims of a totally secular system. At the other end of the spectrum the Roman Catholics wanted more state money to help totally denominational schools run solely by the churches. In the middle of all this stood the Anglican Church, divided against itself on many matters but sure of one thing - the nation needed schools and the Church should be involved in providing them, if that were possible.

The reason why the issue ever arose at all as a national question was that the size and nature of the "education problem" had become more fully appreciated as time passed. More and more children were going to school and the trend showed no signs of being reversed. Indeed, the very opposite was the case as the benefits of education for the individual and the nation as a whole came to be seen. With the realisation that schooling could have a distinctly beneficial effect on one's life, came the corresponding challenge to the assumption that education was essentially religious. Common sense said that secular teaching of secular subjects and skills brought secular gains so why bedevil the issue with religion? Could not the churches teach their own flock separately and leave the schools to secular subjects? Education was too important for it to be left to

the vagaries of denominational conflict. The result of all this debate was that the "unspoken assumptions" were now being spoken and it was being discovered that they were by no means all shared.

Initially the motivation of Churchmen to provide schools had been a mixture of religious and philanthropic desire to help the poor, and to preach the Gospel. Teaching young children the Gospel had meant that the rudiments of reading and writing had to be taught. Teaching was regarded as essentially evangelical, being a "good work" suitable for young ladies and offering hope of salvation to the children of the ungodly and ignorant. (It was also held that it incidentally helped to swell the ranks of the faithful of that particular church and was a good way of attracting new adult members.) (9) Philanthropic motives were not lacking and often they were profitably supplemented by religious zeal. Lord Ashley's Ragged School Union was an admirable example of such a mixture, though it also showed the severe limitations of such an approach to educational provision. (10)

The famous Mrs. Trimmer spoke for many when she roundly declared;

"Surely then, that Church which is one of the pillars of the Constitution as well as the glory of the nation may justly claim the privileges of educating her own member according to her own system." (11)

However, as the nineteenth century progressed this view was increasingly challenged as its practical outworkings became known. (12)

The main challenge came from the State (prompted by a strong Nonconformist element) whose increasing financial commitment had produced the desire for some form of control. In addition there was a growing tendency to secularise education by broadening the curriculum, thus reducing the number of Religious Education lessons (and prescribing that they should be taught at specified times so that children could miss them without "harming the other parts" of their education). Further moves to secularism came with the 1870 Act which could strictly limit the nature of Religious Education given in the school, or even permitted its total abolition. In many ways

the struggle for the control of the schools reflected the Church's struggle to retain her hold on men's minds. As new ideas appeared in science and philosophy men were often put in the false position of having to choose between the Church on the one hand and the claims of the scientist or biblical critic on the other.

Over the years the Church retreated steadily in many spheres (of which education was one) and agnosticism or ~~a~~theism became socially acceptable and even rather fashionable. In education the Church was at its most vulnerable with political, social, educational and economic factors all complicating the fight against the encroaching State and the threat of secularism. With the Church on the defensive in so many areas and under attack for harbouring "Papists" in her midst it is hardly surprising that education became more secular in nature and that the control of the schools slowly slipped away from the clergy and the Church. To suggest, as many clergy did in the latter half of the nineteenth century, that their teaching role extended to the classroom of the local Church school, was acceptable to the general public only in so far as the cleric's teaching itself was acceptable. When, for example, priests used their position to attempt the conversion of Nonconformist pupils the resultant furore was a clear indication that the Church could no longer command acceptance of whatever she chose to teach in her schools. The hard won religious freedom of the Nonconformists was to be defended even in the Church Schools' classroom.

The gulf between the High Churchman and Nonconformists was unbridgeable. On the one hand stood the Anglican clergyman stating his position quite clearly. His task as a teacher of the Established Church of the land was to instruct the children in his schools in the beliefs and principles of the Established Church. This was the very reason why the school existed in the first place and why the Church had a controlling interest in it. Ranged against this view there was a varied opposition, including some Nonconformist parents who might object to the Anglican doctrinal

teaching being given to their child but be unable or unwilling to withdraw him from the school, some Anglican parents who might be unhappy about the Romanist nature of some of the local priest's teachings; others who might object to any doctrinal instruction in schools of any denomination; teachers who might be dissatisfied with their position under the thumb of the local priest.

Perhaps the best example of the clash of conflicting educational philosophies occurred in the 1840's with the Management and Conscience clause controversies. B.R. Marshall explains Denison's position admirably.

"He seemed unaware of the fact that his temporary allies were not only unsympathetic with the grounds of his own opinion, but were, in fact, largely ignorant of their nature and that they were to succumb in the end not because of cowardice but of a fundamentally different approach to the whole problem: - one party because they believed ultimately in the right of the State (temporal Government) to control the "temporal ends" of man and so to a conception of "secular education"; the other because they believed in the integrity of the Church in such a way that her influence could only rightly be brought to bear on society by means other than those which involved co-operation with the State, whether regarded as apostate or irrelevant." (13).

As Marshall hints at in his last sentence, the question of the Church/State relationship was the anchor of the Church's educational activity in the eyes of many churchmen. There were those like Denison, who supported the Establishment whilst admitting its drawbacks, and sought to portray the Church as the State on its religious side with divinely ordained supremacy over every aspect of human life. Through the Church and the Sacraments men's lives were to be transformed by an "infusion of the Holy Spirit and by Divine Grace." The State, in supporting the Anglican educational schemes, did not pay money to an external body, but was merely acting through its spiritual counterpart in the spiritual matter of national education. In this situation it was right that the school, its teachers, pupils and curriculum should be controlled by the parish priest, and such

incursions into the Church's province by the State as the Management and Conscience Clauses should be firmly resisted. Without this overall control how else could the Church ensure the fulfillment of her divinely ordained task of conveying to the nation the idea of the sovereignty of God, the supernatural end of man, the love and grace of Jesus and his eternal Priesthood, and the divine gifts of the Sacraments and the Holy Spirit?

In strong contrast to such a "high" conception of the duty and role of the Established Church were the views of the Nonconformists Miall and Dale:-

"He was convinced from the bottom of his heart that in attacking the Established Church he was waging war against an idea false in itself and vicious in its effects upon the morale of the nation and the Church..."
 "... for men like Miall and Dale - and their followers were numerous and energetic - the union of Church and State was a superstition, blasphemy, and offence against God and Man." (14)

Extreme opposition might be expected from an Nonconformist, but opposition to Denison's views also came from within the ranks of the Church. As the century wore on a number of different rationales of Church involvement were offered as alternatives to Denison's views. Arnold, Maurice and Gladstone (to name but a few) all supported the Church's work - but for a variety of reasons.

Arnold's influence at Rugby and that of the Broad Church party in general, stressed the reformation of character and the duties of the elite as the prospective Christian leaders of the nation rather than doctrinal instruction and Church membership. The Church's role for Arnold was to provide society with young Christian gentlemen, National Christianity (not specifically Anglicanism) was to provide the bond to keep society together. Under the "National Church" (excluding Roman Catholics, Unitarians and Quakers) the whole of society would slowly become enlightened. Talk of separating Church and State was erroneous simply because their

ends were one and the same.

"Religious society is only civil society fully enlightened; the State in highest perfection becomes the Church." (15)

In such a situation all the usual arguments about Church and State would be inappropriate because where Christianity was the common bond no-one could have any adequate reason to want to opt-out. By proposing that all the denominations worship in the parish churches (admittedly holding their own services), (16) Arnold hoped to eliminate all their differences within 50 years. His ideas on the Eucharist were such as to destroy the role of the priest as mediator between his flock and God. The priest for Arnold was merely a member of the Church (as far as sacraments were concerned) although he did concede their "social" role in Christian society. Clearly with such ideas as these his opposition to Denison's position was root and branch. Arnold had virtually eliminated the Church as a thing separate from the State (in its perfected form that is);

"The State without the Church is deficient in the necessary knowledge to achieve its true ends, the highest happiness of man, and the Church desiring the same ends is deficient in power, because it constitutionally lacks sovereign control over human life.... The State having been enlightened by the knowledge of the Church becomes a society seeking the same end which the Church sought, and with the same knowledge, but now with more extensive outward power over outward things. And this was my meaning when I said that in a country where the nation and Government are avowedly and essentially Christian, the State or nation was virtually the Church." (17)

Control of the education system by the clergy was not proper. Whilst the Bible instruction was essential to education (since education was necessarily religious) the schools must be controlled by the State, or denominationalism and factiousness would creep in.

Another Anglican educational "rationale" was offered by F.D. Maurice. He saw the role of the Church as that of

reducing inequality in society. He and his Christian Socialists acknowledged the supremacy of God and the equality of men and acted directly in society to promote both these beliefs. The national Church had a duty to educate the nation, to build up "a consistent and orderly nation". This was to be achieved by uniting the various classes of society in a common bond of the universal human family, and the only group which could achieve this was the clergy.

"He (the clergyman) must think....'I belong to a tribe among tribes; I am a member of a class which stands out from all the classes, which has no right to identify itself with the feelings or interests of anyone, which is bound to consider itself the minister of all'" (18)

Although Maurice was an Anglican he was anti-sectarian in outlook, hoping that the weakening effects of sectarian division could be overcome by making the Anglican Church a truly national church. This National Church was to ensure that the Christian ideal for society was slowly approached. Dissension, sectarianism and narrowness all weakened both the nation and the Church, retarding progress towards the ideal social order. Maurice saw this being achieved first by attaching everyone to a social group and secondly by co-operation between the groups.

"The overriding aims of Maurice's social philosophy was to achieve co-operation between classes. The goal of his socialism was to integrate all classes, not to defend the interests of one. Thus, although he sympathized with the position of the working class, he disapproved of any violent attempts to gain political participation. He was unprepared to trust the people while they were concerned with their rights rather than their duty to God... Unlike many Socialists, Maurice did not strive for social uniformity - he did not wish to abolish classes, merely to change the relations between them. His goal was national and religious unity in the midst of social diversity." (19)

The task of education was to contribute towards the attainment of this goal, but at that time its contribution was negative.

"Here then, Education which we want as the great bond to connect the classes together, which we want as the means of building up a nation becomes the very instrument of dividing us." (20)

The role of the Church was to provide the correct sort of education for each class, imparting to each class instruction befitting its role in society. To this end Maurice was indefatigable in his support of a variety of educational ventures, especially amongst the working-classes. (21) It is in the light of this general frame work that Maurice's opposition to what he called Denison's "claptraps" (see above pg. 49) becomes clear; he could never accept Denison's "narrow" approach to education and the Church.

Perhaps the single most influential figure at that time of conflict was Gladstone. The main principles of his theory were set out in his books, in which he personified the "High Church" attitude to the Church and State problem. (22) Gladstone rejects the idea of the secular State (i.e. the idea that the State has nothing to do with religion). The "liberal" State (which Gladstone watched slowly develop in his lifetime) became increasingly tolerant and finally indifferent to religion. Political liberalism and sectarianism combined to exert great pressure for disestablishment and secular or non-denominational schooling. The progression towards a secular state was slow but inexorable. Vidler comments;

"The theory of the secular State, as in principle it was expounded by Locke and was maintained and developed by the Whigs and Liberals, depended on the view that the State was properly concerned with temporal and material interests only. Religion was concerned with spiritual and other worldly interests.... According to this theory whatever connexion there is between Church and State in any particular country they are in principle separate.... The Liberal State (in) its attitude to religion as well as to economics was laissez-faire." (23)

Gladstone resisted this trend strongly, maintaining that the relationship between Church and State was "natural". The national

religion was a "consecrating principle" for all moral and ethical activity in society. (24) The State was not merely concerned with earthly matters, it was actively involved with morality and truth and had a conscience. National religion was the complement to the activity of the State.

"A nation then having a personality lies under the obligation like the individuals composing its governing body of sanctifying the acts of that personality by the offices of religion, and thus we have a new imperative ground for the existence of a state religion." (25)

Education was for Gladstone an integral part of the nation's culture and as such came under the auspices of the National religion. The roles of the State and the Church were complementary and inextricably intertwined, especially so in the matter of education.

"The State and the Church have both of them moral agencies. But the State aims at Character through conduct. The Church at conduct thro' character."

Gladstone's summing up was carefully balanced drawing all his points together and striking deep against the idea of the secular state;

"Because therefore, the Government stands with us in a paternal relation to the people, and is bound in all things to consider not merely their existing tastes, but the capabilities and ways of their improvement; because it has both an intrinsic competency and external means to amend and assist their choice; because to be in accordance with God's word and will it must have a religion and because in accordance with its conscience that religion must be the truth as told by it under the most solemn and accumulated responsibilities; because this is the only sanctifying and preserving principle of society, as well as to the individual that particular benefit without which all others are worse than valueless: we must disregard the din of political contention, and the pressure of worldly and momentary motives and in behalf of our regard to man, as well as of our allegiance to God, maintain among ourselves, where happily it still exists, the union between the Church and the State. (26)

Gladstone's experiences in politics soon made it clear to him that his early view of Church/State relations did not correspond to

reality. During the later years of his political career, Gladstone saw the Irish Church disestablished in 1869, the court of law delivering verdicts on ecclesiastical matters, the retreat of the Church in confusion against scientists and Biblical critics. In the debates over the 1870 Education Act, Gladstone was honest enough to admit that any "special relationship" the Anglican Church had had with the State was now gone.

Practical considerations had revealed the inadequacies of his ideas - the State was becoming increasingly secular, the Church was becoming less and less "national" and, whatever theological theory might say, the Church was in law answerable to the secular judiciary. (27)

It is scarcely surprising with all these varying ideas of the Church/State relationship that the National Society was for many years the battleground of conflicting theories, throughout the 1840 and early 1850's the battle for control went on. The particular issues of Management or Conscience Clause were merely the points of disagreement of fundamentally different policies. The arguments of the different parties (notably that of Denison's group) were continued in the 1860's in Convocation and it was not until the 1870 Act was passed that Denison's long years of resistance were finally brought to nothing. He commented later;

"The National Society had gone over to the enemy, the Diocesan Board of Education of Bath & Wells with the other Diocesan Boards had done the like, the lower house of Convocation of Canterbury followed at last, and the Church Schools of Church of England for which I had contended for 23 years were finally surrendered into the hands of the Civil Power, for the purposes of the policy of Indifferentism in Religion, first formally set in motion in 1839. This conclusion of the labour of many years could not be without its grievous pain." (28)

The problems of the Church in education arose from a disagreement over her true nature and role in society. B.R. Marshall pinpoints 1839 as the time of critical division.

"At this crucial moment when the Church needed to be aware both of the true ground of its establishment and also of its title to take any part in the process of educating the masses it was hopelessly divided - crippled by misunderstandings." (29)

Marshall maintains that the crisis stemmed from the inability of the Church to adjust her theological ideas (and specifically that of the doctrine of Grace) to enable her to justify controlling an education which was not merely spiritual but whose

"Scope was rapidly being widened to include the possibilities of development of the whole of the life of every man. Was their teaching of the doctrine of grace such that it gave them a pre-emptive right to control the details or even the general drift of the world by development of man? was it likely that the State would encourage such a tendency? Was it not more likely that the State would endeavour to remind the Church of its "true province" and to prevent it from interfering in the State's legitimate concerns?" (30)

With some notable exceptions the Church failed to produce any arguments acceptable to the majority to support such an extension of its influence. The old policy of unspoken assumptions and continuance of previous co-operation based on the old relationship of Church and State was continued until it became clear that the State (prompted by Nonconformists) did not agree to this extension of the Church's power. By that time (Marshall points to the setting up of the Committee of Privy Council on Education in 1839) it was too late. The seeds of Denison's defeat in 1870 were already sown and germinating.

Even so for the Anglicans the uncertainty continued after 1870. Denison was defeated, but there was no consensus of opinion within the Church. In the absence of a clear policy decisions were taken on an ad hoc basis whilst the debate over educational philosophy for the Church continued. In constructing such a philosophy attention had to be paid to the facts of the situation, rising costs, falling income for Church Schools, the ever increasing demand for more school places and a curriculum from which Religious Instruction was

being progressively excluded. Following the 1870 Act interest for some while centred on how the Act would work rather than on trying to restate the principles on which Church schools existed. Indeed, so concerned were Churchmen about the mere survival of their schools and the injustices their supporters suffered, that it was not until the 1902 Act that principles could be seriously debated again.

In the furore surrounding the 1902 Act a new element of realism can be detected in the Church's defence of her schools. Emphasis was placed not so much on the Church's role as the rightful provider of education to the nation, but on the beneficial effects of Church schools (their efficiency, their good educational record, the fact that they had saved the country millions of pounds) and the difficulties they were operating under (no fees, failing support because of the general education rate, unfair competition, increasingly stringent building regulations, etc). Also, taking their cue from their old allies the Roman Catholics, parental choice was produced as an argument.

"Parents should have the right to determine the religious instruction given to their children, and no schools should be penalized because of the religious views held by the teachers or pupils." (31)

It was characteristic of the debate that matters of principle touching on the Church's relation to the State were almost totally lacking. Moderate appeals to reasonableness and the rights of the individual were the order of the day.

"All we ask, all we have ever asked, is that the State shall make it possible for every parent who is compelled to send his child to an elementary school whether elementary or Board, to have that child taught the Christian religion - if he desires it to be taught the Christian religion at all - in the way that he himself thinks right." (32)

What could be more reasonable? Unfortunately it was not strictly true, it was not "all we have ever asked" but considerably less than that - not that the Nonconformists were anymore favourably inclined towards the Anglicans' requests than in previous battles!

The defence of Church schools stemmed from the status quo. The Church could no longer claim to educate the nation, she could not afford it and the nation did not want it. Thus the rationale for church schools was reduced in scale from the national role and rights of the Established Church to the denominational defence of her interests. Practical and political considerations came into play, the idea of rate aid as "rent" for Church schools was prominent in the debate, as was the injustice to the supporters of Church schools of "double rating". By contrast the Nonconformists agitated strongly against the very principle of the Act along the lines of the old conflicts (perhaps detecting that some Anglicans were close to turning the Nonconformists' own arguments against them).

"This, Sir, is not to us a question between rival churches but between citizens and the State. The religious differences between the Church of England and ourselves are not differences which legislation can decide. . . . Our appeal is to the State. . . (and) to the legislation which creates an ecclesiastical monopoly on the schools of the people we will not submit." (33)

In a situation strangely reminiscent of Denison's final defeat the extremists on both sides made their extravagant demands, but practical considerations ensured that some compromise would be reached. Not all the opponents of the Act could follow Dr. Clifford in to passive resistance, seeing the justice in the accusations of Nonconformist inconsistency. As might have been expected the Roman Catholic's defence of their schools was clear cut and forcibly argued, whilst Anglican comment was by contrast somewhat confused. One leading Catholic remarked in 1904,

"It is extremely difficult to know what the Church of England does want, if indeed it has any clear idea itself. . . far too large a proportion of the Anglican laity has no strong convictions on the subject of religious education." (34)

The final acceptance of the 1902 Act can be said to mark the end of an era in the role of the Church in her relation to her schools.

Gone were the notions of the Church as the "nation's spiritual side" educating the nation's children .

The Church was now merely the largest denomination assisting the State in the provision of education. The decline of the status of the local clergyman, the expansion and secularization of education, and increasing central and local Government control of schools had rendered the older rationale of Denison obsolete. The acid test of financial support for Church schools showed Sir Bertram Wardle's assessment (see above note 34) of the Anglican Church to be correct, and in the following years the lack of conviction and support amongst the Anglican laity appeared to be spreading. With the cooling of denominational passions the spirit of ecumenism slowly flourished. Anglicans (and Nonconformists) began to see the danger of education becoming totally secular, especially as the number of Church schools continued to fall. The compulsory Religious Education clause of the 1944 Act was supported by all the Churches who had earlier been at loggerheads and reflected the general concern that education should have an element of religion in it, but by that time the whole tone of the debate had changed. The intervening years had changed matters considerably. Spencer Leeson commented on the official publications of the period 1904-mid 1930's.

"The general impression left by an examination of these papers is two fold. First, there is a reluctance to touch religion at all - a reluctance born of many years experience of bitter contention: though there are clear signs towards the end of the period of an altering view. Secondly there is the assumption that though the State is concerned for the formation of character, ethical teaching unsupported by belief is enough for that purpose." (35)

In the years of Nazi rule in Germany the question of the proper relationship between Church and State was raised in an acute form. Spencer Leeson referred to it in his Bampton Lectures for 1944.

"The god-State stands for the absolute supremacy of its will, against which there is no appeal. That great Church in idea stands for the absolute supremacy of the will of God....Between the god-State and that great

Church there is war eternal unappeasable. The Church... will never admit the indefeasible right of the State to possess the souls and bodies of the children..." (36)

Leeson wanted to see the State doing 'all in its power to encourage good religious teaching' but reserved to the Church (i.e. all the Christian churches) the right to decide what Christian instruction should be. His words make the new situation clear,

"It was to the Church that the faith was committed, not to the State, and Church and State are no longer one, as in idea at least they sometimes were in the Middle Ages, nor will they be again in any future that is relevant to us." (37)

He suggests that four agencies are jointly responsible for a child's education, the Home, the School, the State and the Church. The Church is encouraged to co-operate with the other three agencies and to exercise her teaching role to the full. The clergy must not neglect their educational duties in the schools (nor on the other hand, dictate to the teachers) but seek to reinterpret the Christian truths to each generation in an intelligible form.

Leeson here epitomises the hope and optimism generated by the 1944 Act, encouraging interdenominational co-operation, trying to help rather than hinder the teacher, infusing the home and the State with the influence of the Holy Spirit, defending the conscience clause (both for teacher and pupil), promoting the training of teachers of Religious Education, - all these are aspects of the spirit of the 1944 settlement. Denominational instruction remained under certain circumstances and an overtly evangelical approach to Religious Education was encouraged, but the Church's role in schools was seen in terms of providing the link between the home, the church and the school. The Church was now put in the position where a "Church school" supposedly had something "extra" to offer over and above the non-Church school. There was the opportunity for the Churches to show how their idea of a satisfactory education was superior to that provided by the Local Education Authority. It was a cogent justification of the Church School ideal, and was a challenge to the Church, but again the gap between theory and practice was the fatal flaw.

In the years since the 1944 Act great dissatisfaction has been expressed with some aspects of Church schools. Many have voiced their misgivings over the nature of Religious Education given in the schools and many have wondered what distinctively denominational contribution can be made when sometimes only Agreed Syllabus instruction is given in some Church schools. Much valuable work has been done in this period by the Institute of Christian Education and Student Christian Movement in Schools. These two bodies together with Young Mens Christian Association and Young Womens Christian Association merged to become the Christian Education Movement and their efforts are evidence that the Church has not totally ignored her responsibilities to children in State schools in the last twenty five years.

The whole question of Church schools has been considered at length in the Durham Report, "The Fourth R", both in practical and theoretical terms. It is indicative of the changed circumstances in which the Church is working that religious considerations are no longer regarded as of such importance that 'education' suffers as a result (which was often the case in the early Church Schools). All activities in Church schools must now be capable of being defended as in principle and practice educationally sound. Thus some critics of Church schools say that denominational instruction (which is what voluntary aided schools are supposed to provide) is 'educationally quite inappropriate to the primary school and only rarely acceptable at the secondary level'. (38) Other critics suggest that Church Schools have a protective or limiting role, shielding the child from 'harmful' influences outside the worshipping community and they condemn this 'narrowness' as educationally unsound. If on the other hand the Church School does not perform this function what else does it do? Why then are Church Schools needed? The defence offered by the Durham report is that the Church School can be both 'committed' and 'open' in its approach, "committed" in the sense that the school and teachers represent a particular set of beliefs, but also "open" in the sense that these

beliefs or presuppositions are not

"unchallengable facts or dogmas, and therefore being ready to consider arguments against them... In this sense openness is compatible with having and communicating a definite and defensible position, though the possibility of needing to revise this position will never be closed." (39).

The Report goes on to defend the right of a religious community (where it is economically justifiable) to have a school "through which its common presuppositions can be reflected and communicated... provided that the criteria of openness, as defined above, are preserved." The purely denominational aspect of Church schools is very low key, with the emphasis being on the service to the community rather than the denominational privileges gained thereby. The Report candidly says,

"It must be admitted that in the past indefensible positions have sometimes been adopted both by some of the Church's educational administrators in their political negotiations and also in the actual classroom practice of certain clergy and teachers in church schools. But misunderstandings... should not be allowed to persist. It needs to be clearly recognised by all parties concerned that the Church of England does not wish to perpetuate the Dual System for any mere denominational advantage but because it sees in the Dual System an important opportunity to express in direct service its concern for the general education of the people of the nation." (40).

and again,

"It must be emphasized yet again that in its concern with the Dual System the Church of England is not seeking special opportunities for denominational instruction." (41).

That something "extra" which the Church schools had to offer over and above what a State schools could offer was the benefit which came from the situation where the presuppositions of the home, the church and the school were all the same,

"It is where the shared assumptions of the members of a school's staff coincide with the assumptions of the parents of the pupils that the educational potential of a Church school can become most fully realized.

Where a stable context for personal development is provided by a healthy conscience of school and home, each in its turn related to a Church which is itself a positive source of influence in the local community, then the educational processes operating in that situation receive an extra dimension. It is this type of potential which we would claim for the church school, and it is on these grounds that we believe the continued existence of Church schools can be justified while meeting the most rigorous educational demands for openness." (42)

This Report is the most comprehensive study of Church Schools. Its general tone and practical approach (on its financial recommendations see above pg.237) provide hope, that the problems of the Church school have now at least been outlined and disseminated to a wide audience in an intelligible manner. A rationale for Church schools comes over clearly and, judging by reactions to the Report, seems to have won a certain measure of support. (43) However, doubts have been expressed as to how many of the Church's Schools in fact can be fitted into the above description especially at secondary level. (44) The theoretical justification for the Church's schools (indeed for any denominational school) is stated quite cogently, but when this justification is applied to particular cases it is often seen that the theory does not fit the practice quite so easily. In particular the responsibility of the Church to pupils in State Schools has been marked down as a "blind spot" in the Church's educational activity. (45)

The existence of Church Schools is bound up with the question of Religious Education in the nation's schools - indeed the Durham Report originated from a Commission set up by the National Society and the Church of England Board of Education to enquire into Religious Education. A detailed review of recent developments in Religious Education would not be appropriate, but it must be noted that if Religious Education (as the Fourth R understands it) were ever to be excluded from schools, then the rationale for Church schools provided by the Fourth R would need to be almost completely renewed.

The ambiguities of intention and function inherent in the Church's involvement in schools have perhaps been most clearly articulated in a recent report "The Child in the Church" published by the British Council of Churches. (46) This report, already reprinted six times since May 1976 has provoked considerable discussion amongst Churchmen. It seeks to draw a firm distinction between "education" on the one hand and "nurture" on the other, and it shows a refreshing realism in its appreciation of modern educational trends and their consequences;

"Other developments in education are changing the world for the growing child. For many years the county schools have been seen as agents of Christian nurture. School worship and classroom Religious Education were intended to encourage children in Christian living. But it is now generally recognised that it is unrealistic for the day schools to treat all their pupils as if they were or ought to be Christians. If the schools are to encourage the Christian faith they must also encourage members of other religions and those who do not wish to belong to any religion. The schools seek to develop thoughtful responsibility in pupils and through Religious Education to develop an understanding of religions. The crisis in Christian nurture is thus heightened by the fact that the Church and the school can no longer be thought of as partners in Christian nurture." (47)

The report, whilst maintaining the importance of Religious Education in the school, sees it as an educational activity, standing as such in contrast to the activity of Christian nurture. The former is open, uncommitted, self-critical and nonevangelistic. The latter is committed to a particular Weltanschauung, seeking to give the child his own past, so that he may create his own Christian future.

The consequences of accepting such a set of ideas are far reaching, representing the gap between the role of the Christian (or anyone else) as educator and the specific role of the Christian as nurturer. Where these two overlap (e.g. in the Church School) there should be a clear difference of approach.

"The differing roles of school and Church and perhaps the family in presenting the Bible to children need to be carefully defined. Quite different ways of approaching the

Bible are appropriate, respectively, to Church and School. (The Church school may present special problems.) (48)

That final sentence in parentheses represents an acknowledgement that the Church school is in a peculiar position. It is interesting to note that, in county schools at least, the final sundering of education and any evangelistic activity by the Church has been proposed. Gladstone's theory of "nothingarians" seems likely to be officially realised by this total secularisation of education. Whether this movement of thought to separate education and active religious committment in the classroom will make the final step of carrying this policy over into the Church school remains to be seen. What is clear is that the proposal would mean the Church's abandonment of any claims she might have (or wish to have) to use her influence in the county schools for evangelism;

"The county or "state" school is one among the community's institutions, it is not an arm of the Church." (49)

Instead, the report throws the responsibility for nurturing the young child back onto the worshipping community and the family;

"We recommend that since the Local Education Authority school can no longer be expected to carry any more responsibility in principle for Christian nurture than for the nurture of Muslims, Jews or Humanists, local churches must accept full responsibility for the Christian nurture of their young." (50)

The role of the church school is in need of further clarification, the report suggests, but it does apparently envisage a valuable contribution from those church schools which can manage to live successfully with the distinction between nurture and education;

"The central responsibility of the church school is education. It is as an educational institution that the church schools must be assessed.... This does not imply however that the church schools may not have a responsibility also in the area of Christian nurture. This, when it is attempted, must not be confused with the Religious Education programmes, indeed, any work done in Christian nurture in church schools must be in addition to and not instead of their educational work.

Many church schools are already well aware of these distinctions but further progress must be made in exploring and expressing them." (51)

This is an important point of the Report as it relates to the subject of this thesis. Here "nurture" is regarded as a thing which involves activities and objectives going beyond the scope of the secular educationalist;

"Secular education and Christian nurture have this in common: they both seek to give the child his past so as to enable him to create his own future. But whereas education conceives of this future broadly in terms of the values of our liberal democracy, Christian nurture conceives of it in terms of the Christian future. Secular education fails if a person becomes a bigot but not if he becomes an atheist. Christian nurture fails both if he becomes a bigot and if he becomes an atheist... Christian nurture occupies a middle position between closed and authoritative instruction on the one hand, in which the past is simply reduplicated, and open, enquiring education on the other." (52).

If the arguments of the Report are accepted, any activity which is designed to induce in the child a commitment to any religion (or denomination) is deemed to be educationally unacceptable within the framework of a normal county school. This attitude to the role of the county school is based upon an appreciation of the difficulties which the county schools have had to deal with since 1944, especially in connection with Religious Education. At the time of the Butler Act it was clear that many Local Education Authorities saw themselves participating in the religious renewal of the nation;

"We are at the beginning of a movement to keep Great Britain a Christian nation, or rather to help it become a more Christian nation than ever before... the influence of the schools may be the decisive influence on the life of the next generation." (53)

This general line of thought carried with it certain expectations of and obligations for the new county schools with their compulsory Religious Education given in accordance with the Agreed Syllabuses. Knight comments ,

"The county school (was) thus expected to function as a Christian family and it is assumed that in so doing it will be acting as an adjunct to the home, carrying out parental wishes." (54)

Over the next twenty five years the schools found that they had less influence over their pupils than the parents. Many county schools experienced great difficulties in trying to live up to the expectations of the 1944 Act. This was especially true of Religious Education, where children were often apathetic or even hostile to Religious Education (as it was then taught). There was also considerable confusion amongst teachers as to what they were attempting to do in the Religious Education lesson. This was not helped by a very severe shortage of properly trained Religious Education teachers and the subject suffered from being taught by anyone and everyone on the staff to fill up their teaching timetable. The researches of the 1960's (see above page 236) and the development of the subject over the last ten years have gone some way to restoring its educational acceptability amongst both staff and pupils, but there is still a long way to go. The changes of approach and content in Religious Education were not easily brought about. Knight, commenting on the introduction of the controversial Birmingham Agreed Syllabus in 1974 considers it

"Marks the end of an era in Religious Education. In 1944 it was generally considered that the purpose of Religious Education was to nurture Christian faith and agreement was sought on what was commonly held to be true so that this process could go in county schools in spite of denominational rivalry. Within the space of thirty years the problems of denominational rivalry have become irrelevant and agreement is being sought within the same structure laid down by the 1944 Act on what is commonly held to be worth knowing." (55)

The Child in the Church report works from the assumption that the "modern" Religious Education is here to stay and is regarded as the norm. A confessional or evangelistic approach to Religious Education is considered to be educationally inappropriate because on analysis it is shown to be a form of Christian nurture rather

than secular education. Such nurturing is the responsibility of the local worshipping community not the county school which serves a religiously plural society. In other words, to trace backwards through the period covered by this thesis, the present state of Religious Education has ended up closer to the position of the British and Foreign Schools Society than that of the National Society. The optimism of the Church in 1944 that Christian education at least would be provided in all State schools has faded to be replaced, under the pressure of experience, by a subject that is acceptable in terms of the liberal secular education which surrounds and all but engulfs it.

However the Report does admit the special position of the Church school in all this. Its final recommendation is a mixture of belief and hope, emphasizing the need for guidance and practical successful experience in formulating a credible policy.

"We recommend that the Church schools should explore and express the distinctions between Religious Education and Christian nurture. In particular, what might be appropriate for Christian nurture in Church schools be investigated." (56)

The crucial question is - can Church schools come up with useful suggestions in this area or is the Report asking them to do the impossible? A new version of "denominational atmosphere" is clearly required!

One thing the Report does make clear is the return to the responsibilities of the worshipping community. This trend is not limited to the Anglican church. Shortly after the publication of the "Child in the Church", The Free Church Federal Council Education Committee published a discussion document on Religious Education in county Schools which concluded as follows;

"Equally important, the challenge of our times, and the changing scene in Religious Education which we see ought to be accepted, serve only to remind us that the transmission of the Christian Faith - in education and evangelism and mission - belongs to the Church itself.

"We can no longer hide behind the history of our country, the educational provisions of our country, the established institutions of our country. If Christianity is to remain as a vital and living element in our country it is to the Churches themselves that we must turn There is a duty at home and at church and it is here that the most formative influences are at work. The sooner both Church and parents of children realise this the better it will be for the health and well being of the country to which we belong." (57)

The attitudes lying behind the Child in the Church report do effectively bring to a close one aspect of the Church's work in county schools. For the first time ever it is being openly admitted that Christian nurture (for want of a better phrase) is not the job of the county school. This represents the total secularisation of education given in county schools. Religious Education may remain and even flourish but it is seen as essentially a 'secular' subject, even though it deals with religion. In Church schools as well there is a need to work out a *modus vivendi* for nurture and secular education. The results of such efforts will be carefully watched by all concerned.

In conclusion, it is clear that the Church has made a valuable, if not always thoroughly understood contribution to the development of the school system in England. It is a tribute to the persistence and tenacity of the supporters of the Church's schools that so many of them exist today in spite of their past and present problems. The rationale the Church gives for her schools today will probably not be presented (or accepted) with unanimity and Church schools will probably continue, as in times past, to mean all things to all men. Another example of the influence of the Church in education is the existence today of Religious Education in the crowded school curriculum. The "Fourth R" may well be right in saying that the presence of the Church in education is necessary because it shows that the Church realises how important education is. The reverse is also true, in that religion and the spiritual side of life is important, and education, even modern secular education, should not ignore it. If the Church did abandon her presence in the

schools altogether, she would not only be ending a long and honourable tradition, she would also be effectively signalling her abdication of any effective influence or responsibility for any future development. This is something which her former distinguished advocates would have all fought against, and would represent a retreat by the Church on a scale far greater than anything any of her previous opponents had ever managed to force upon her. As long as the Church can retain the confidence of all her other partners in education this sad situation need never arise and it is the ardent wish of the author that it will not do so.

Notes on the preceding chapter

The changing role of the Church

1. See the opposition to the State Normal School and Normal TTC in 1840 and the Management and Conscience Clause controversies.
2. R. Shannon. *The Crisis of Imperialism, 1865 - 1915*. Paladin Books, 1976 page 90.
3. Platten rebuts the argument that the relinquishing of the Church's control over education was responsible for the subsequent secular trend. Platten op cit pg. 299 BJES Vol 23. 1975.
4. The figure is about 10% now - see the Durham Report *The Fourth R* and see above pg.247 See also William van Straubenzee's recent suggestion that Voluntary schools (Roman Catholic, Anglican and Methodist) should join together to become Christian Schools. *Sunday Times* 13/3/77.
5. It would have been unthinkable for any political leader of the last century to have refused to see the Archbishop of Canterbury because he was "too busy" with the problems of the national economy, as happened earlier this year. (1977)
6. E.g. The monarchy, the House of Lords with Anglican Bishops as members.
7. E.g. Closure of Church Colleges, non representation on Local Education Authorities, "instructions" from Local Education Authorities on the future development of Church schools.
8. F.D. Maurice the Educational Role of the National Church, Michalina Vaughan and Margaret Scotford Archer in Sociological Year book of Religion in Britain 5th Ed. Michael Hill, SCM.
9. Though see above, pg. 85/6.
10. For details see Burgess *Enterprise in Education* op cit Pg. 131ff.
11. "A comparative View of the New Plan of Education..." Mrs. Sarah Trimmer. London 1805. pg. 150/1

12. John Hubbard M.P. in "The National Society and the National Church" 1876 claimed
- "Education is a religious work... The most perfect system of education is that which combines secular with religious instruction."
- Platten comments "such a confident assertion on the 'future of religion and education' would soon be rare". Platten, *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol 23. 1975 op cit, pg. 285.
13. Marshall PhD Thesis page 59. Theology of Church and State 1800-1870.
14. Addison, Religious Equality in Modern England, Pg. 92
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1944.
15. Postscript to Principles of Church Reform. London 1833. Pg.19
T. Arnold.
16. For details on this see B.R. Marshall op cit Pg. 256.
17. B.R. Marshall 266 ff. quoting Arnold "Fragment of the Church"
pgs 11 and 186. 2nd ed. London 1840.
18. F.D. Maurice Lectures on National Education Pg. 179 London
Dalton and Clarke 1839. How far Maurice's contention that
Anglican clergy were drawn from all sections of society and
therefore could reach all of society with their preaching
is debateable - perhaps this was the fatal flaw which reduced the
effectiveness of his arguments.
19. Vaughan and Archer op cit pg. 54
20. F.D. Maurice. "Has the Church..." op cit pg. 33.
21. Maurice thought the upper and professional classes should have a
basically classical education, the middle classes should concentrate
on English language, history and Anglo Saxon (to reinforce their
sense of nationality) and the working classes should receive an
education to make them more humble and human, stressing the
common culture of the national Church rather than just literacy.

22. The State in its relation with the Church 1838 and Church Principles and their Results (all references will be to the 2nd edition 1840).
23. A.R. Vidler. The Orb and the Cross Pg. 21/2 Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1945.
24. He also said it had scriptural support, it was expedient and customary.
25. Church and State Pg. 39.
26. Pg. 83 2nd edition 1839.
27. See above Pg.101note62("May it not rather be said that the tables are turned? There is no special recognition of the Church in the present plan?") Even as early as 1842 when he supported Lord John Russell's Bill to admit Jews to Parliament, Gladstone rejected the claims of the Anglican Church to be the organ of "national religion". She had begun to make impossible demands on the conscience of the State because
- "New features have appeared in the religious movements of the day: a disloyal spirit and a secret preference for an aggressive communion developed themselves in a mode and with a force new to her experience...(so that)... as a public institution claiming to be the exclusive handmaid of the State for religious purposes...she has silently surrendered one of her ancient perogatives, that of being the sole recipient of the bounty, as she is the sole object of control, of the Legislature.
- Quoted - Marshall op cit pg. 607 Speech to Commons 16/12/1847 (published London 1848 pg. 21).
28. Notes on my life. Denison Pg. 358.
29. B.R. Marshall op cit Pg. 366.
30. op cit pg 410.
31. Taken from the Memorial from the Archbishops Conference to the Government November 1895. (See above pg 63).
32. Guardian 4/12/1895. para 1872. Purporting to convey the gist of the Anglican delegation's requests to the Prime Minister.

33. B.H.Smythe M.Ed. Pg. 205 Quoting Fairbairn's Address to Balfour 1902 on behalf of National Free Church Council.
34. Sir Bertram Wardle to the Catholic Conference 26th September 1904 Taken from "Catholics and Education" CTS 1908.
35. Spencer Leeson. Christian Education Longmans 1947. pg. 244. appendix III.
36. *ibid* Pg. 188.
37. *ibid* Pg. 191.
38. The Fourth R. The Durham report on Religious Education National Society and Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1970. Para 473.
39. *ibid* Para 483.
40. *ibid* para 521 pg. 252.
41. *ibid* para 484 pg. 228.
42. Para 484 pg. 228/9.
43. For reaction for and against see Learning for Living CEM Sept. 1970 Pg. 4 and 11 ff. and TES 19th June 1970 article by Lionel Elvin.
44. i. e. 1) where the staff reflect the denominational background of the school.
2) where the school population and membership are of local church and congregation are closely linked.
45. See especially Dr. Kathleen Bliss' article "Politics or only Ruminations?" in Learning for Living September 1970 Pg. 17.
46. May 1976. Report of a Working Party of the Consultative Group on Ministry Among Children. Published by British Council of Churches.
47. *op cit* pg. 9/10 Para 22.
48. *op cit* para 88.pg. 31.
49. *op cit* para 110 pg. 39.

50. ibid Recommendation 12, page 45.
51. ibid para 111 pg. 39.
52. ibid para. 57. Page 22.
53. C.G. Knight "The County School as an agent of Christian Nurture 1944 - 1974." M.Ed. Dissertation Birmingham 1976. Pg. 52.
Quoting the 1950 Birmingham Agreed Syllabus.
54. ibid pg. 20.
55. ibid pg. 122.
56. op cit pg. 46 Recommendation 14.
57. "Religious Education in County Schools" a discussion document
prepared by the Free Church Federal Council Education Committee.
Pg. 15.

Appendix A

Note on the administration of Church schools

For many years after its inception the National Society was the administrative body for the great majority of Church schools. After the establishment of the Committee of Privy Council in 1840 the State slowly expanded its interest in schools. It consolidated its position in 1856 by formally establishing the Education Department, whose head was a vice president of the Committee of Council and who would be the Department's Parliamentary spokesman. In 1870 this became the Board of Education with Forster as its first President. All this time educational administration had become more and more chaotic. The National Society still played a very significant part in advising Church schools on new regulations and in setting up new schools or defending the existence of those under threat of closure. Each church school was in direct touch with the Board of Education in London and matters of grants, "payments by results", and all matters of administrative detail went direct to London. In addition to the Board of Education other Government departments were involved in payments for activities which went on in schools of one sort or another (e.g. the Charity Commissioners, the Science and Art Department, the Board of Agriculture). In addition to the 20,000 or so voluntary schools, these departments also had contact with the 2,500 School Boards of varying sizes, strengths and levels of activity. Small wonder that one of the forces operating on the Government before the 1902 Act was the prospect of total administrative chaos!

During this period the role of the National Society had expanded from its original scope to cover such aspects as Sunday schools and Teacher Training Colleges. As education had expanded so quickly, the National Society had responded by taking on an increased area of activity, even though it experienced severe financial difficulties at times due to the falling off of interest in Church schools, especially after the First World War. Even so in a report to the Church Assembly in 1929 a Committee under the chairmanship of Sir Henry

Hadow recommended that the National Society's role should be further expanded to cater for the growing needs of the Church in all aspects of Religious Education over the whole range of national education. A joint body called the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education was set up with the National Society acting as the administrative base for the new body. This involved a number of alterations to the National Society's Charter which were implemented in 1934 by the granting of a Supplemental Charter. (1) As a result of all this the workload of the National Society increased and matters such as Higher Education now came within the Society's area of responsibility. In 1939 the Church Assembly rather tardily recognised the contribution the National Society was making in this field by granting £2,500 to cover "new Charter work".

From its very early days the National Society had encouraged the establishment of local voluntary groups to support Church schools. Many of these had evolved into some sort of diocesan body which liaised with the Local Education Authorities over church school matters. (2) In 1943 Diocesan Education Committees with statutory powers were established in each diocese. This was an act of great foresight, because the existence of such bodies made various legal and administrative aspects of the 1944 Act much easier than they otherwise would have been. (3) It also strengthened the hand of the Diocese in negotiations with Local Education Authorities over development plans following the Butler Act.

The Diocesan Education Committees dealt with the bulk of the detailed administration of Church schools following the Act, especially those concerned with working out in practical terms exactly what governors of Aided schools were liable to contribute to. In this and in other matters the National Society was there to negotiate and advise with central government departments and to assist in more general ways, such as helpful publications (e.g. see the National Society's publication "The Aided Schools Handbook"). It was also involved with the launching of the Barchester scheme in 1949

which was intended to provide financial assistance for Aided schools.

The National Society had found that the machinery which had been set up by the reorganisation in 1934 was ill-fitted to the tasks the Society had subsequently had to perform. Indeed, at the time of the reorganisation there had been protests that the individuality of the Society would be lost by being too closely associated with central Church administration. In 1947 this was rectified by another administrative reform setting up a new Central Council of the Church Assembly with five departmental Councils covering all areas of responsibility (and on all of which the National Society had representatives). (4)

This released the National Society from the responsibility of supervising the old Central Council and enabled it to regain its old independence and yet retain very close links with those departments of the new Central Council which dealt with schools and Colleges. In 1956 the Church Assembly established the Board of Education but retained the special relationship with the National Society.

The present situation is that most church schools are in touch with their local Diocesan Education Committee usually through the person of the Diocesan Director of Education. Each school is, ultimately, independent in that, if the governors wish they can defy the wishes of the Diocesan Education Committee or even, within certain limits, the Local Education Authority, concerning changes of status or closure. Similarly the Board of Education has no powers of compulsion over the decisions of each Diocesan Education Committee. As a result of this discrete structure, there has been for some time a tendency to adopt an ad hoc policy towards Church schools with each diocese working out its own salvation. There has recently developed an awareness that this was an unsatisfactory state of affairs and, following the impetus of the Durham report, forward planning and the development of an overall policy in schools has played a more prominent part in Church thought and policy statements by the Board of Education. (5)

Notes on Appendix A

1. For details see pg. 61 ff of Burgess & Welsby.
2. *ibid* pg. 16 for details
3. *ibid* pg. 123
4. They were; Religious Education in school
Religious Education outside school
Adult education,
Youth Council
Council for Training Colleges.
5. See especially the report of the Carlisle Commission "Partners in Education" and the reports of the Board of Education on financing schools see above pg.237ff.

Appendix BNew Voluntary Schools 1945-62

	<u>Aided</u>	<u>Controlled</u>	<u>Special Agreement</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Church of England	schools 107 pupils 24360	schools 89 pupils 16670	schools 19 pupils 6420	schools 215 pupils 47450
Roman Catholic	414 114145	" -	97 36910	511 151055
Other	32 6015	36 5625	2 810	70 12450

Appendix CStatistics of Voluntary schools 1950-75

	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
<u>Church of England</u>						
Primary pupils	878703	925166	778494	759993	844691	833923
schools	8568	8098	7585	6915	6228	5727
Secondary pupils	65186	69672	80328	80597	91378	133581
schools	271	268	249	229	212	227
<u>total</u> pupils	943889	994838	858822	840590	936069	967504
schools	8839	8366	7834	7144	6440	5954
<u>Roman Catholic</u>						
Primary pupils	343515	389615	417845	442920	498189	478084
schools	1647	1664	1729	1811	1991	2124
Secondary pupils	51142	69175	129243	195859	243952	316295
schools	186	246	345	485	535	522
<u>total</u> pupils	394657	458790	547088	638779	742141	794379
schools	1833	1910	2072	2296	2526	2646
All schools	27898	28808	29289	28745	28445	28291
All pupils	5651155	6515675	6924281	7092155	7958848	8923979

Schools & Pupils expressed as % of all schools & pupils

	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Church of England schools	31.68	29.04	26.74	24.85	22.64	21.05
Roman Catholic schools	6.57	6.63	7.07	7.99	8.80	9.35
Church of England pupils	21.62	15.26	12.40	11.85	11.76	10.84
Roman Catholic pupils	6.98	7.04	7.90	9.01	9.32	8.90
Church of England pupils						
primary	22.21	20.11	18.53	17.79	17.19	16.35
secondary	3.84	3.64	2.94	2.86	3.00	3.49

Select bibliography

- F. Adams The Elementary school contest. 1882. reprinted 1972 Harvester Press ed. A. Briggs.
- W.G. Addison Religious Equality in modern England, SPCK, 1944.
- B.M. Allen Sir Robert Morant, 1934, Macmillan.
- J. Amery Life of Joseph Chamberlain, Macmillan 1951.
- A. Ashwell Life of S. Wilberforce., London 1880-82
- J.J. & A.J. Bagely, The State & Education in England & Wales 1833-1968, Macmillan 1968.
- G.K. Bell Randall Davidson, O.U.P. 1952
- C. Birchenough History of Elementary Education in England & Wales, 1938 UTP.
- E.F. Braley A policy in Religious Education, 1941 London.
- E.J. T. Brennan (ed) Education for national efficiency - the contribution of Sydney & Beatrice Webb London, Athlone Press 1975.
- C.F.K. Brown The Church's Part in Education 1944, NS & SPCK.
- H.J. Burgess Enterprise in Education, NS & SPCK 1958
- H.J. Burgess & P.A. Welsby A short history of the National Society 1811-1961, NS 1961.
- S.C. Carpenter Church & People, London. Murrey 1959.
- O. Chadwick The Victorian Church. A & C Black, London 1970
- G.K. Clarke Churchmen & the condition of England 1832-1885, London Methuen 1973.
- T.G. Cook (ed) Local studies in the history of education, London, Methuen 1972.
- F.W. Cornish History of the Church of England, 1910 Macmillan.
- J.C.S. Cox The Life of Cardinal Vaughan, Herbert & Daniel 1910
- M. Creighton Thoughts on Education, Longmans 1902.
- M. Cruickshank Church & State in English Education, Macmillan 1964

- S.J. Curtis, History of Education, (1967 edition,) UTP.
- G.A. Denison Notes on my Life, Oxford 1878.
- H. C. Dent Education in transmission, Kegan & Paul 1944
- " The Education Act 1944, ULP.
- E.J.S. Eaglesham From School Board to Local Authority, RKP 1956
- Sir R. Ensor England 1870 - 1944, OUP 1936.
- H.A.L. Fisher An unfinished Autobiography, OUP 1940
- N. Gash Reaction & reconstruction in English Politics, Oxford Clarendon Press 1965.
- J.M. Goldstrom Education. Elementary Education 1780-1900, David & Charles 1972
- J.L.B. Hammond Lord Shaftesbury, Penguin Books, 1939.
- H.Henson The Education Act & After, 1903 London, Methuen.
- W.F.Hook On the means of rendering more efficient the Education of the People 1846.
- F.A. Iremonger William Temple, His life & letters, OUP 1948
- Dom Philip Jebb (ed) Religious Education, 8th Downside Symposium DLT 1968.
- S.E.S. Leeson Christian Education, Longmans 1947 London.
- " Christian Education Reviewed, Longmans 1957 London.
- J.S. Maclure Educational Documents in England & Wales, 1816 to present day, Methuen 1965
- Sir J. Marchant Dr. John Clifford, Life, letters & Reminiscences, 1924 London.
- F.D. Maurice Lectures on National Education, London 1839 Dalton & Clarke
- " Has the Church or the State the power to educate the Nation 1839, London.
- J.Murphy The Education Act 1870, David & Charles 1972.
- D. Nicholls Church & State in Britain since 1820, RKP 1967.

- E.S. Purcell Life of Cardinal Manning, 1895, London.
- T.W. Reid Life of Rt. Hon. W.E. Forster, 1888.
- E.R. Rich The Education Act 1870, Longmans 1970.
- Riley, Sadler & Jackson The Religious Question in Public Education, Longmans 1911.
- B. Sacks Religious Issues in State Schools in England & Wales, University of New Mexico Press 1961.
- R. Shannon The crisis of Imperialism 1865-1915, Paladin 1976.
- B. Simon Education & the Labour Movement 1870-1920, Lawrence & Wishart, Studies in Education 1965.
- " The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-40, Lawrence & Wishart 1974.
- F. Smith The Life & Work of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, Murray 1923.
- T.A. Spalding The work of the London School Board, 1900 ed, King
- D.W. Sylvester Educational Documents 800-1600, Methuen 1970.
- L.B. Tirrell The Aided Schools Handbook NS & SPCK.
- M. Vaughan & M.S. Archer Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain, No.5 SCM (edited by M. Hill), 1972.
- A.R. Vidler The Orb and the Cross, SPCK 1945.
- D. Wardle English Popular Education 1780-1970, CUP 1970.
- N. Wood The Reformation & English Education, London 1931.
- G.M. Young Victorian England. Portrait of an age. (2nd ed.) London OUP 1969.

Journals, Papers and Reports.

Church Times,
Guardian,
Hansard,
Times.

1. The Child in the Church, British Council of Churches 1976.
2. Crisis in Church schools. General Synod, (Misc) A 1972
3. The Fourth R. The Durham Report on Religious Education. NS & SPCK 1970.
4. Partners in Education, The Carlisle Report on the role of the Diocese. NS & SPCK 1971.
5. The Recruitment, employment and training of teachers of Religious Education, British Council of Churches 1971.

British Journal of Education Studies

W.H.G. Armytage, The 1870 Education Act. 1970 Vol 18 No.2.

D.W. Dean, The difficulties of a Labour Educational Policy and the failure of the Trevelyan Bills. 1929-31 Vol 17, 1969.

" The development of the 1918 Education Act, Vol 18 1972.

E.J.S. Eaglesham, Planning the Education Bill of 1902. Vol 9 1961

" Implementing the Education Bill of 1902, Vol 10 1962.

K.M. Hughes, A Political party and education, A Reflection in the Liberal Party's Educational Policy 1867-1902. Vol 8, 1959/60.

W.P. McCann, Trades Unionists, Artisans and the 1870 Education Act, Vol 18 1970.

J.E.B. Munson, The London School Board Election of 1874, Vol 23, No. 1 1975.

S.G. Platten, The Conflict over the control of Elementary Education, 1870-1902 and its effect upon the life and influence of the Church, Vol 8 1959/60

N.J. Richards, Religious Controversies and the School Boards, 1870-1902, Vol 18 No. 1, 1970.

A. Rodgers, Churches and children, a study in controversy over the 1902 Education Act, Vol 8, 1959/60.

Journal of Ecclesiastical History

D.R. Pugh, The Church and Education: Anglican Attitudes 1902, Vol 23, 1972.

N.J. Richards, The Education Bill of 1906 and the decline of political Nonconformity, Vol 23, 1972.

J. T. Ward & J.H. Treble, Religion and Education in 1843. Reaction to the Factory Education Bill, Vol 20, 1969.

Church Quarterly Review

April 1902. Article 11, The New Education Bill.

July 1906. Article 8, Education and Politics

April 1908. Article 1, The Education Bill 1908.

June 1930. Article 5, Church Assembly

The Nineteenth Century and After

C.E. Loseby, Our misdirected schools, Vol 93, 1923.

H.W. Household, For the avoidance of revolution, - the right education for the workers' child. Vol 93, 1923.

Sir A. Selby-Bigge, Voluntary schools, Vol 110, 1931.

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society

J.H.S. Kent, The role of religion in the cultural structure of the Victorian city, 1973 Vol. 23, 5th series.

Theses and Dissertations consulted

- A. Bentley The transformation of the Evangelical party in the Church of England in the later nineteenth century. Ph.D. Durham 1971.
- M.A. Cruickshank . A History of the Dual System in England and Wales. Ph. D. Leeds 1955.
- E. Daniels The Educational thought of S. T. Coleridge M. Ed. Durham 1976
- J. A. Dewey An Examination of the role of the Church & State in the development of Elementary Education in North Staffordshire between 1870 and 1903. Ph D. Keele 1971.
- G. C. Jones Spencer Leeson's contribution to Religious Education M, Ed Birmingham 1971.
- M. Fleming Church, State and Society in the thought of F. D. Maurice. M. A. Durham 1973.
- C. G. Knight The County school as an agent of Christian nurture 1944-1974. M. Ed. Birmingham 1976.
- B. R. Marshall Theology of Church and State 1800-1870. D. Phil. Oxford 1956.
- T. McManners The work of Lord Brougham for English Education. Durham M. Ed. 1952.
- A. Pomfret Reaction of the Established Church of Educational Legislation 1918-1959. M. A. London. 1969.
- M. K. Smith Relations between the Church of England and the State 1838-1870. M. A. Sheffield.
- B. H. Smythe Church attitudes to Education at the end of the nineteenth century. M, Ed Durham. 1969.
- J. Sullivan The Educational work of Robert Lowe. M. A. London 1951.
- J. R. Tate The Life of W. F. Hook M. A. Durham 1971.
- M. A. Travis Dual system reform in England & Wales 1941-44. M. A. London. 1950.
- W. H. Wright The Voluntary principle in education. Durham 1964. M. Ed.