Educational reform in Germany 1918-1933

Martin, G W

ABSTRACT

(Educational Reform in Germany, 1918-1933)

This thesis is an account of educational reform - proposed, attempted, and achieved - in the so-called Weimar Republic. After an outline of the pre-1918 school system there follows a description of the political background to the Weimar period, with special attention given to the currents of political opinion in favour of educational reform. Next comes a survey of the Pedagogical Movement, the collective name applied to the various independent trends among educational reformer in the years before and after the Great War, such as the youth movement, the art educational movement, the establishment of many private boarding schools, and the attempts to create the Arbeitsschule and the Einheitschule. Then follows a description of the involvement of the central government in educational reform during the Weimar period, including such topics as the educational clauses of the Weimar Constitution, the Reich School Conference of 1920, the fate of the Reich Grundschule Law of 1920, and the unsuccessful attempts to establish the non-denominational Volksschule as the standard type of school for most children. After that comes a survey of the attempts at Länder level to give effect to the prevailing ideas in education, dealing in particular with the attempts to implement the concept of the Einheitsschule at all stages of education from the Grundschule to vocational and adult education. Following that is a description of the part played by the public experimental schools which were a feature of this period, special attention being devoted to the main

centres of such activity - Hamburg, Bremen, and Berlin. The last chapter looks at reform in the universities and at the not inconsiderable changes made in the arrangements for training Volksschule teachers. The conclusion sets out to define the essential spirit of educational reform in the Weimar Republic and to assess its significance for German education since 1945.

The University of Durham

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN GERMANY; 1918-1933

being a thesis submitted for the Degree of
Master of Education
in the University of Durham

by

GEOFFREY WILLIAM MARTIN

April 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

The Great War ended in 1918 with the collapse of the Kaiser's regime and the surrender of the German army. This was an abrupt change in the course of Germany's national affairs, although pressure had already been building up for some time for reforms in certain spheres. Among these was education. With the new republican constitution it would seem that the way was now open for extensive changes in the structure of the nation in general and in education in particular, so that the shortcomings of the past could be put to rights, democracy could have a chance to take root, and a fresh start could be made after defeat in war had shaken national pride. In the following pages, then, it is intended to examine the origins, progress, and significance of educational reform - proposed, attempted, and achieved - between the end of the First World War and Hitler's coming to power in 1933, the period of the so-called Weimar Republic. Thereby it is hoped to demonstrate to what extent the opportunity for a restructuring of German society was exploited and to what extent this opportunity was missed.

The first task in such a survey is to clarify what is implicit in the term "reform". In this it is especially necessary to distinguish "reform" from "change", for, although they can sometimes be used as synonyms, there is an essential difference between the two, a difference which determines up to a point the material to be presented here. It must be observed in this respect that, while all reforms are changes, not all changes are reforms. In other words, a reform is a type of limited change. It would appear, in fact, that a reform is a deliberate, purposeful change based on an analysis of the deficiencies in a given situation

together with a plan for their improvement. This implies that change, in the wider sense, may be haphazard and not attributable to any recognisable cause, whereas reform must come about as the result of some human action and can, therefore, be judged by moral principles. Reform, then, proceeds from the volitional choice of certain individuals.

It is also necessary to distinguish "reform" from "reaction". Both are deliberately willed changes, the latter suggesting the wish to return to a formerly existing state, whereas the former, while not excluding such a course of action, tends to be more frequently employed as meaning a moving forward away from past malpractices. It is a matter of emphasis, but the reformer is basically more interested in righting the wrongs of the past, instead of recreating its more desirable, but now defunct, features; and this is the sense in which it will be used here.

The points raised above have the following implications. However much educationalists try to frame an educational policy based on rational and moral principles, their influence is not the only determinant of such action. As a social institution serving a variety of purposes, education may be subjected to various pressures acting on it from outside which are not all traceable to a specific human agency. Changes, as defined above, in one part of society can produce shock waves which radiate outwards and affect other parts involuntarily. However, in as far as it is possible to unravel the intertwined threads of cause and effect, an attempt has been made to restrict the scope of this thesis to a consideration of only those events attributable to some clearly recognisable act of deliberate policy. Developments and other vague trends, which might be described as ordinary changes, have accordingly been consigned to a subordinate role. Also, if one accepts that the emphasis of reform is to work towards something new, it is possible to leave almost unmentioned those forces at work in the Weimar Republic

which were canvassing for a return to conditions as they prevailed in the Kaiser's Germany.

Although the stress is to be laid on educational reform originating from some identifiable source, it would be wrong to say that such ideas are produced in a vacuum, as if the would-be reformer were divorced from events around him. Thoughts of reform are, by their very nature, a response to inadequacies perceived in the existing circumstances, and this being the case it is necessary, in Chapter One, to describe in broad outline the German educational system as it was before the Great War, drawing special attention to those areas where dissatisfaction was being expressed. Only in this way can one fully appreciate the real quality of the efforts made to introduce reform.

That we are concerned with a wider perspective than just to review the existing situation in education follows from what was said above about the reciprocal relationship between education and society. Consequently, Chapter Two is a brief survey of the events leading to the establishment of the Weimar Republic, its subsequent history, and its final collapse. Within this framework it is possible to pick out those areas of political opinion which seem to have had most influence on the direction of educational reform. Having a vision of an ideal society, the politician has possibly more power to ~~materialize~~ realise his vision than those more involved in the world of education (and this was especially true of those politicians sympathetic to reform in the early days of the Weimar Republic). After all, the success of educational reform depends ultimately on the appeal and skill of its political supporters. Here one must single out three schools of political belief, of which the most important was socialism. Originating in Germany, socialism was the greatest single influence on the establishment of the Weimer Republic, and the fortunes of educational reform are closely linked to it. Yet one cannot overlook the role played by those who, while not socialist in

outlook, were prepared to work for the survival of the new democratic, republican constitution. The left wing of the German Liberals was such a party, although their aims in education differed somewhat from those of their partners. Many of the Socialists and the Liberals were further linked by their acceptance of certain nationalist ideas. These were presented in more muted tones, as the result of the Kaiser's policies being regarded in some quarters as responsible for the defeat in war, but nonetheless they did influence the course of educational reform.

As will be seen, the nation over which the Kaiser had ruled was in reality a deeply divided country. Although the government appeared so authoritarian, there were forces at work within the country which the government could not control, not least of which were the various schools of thought on the subject of educational reform. In an attempt to replace the formal, abstract approach to learning, which many schools under the spirit of Herbart practised, there evolved a richness of alternative proposals. While the Second Empire survived, however, these were not likely to gain full official acceptance. Yet once the Kaiser had departed the scene, there already existed an impressive body of educational thought (and to a lesser extent, practice) upon which the new government could draw in its endeavour to establish a system of education capable of promoting the ideals of the new state. Therefore, in Chapter Three, we turn to a description of these various bodies of opinion, their history and the thinking behind them, so that one may better understand the origins of the proposed reforms and their contribution to the Weimar period. All of these ideas are known collectively as the Pedagogical Movement and, as far as is possible, the aim has been to analyse it into its constituent elements, even though they in part overlap and some divisions are a little arbitrary.

Whereas previously attention was deveted to the theoreticians and

the experimenters, in Chapter Four we come to the attempts made to transfer their ideas into the every-day practice of the national educational system. Here the role of the central government is specifically described. That the central government had powers over education was in itself an innovation, and therefore it is very important to look at the responsibilities the government assumed in this field and how successfully it carried them out. In Chapter Five attention is directed to reform at provincial level for this was traditionally, and continued to be, the most effective centre of educational powers. Thus, for reform to be fully implemented it had to be acceptable at this level. Since it would have been somewhat tedious to catalogue the situation in each of the sixteen provinces, the discussion centres instead on the various branches of the school system in turn, referring only to those provinces which had a special contribution to make to the reforms within a given section. In Chapter Six the experimental schools are described. These institutions tried to cast off as far as possible the bureaucratic chains which bound the ordinary state schools, so that they were relatively free from outside interference. Thus they do not fit into any scheme so far described, and yet their role as the proving ground for new ideas was so important that they deserve separate treatment. Again it would have been monotonous to describe all such schools, unique as each one was, and so their main features have been established by describing the experimental schools in the leading centres of Hamburg, Bremen, and Berlin, and only making passing reference to the more outstanding features of the rest. Chapter Seven takes up the theme of higher education. Here we shall see that the universities, because of their special position in the educational system, were very resistant to reform. It was in the question of teacher training that the universities were most closely involved in attempts at reform, even though ultimately

they were little affected by it.

In the Conclusion some assessment has been attempted of the essence of educational reform in the Weimar Republic. Whereas as it has been stated above that moves for reform in this period were a continuation of an already strong reform movement originating in the pre-war era, it is here germane to examine those features of educational reform in the Weimar Republic which mark it off from what preceded it. It is also necessary to look at the reasons why, in comparison with the strong demands for educational reform which were made during the period, the final balance shows so little actual achievement, and whether this fact in any way either contributed to, or helped to delay, the disaster which was to overtake Germany with the coming of Hitler. Lastly, it is necessary to look at the Germany of today, both the Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, so that one may assess the influence exerted on modern education by the ideas and efforts of the men of Weimar.

A final word needs to be said about the problem of language. The names of German institutions, educational or otherwise, have been left, unitalicized, in German rather than use their nearest English equivalent, which may not quite capture their distinct nature. The first time such a term appears either its meaning will be conveyed by a special note or the context will make it clear. Thereafter reference may be made to the Glossary in which all such expressions are explained. In addition, the titles of all books and similar publications in German are given in their original form, followed immediately by an English translation. All quotations are in English; that some had to be translated specially from German for the purposes of this work is acknowledged by means of a note.

CHAPTER I

THE PRE-1918 EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Reform has no meaning if it is not known which conditions provoked the call for reform. It is therefore necessary to look at education in Germany in the years before 1918 before turning to a description of the roots of reform thinking and its effect on education in the Weimar Republic. To be more precise, the following is an account of education in Prussia, for Prussia was by far the largest and most important state within the Second ~~Empire~~ Reich. However, reference is made to other states where these show material differences from the Prussian model if these are significant in the light of later developments.

As early as 1794 Prussia had made the provision of education a function of the civil government. It was, then, the first nation to take over a task which had hitherto been the prerogative of the churches, and as a result Prussian education became a model for those countries which sought to make their own educational systems more effective than could be achieved by voluntary efforts alone. The rise of nineteenth century Prussia to pre-eminence in Germany and on the Continent as a whole was attributed to the excellence of its education. Yet towards the end of the century the very changes in society which the provision of universal education had in part brought about became in turn the cause of demands for educational reform, so that education might better keep in step with the new social conditions. Foremost among these changes was the rapid industrialization of Germany which widespread literacy had helped to make possible. That reforms did not readily occur was due to the way in which Germany was ruled (for the Kaiser still believed in his divine right to rule, with the inevitable consequence that his

government was the most autocratic in western Europe) and this of course was reflected in the administration of education. Although education was decentralized in the sense that even after 1871 there was no national authority responsible for the control of education, each of the member states of the Empire nonetheless kept rigid centralized control within its own borders. The respective ministries responsible for the administration of education supervised every detail of the running of the schools. Curricula, syllabuses, teacher certification and employment - all were decided by civil servants, so that the initiative for educational reform usually depended on the good will of the central authorities and could therefore rarely proceed from school or classroom level. Since the central authorities were the servants of governments owing no responsibility to publically elected representatives, they proved in the main to be rather insensitive to pressures exerted from below.

The system of education over which the Prussian civil service presided was basically bi-partite in character, the division between the two parts being determined by social factors. For the great mass of the population, which formed the working class, schooling was provided in the Volksschule. This was an eight-year school to which pupils were admitted at the age of six. It was organised on a denominational basis so that a Volksschule was designated as being either Catholic, or Protestant, or even Jewish. In practice this meant that all the staff and pupils were of the same religious conviction, the respective clergy had certain rights of inspection, and the whole school was geared to creating the ethos of its particular confession. Elsewhere in Germany there was a proportionately small number of inter-demominational schools where the ratio of pupils belonging to the two major religious groups was mirrored by a similar division in the staff. In this latter type all the pupils were taught together except for religious instruction where

they were, of course, divided into their denominations. In all the Volksschulen the aim was to impart the necessary elementary knowledge sufficient to produce an efficient work-force but not one so highly trained as to give the pupils ideas above their station in life. The teachers were themselves former Volksschule pupils who, upon completion of the full eight years, had moved on for a further three years general education at a Präparandaranstalt before receiving their professional ~~training~~ ~~education~~ at a Seminar. The atmosphere in the Seminare was rather illiberal. Usually located in a small country town, the Seminar imposed restrictions on personal freedom and set out to impart only the very minimum of knowledge and skill while discouraging independent thought and a sense of professional dignity. The Volksschule teachers, despite the limitations of their training, were in the main articulate and politically conscious, and thus they acted as the spokesmen for the working class, from the ranks of which they were in any case largely drawn.

Within the ambit of the Volksschule but distinct from it was the Mittelschule. This had been recognised by Prussia in 1872 and it remained essentially a north German institution. It offered a six-year course to which pupils at the Volksschule could transfer at the age of ten. The curriculum aimed at a higher academic standard than that at the Volksschule but still concentrated on subjects with practical application, including one modern foreign language. The school owed its origins to the wish in certain quarters that there should be a school which might serve the needs of those who required more than just elementary education, while at the same time remaining close to the world of practical affairs. In practice the Mittelschule was used by those young people who hoped to take up middle grade positions in industry and commerce.

The second branch of the educational system consisted of the höhere Schulen. This was the collective term for the various schools

used by the upper stratum of society to prepare for the highest positions in industry, the army, and the professions. Pupils usually entered such a school at the age of nine, the preceding three years having been spent in a private Vorschule where the necessary rudiments of learning were acquired. The types of höhere Schule were very numerous, but for the sake of simplicity the number can be reduced here to three - the Gymnasium, the Realgymnasium, and the Oberrealschule. Of these the Gymnasium was the oldest, most common, and most prestigious type. Its devotion to Classical studies went back to the Humboldt reforms of the early nineteenth century, but in the following decades much of this spirit had been lost in favour of pedantic attention to the minutiae of grammar and an accumulation of many other subjects all deemed necessary for a future servant of the state. The Realgymnasium reflected these developments in that Latin was all that remained of the Classical spirit. The Oberrealschule, too, had attempted to build its course around a more modern core and concentrated therefore on modern languages, mathematics and science. For the whole of the nineteenth century the Gymnasium had been the only school authorized to conduct the Abitur examination, which entitled all successful candidates to admission to higher education, but by 1901 this right had been extended to the other two types as well. The Abitur examination was the culmination of at least nine years spent at the höhere Schule, but promotion at the end of each year to the next higher grade was by no means automatic.

On these three basic types of höhere Schule there were certain variations. Each had a six-year equivalent (the Progymnasium, the Prorealgymnasium, and the Realschule) for those requiring a less extensive grounding in academic studies. These schools also had the advantage that to have studied in this way for at least six years entitled any pupil to a one-year reduction in the length of his compulsory military

service. At the same time some attempts had been made to reduce the many divisions between the höhere Schulen, for these implied in effect that a child's schooling (and therefore career and life) was determined by a once-and-forever decision at the age of nine. Some overlap in their separate curricula was the aim, and in practice this was achieved by delaying the introduction of Latin (if it was included in the time-table at all) until the beginning of the fourth year. In this way it was possible to so arrange it that all three basic types of höhere Schule could at least have the same curriculum for the first three years. Centres for such experiments were Altona and Frankfurt-am-Main, and the schools involved were known as Reformgymnasien.

The teachers at the höhere Schulen had all studied at a university. Before they were accepted as teachers they had to pass a state examination in their chosen subjects of academic study, serve for two years as probationary teachers, and then pass a second state examination in matters relating to education.

Girls' education was organised in a slightly different way. The Volksschule was co-educational[1], but it was in the sphere of the höhere Schulen that the common German prejudice that a woman's place was in the home manifested itself. The opportunities for girls to gain an education here of the same standing as that available to boys did not exist. No matter how similar the work was in a girls' höhere Schule to that in one for boys, it was not until 1908 that the girls' höhere Schulen were accorded the right to conduct the Abitur examination, thereby entitling girls to admission to a university. In that year a reform of girls' education was carried through so that the following pattern became officially accepted. The basic kind of girls' höhere Schule was the Lyzeum which offered a seven-year course beyond the age of nine. If it was intended to study for the Abitur it was usual to transfer

after three years to a Studienanstalt, (of which there were three types parallel to the boys' höhere Schulen), for six years. In this way the system for girls resembled the 'reform' type of Gymnasium. For those girls wishing to continue their education beyond the Lyzeum a further one, two, or three years study of, in the main, non-academic, feminine subjects was possible at a Oberlyzeum or a Frauenschule.

To complete this description some reference must be made to vocational education. It was a principle firmly established in Germany that the schools described above should impart a general education of no specific vocational relevance. The time for this came when a young person left the Volksschule and enrolled at a continuation school. With industrialization the need had grown for technical training and this had at first been organised in schools which opened on a Sunday. Yet increasingly the tendency was for the young trainee to attend on a week day, for which he was permitted to be absent from work. Although such arrangements were widely available, not all leavers from the Volksschule automatically spent some time here. The curriculum, too, was not organised according to any consistent principle.

This picture of the outside of the Wilhelminian school system needs, however, to be matched by a description of the general atmosphere which prevailed within the schools. In the main the schools were drab, discipline was harsh, the teachers were strict and aloof. The pupils sat in fixed rows of desks and were expected to sit silently while the teacher expounded the material to be learned without question. Only when invited to answer a question were the pupils permitted to speak. The subject matter was presented verbally with stress on theoretical aspects often beyond the pupils' own experience. No deep understanding or insight was demanded of a pupil, it being sufficient that he should learn a plethora of unrelated facts by dint of constant repetition. In short,

the atmosphere was one of unimaginative formalism. Gerhardt Hauptmann, the dramatist, when recalling his school days in the 1880s summarised the prevailing atmosphere thus: "The man who stood behind the teacher, invisibly setting the tone, was not Lessing, Herder, Goethe, or Socrates, but the Prussian drill-sergeant" [2]. In the literature of the period there are several distressing pictures of school life[3], and the incidence of schoolboy suicides was markedly high[4]. For many, then, school was not a pleasurable experience, and the educationalists were coming to realise this.

Notes

1. This means that boys and girls attended the same school, but they were not necessarily mixed for lessons.

2. Gerhardt Hauptmann, Das Abenteuer meiner Jugend (Berlin: 1937), Vol 1, p. 261.

3. e.g. Thomas Mann Buddenbrooks, Heinrich Mann Professor Unrat, Friedrich Huch Peter Michel, Emil Strauss Freund Hein, Holz & Jerschke Traumulus, Frank Wedekind Frühlings Erwachen, Otto Ernst Flachsmann als Erzieher, Georg Kaiser Rektor Kleist, Otto Bierbaum Stilpe, Robert Musil Die Verwirrungen des Zöglings Törless.

4. In Prussia the following numbers of schoolboy suicides were reported in the years immediately before the First World War. 65 (1909), 59 (1910), 72 (1911), 84 (1912), 67 (1913). However, it is interesting to note that the figures were only a little lower in the Weimar period: 41 (1923), 56 (1924), 52 (1925), 63 (1926), 68 (1927). Figures quoted in Reinhold Lehmann, "Germany", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College Columbia University 1928 (New York: 1929), p. 121.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATION AND POLITICS IN THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC

In the autumn of 1918 the German high command informed the Kaiser that Germany could not win the war and that therefore it was proposed to seek an armistice with the Allies. That it was decided not to fight the war to an incontrovertible conclusion was due to the German expectation that any peace treaty would be based on President Wilson's Fourteen Points which, inter alia, promised no annexations and no reparations. Yet Wilson made it clear that before he would open negotiations with the Germans he would like to see a more democratic government in power in their country, preferably without the Kaiser as head of state. Thus the Kaiser was prevailed upon to abdicate on 9th November, 1918, and the armistice was signed two days later. In the preceding two months the government had already been widened to include more democratic elements, and for the first time members of the SPD (German Socialist Party) were given cabinet positions. It was these men who were left holding the reins of power when the Kaiser departed, although their newly-found authority did not go unchallenged. Throughout the country workers' and soldiers' soviets were springing up on the Bolshevik pattern, which attempted to force through a revolution similar to the one which had occurred only the year before in Russia. The Socialists, however, mindful of the fate of Kerensky, made a pact with the army high command with whose help they were able to suppress brutally this threat from the extreme left. By February 1919 the new rulers were sufficiently in control as to be able to hold elections for a national assembly in which the SPD was the largest single party. Meeting in Weimar, the delegates drew up the new constitution which was ratified on 11th August 1919.

In this way Germany was transformed in less than a year from a militaristic, autocratic monarchy into an apparently democratic republic. Unfortunately, for the next fourteen years the country had to struggle to overcome a series of internal and external crises. Political assassination was commonplace and attempted coups d'état not unknown. The Treaty of Versailles weighed heavily and produced much unrest within the country. Above all, the severest shocks were caused by the inflation of the early twenties and the economic depression resulting from the Wall Street Crash of 1929. In such an atmosphere it was difficult to make democracy work, especially since the politicians who worked to uphold it were generally inexperienced and ineffectual. As a result democracy never took root among the majority of the population, and support grew for a single strong man to direct the nation's affairs without the restriction of checks and balances. After 1930 it became impossible for stable coalition governments to be formed and the President had to make use of his powers to nominate personally the Chancellor. Thus in 1933 Hitler was summoned to fill this position and, with the ground already prepared for him, he found it easy to remove whatever vestiges of parliamentary democracy still remained.

We have seen, then, that the parties of the left played an important role in the establishment of the Weimar Republic. Although divided among themselves, it was to them that the population turned to run the country when the policies of the Kaiser and his army had led to such disaster. This, of course, had consequences for education which make it necessary to understand something of socialist thought.

The SPD had been formed in 1875 in response to the increasing pace of industrialization which had occurred in Germany after the unification of 1871. Despite hostility from the ruling elites, the SPD had become the largest single party in the Reichstag (lower house of

parliament) by 1912. Towards the end of the Great War the party had split into the Majority Socialists, who broadly supported the war aims of the country, and the Independent Socialists (USPD), who, with the defeat of Tsarist Russia, were opposed to further war against worker colleagues in countries with a more democratic government than their own. Further left was the Spartacist League which instigated the Bolshevik-type revolution in late 1918. In 1922 this became the German Communist Party (KPD) which attracted into it some of the more extreme elements of the USPD, while those remaining rejoined forces with the SPD proper.

The cause of these divisions was basically the attitude each of the parties had towards Germany's imperial past. The SPD, as we have seen, was quite prepared to form an alliance with the backbone of the Kaiser's state rather than countenance a revolution which might sweep all traces of that away. In spite of this, or perhaps because of it, the SPD was the largest of these left-wing parties and always commanded a good proportion of the votes in all the elections during the Weimar period. It was also strong in some of the provincial parliaments. Yet the antagonism of the SPD with the other socialists caused the SPD to turn for support to the less radical parties which favoured a republican form of government, such as the German Democratic Party (DDP) and the Catholic Centre Party. This schism was politically regrettable since this was without doubt the cause of the failure of many socialist ideals being put into practice in the new state. However, it is still probably true to say that the Weimar Republic was born out of widespread public support for left-wing policies, coupled with the feeling that the capitalist order had yielded to a new era in social organisation. A new society demands a new educational system. What did the socialists have to offer in this respect?

Karl Marx had taught that the proletarian revolution would inevit-

ably overthrow the capitalist system as a fact of historical change and that therefore no human agency would be able to prevent this. Since man was thus powerless over his fate there could be no such thing as moral responsibility, and for education this implied a restricted role of merely teaching the individual how best to take his place in the real world of earning a living. However, the years passed and Marx's prediction did not come true. In 1898 E. Bernstein proposed a revision of Marx's doctrine, that found considerable approval, namely, that the workers should not passively wait for the coming of the revolution but should take active steps to hasten its arrival. The form that this new involvement was to take was open for discussion, but for education the essential point was that it was now accepted that the will of man had a part to play in the determination of his fate. If one concedes the necessity for one to take some responsibility for the conduct of his affairs, then a fuller educational programme becomes possible. For the orthodox Marxist education was primarily vocational preparation[1)], but for the more moderate socialists a moral dimension was now added to this. In addition to learning a vocational skill and understanding the economic structure of society, the latter maintained that education should also prepare the pupil for living in the coming society by acquainting him in advance with the new personal relationships which would develop therein. In this way education, and not revolution, became an important way for bringing about the socialist millenium.

Two aspects of socialist theory are especially relevant to a wider delineation of its educational programme. Firstly, for the socialist economic forces alone determine the fate of the world. There are, then, no absolutes and nothing exists beyond material reality. Consequently it is impossible to define education as a process of matching the pupil to a system of pre-determined, immutable values. Instead the reverse

is the case. The final end of education is unknown since that depends on the differing characteristics of each pupil, and so the aim now becomes to ensure that a pupil is enabled to reach the fullest development which his individual capabilities will allow.

This emphasis on individuality is in part balanced, and in part supplemented, by a second aspect of socialist theory, namely, that the present inequalities in the organisation of society will give way to a new system in which there are no divisions, no classes, no barriers between men. The implications of this are considerable. There will be no leisured élite living off the produce of the toiling masses, but instead all will have to contribute their talents to the benefit of society. As a result the classical distinction between liberal and vocational education will disappear. Then, if the means of production are jointly owned there can no longer be a system of social status based on property. The respect due to a man will not depend on his possessions but rather on what he intrinsically is. It follows that all men will be presumed equal so that traditional distinctions, as between worker and employer will of course become irrelevant, as will any previously presumed distinction between the sexes or between adult and child. Education will deal with all these categories according to their merits. Finally, the assimilation of those with wealth (and therefore power) will mean that the form of government most appropriate to these new circumstances is no longer an oligarchy but rather a democracy in which the power for the conduct of the affairs of society resides with every one of its constituent members. As a result the masses are no longer obedient, submissive, mindless labourers but will become instead emancipated, autonomous citizens who freely and responsibly play an active part in ordering the community in which they live. Each person has a duty to develop those virtues which will ensure the smooth running

of the group, foremost of which should be the readiness to subordinate selfish desires to the welfare of the whole. Here education had an important part to play by giving the opportunity for communal action to promote a sense of mutual inter-dependence.

In practice the socialist school would be as follows. All pupils, boys as well as girls, in a given locality would attend the same school for the whole of their school career. In this way no élite schools would exist and no one child would have more favourable opportunities than any other. The resulting body of shared experience and knowledge would promote a sense of solidarity. Internally, however, the school would be sufficiently flexible to be able to discern and then further the differing individual talents of the pupils. The curriculum would have less time for abstractions, but would concentrate on practical subjects, stressing vocational relevance and nearness to life. The competitive spirit of the old school would yield to a willingness to work together, as in project work and discussion groups. The teachers would no longer feel they were educating towards fixed standards but would devote their full attention to the welfare of each pupil. Instead of task-masters they would thus become advisors and friends. Administration would be taken out of the hands of the bureaucrats and given to those most directly involved in the well-being of the school - the parents, teachers, and pupils. It was obvious that considerable reforms would have to be undertaken if existing German schools were going to be adapted to the socialist model.

Although they were the main impetus behind the establishment of the Weimar Republic in its final form, the socialists were aided by other shades of political opinion which, although they did not share the same ideology, did nonetheless believe in the virtues of a republican democracy. Foremost among these were the Left Liberals of the

DDP. The growth of industry in the Second ~~Empire~~ Reich with its tendency towards forming cartels had not in Germany, as elsewhere, particularly favoured the prosperity of the small businessman. The DDP was, therefore, as its name suggests, prepared to work to preserve the new state, even though its aims, including those in education, differed from those of its partner.

Fundamentally the Liberals believed in a laissez-faire economic system in which there were no checks on the operation of a free market in trade. In this way supply could be perfectly matched with demand, the efficient would prosper and the inefficient go to the wall. In order for the system to work properly it was necessary to ensure that every person was able to participate without hindrance, and this was where education had a part to play. Schools were to reflect this emphasis on competition and the object of educational reform was to remove the inefficiencies in the system which prevented the individual from finding the position in society for which his special talents fitted him. Ability was the sole criterion to decide the type of education a given child would receive, and schools which set out primarily to bestow the distinguishing marks of a particular social class were to be replaced by schools which permitted the able, regardless of their social origins, to develop their full potential. The curricula of the schools, too, needed reform so that the ideals of liberal education (as propounded by Aristotle), with their devotion to studies pursued for their own sake, could be replaced by subjects with greater practical bias and more relevant to the modern commercial age.

Apart from their republicanism, the SPD and DDP also exhibited certain nationalistic tendencies. Hans Kohn[2)] maintains that the overall trend in German history between Napoleon and Hitler was a gradual rejection of the ideals of democracy, as pursued by the other nations of

Western Europe, in favour of the aggressive assertion of German national superiority. Although in some cases this may appear inconsistent with the ideology of certain parties, most parties with the exception of those of the extreme left found great difficulty in freeing themselves from the tendency towards chauvinism. Even the SPD, despite its ideal of international working-class solidarity, voted in favour of the war in 1914, and, as we have seen, was prepared to conclude a pact in 1918 with the militarists of imperial times rather than ally itself with the USPD. The reason for this is difficult to explain but some factors may help to throw some light on the problem. Geographically Germany had few natural frontiers, in religion and history the country showed little unity. The German national idea was, therefore, founded on the more intangible unifying principle of a common culture and a belief in a purity of race and a way of life which, since at least the time of Tacitus, had remained unaffected by foreign incursions. Because, then, the foundations of the nation were based on such vague concepts, many Germans found it necessary to compensate for this deficiency by over-asserting their sense of nationhood. For the SPD and the DDP to have consistently opposed this would have seemed to strike at the very rules within which the whole business of politics was conducted.

It must, of course, be stressed that those to the left of the SPD were not tainted in the same way, and in view of the general mood of disillusionment which overtook the country in late 1918 with the policies of aggressive German nationalism it was to the parties least associated with the country's former war aims that the bulk of the nation turned. Nationalism did not disappear completely but in the early years of the Weimar Republic it was unfashionable to utter such sentiments. For a while, then, the more extreme manifestations of German nationalism were suppressed, even if not entirely eradicated. However, as the years

passed the nationalists were able to reassert themselves more by convincing the public that the surrender of 1918 and the acceptance of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were a betrayal of German national interest on the part of the republicans, and thus bring about the eventual rise of Hitler. Speaking with reference to education it would be true to say that nationalism in the Weimar Republic was never dominant. It tended to play down its racialist elements, and it contained none of the grandiose rhetoric of the previous epoch. Nonetheless its presence was unmistakable.

In practice the strains of German nationalism can be detected in the demand made by Johannes Tews that the nomenclature of German educational institutions should make use of German, and not Latin, words. Furthermore, there was a demand for a truly German school, in the sense that instead of making foreign culture, especially that of Antiquity, the cornerstone of the curriculum in the höhere Schulen it would be better if young Germans could learn about matters of more immediate significance to them, such as German geography, German history, and German culture. The nationalists also opposed the bi-partite school system because a more unified school system would create a greater sense of unity in a country remarkable for its internal divisions. In this matter there are links with the educational policies of the socialists and liberals, as there are also in the common stress on individualism. For the nationalists, however, individualism meant producing young Germans who were recognisably different from other nationalities. Not the full development of the abilities of the individual but rather the cultivation of the irrational became the aim. Pursuit of objective truth could not mark out a German from the rest of humanity, and so this could only be achieved by emphasising the idiosyncratic[5] and bizarre as the end of educational endeavour. Finally, those of nationalist leanings were

disenchanted with the effects of industrialization. This had caused the sudden growth of the large towns drawing people away from their traditional homes in small rural communities. These, it was felt, were the fountainhead of all that was quintessentially German[3]. Therefore the nationalists supported any plan which set out to reduce the flight from the land and make rural schools as attractive as their urban counterparts. It was also felt necessary to introduce town children to their country heritage at every possible opportunity.

It must be emphasised that not all educational reformers were consciously working for political ends. The programmes outlined above form a background against which education in the Weimar period was conducted. The ideas are merely those with a contribution to make to reform; the reformers used them singly or in combination to produce their own version of desirable educational ideals without necessarily being aware of their significance beyond the realm of education. The conclusions which the educationalists had drawn from these ideas and the concrete shape they gave to them is discussed in the next chapter.

Notes

1. cf. "Modern industry ... through its catastrophes imposes the necessity of recognising, as a fundamental law of production, variation of work, consequently fitness of the labourer for varied work, consequently the greatest possible development of his varied aptitudes... Modern industry... compels society, under penalty of death to replace the detail-worker of today, crippled by life-long repetition of one and the same trivial operation, and thus reduced to the mere fragment of a man, but the fully developed individual, fit for a variety of labours, ready to face any change in production, and to whom the different social functions he performs, are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural and acquired powers. One step already taken towards effecting this revolution is the establishment of technical and agricultural schools, and of écoles d'enseignement professionnel, in which the children of the working men receive some little instruction in technology and in the practical handling of the various instruments of labour... There can be no doubt that when the working class comes into power, as inevitably it must, technical instruction, both theoretical and practical, will take its proper place in the working class schools. There is also no doubt that such revolutionary ferments, the final result of which is the final abolition of the old division of labour, are diametrically opposed to the capitalistic form of production, and to the economic status of the worker corresponding to that form." - Karl Marx, Das Kapital (London: 1908), pp. 493-94. Quoted in David Childs, East Germany (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1969), pp. 181-82.

2. Hans Kohn, The Mind of Germany (London: Macmillan, 1962).

3. cf. "Yet the town, in particular the large city, has never really been accepted in Germany as an environment worth living in. Where writers dealt favourably with city life, their works were soon denounced as 'asphalt literature'. The simultaneous glorification of the country as the home of everything healthy and denigration of the city as the root of all evil is a solid stereotype of a cultural pessimism that appears in the elementary school primer as well as in the parting speech of the principal on graduation and indeed in declarations of government policy; and is a symptom of a lack of urbanity." - Ralf Dahrendorf, Society and Democracy in Germany (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson Ltd., 1968), p. 50.

CHAPTER III

THE PEDAGOGICAL MOVEMENT

The Pedagogical Movement was the educational expression of the forces described in the foregoing chapter. It is, therefore, the name applied to the various attempts at educational reform in Germany, starting at the end of the nineteenth century and continuing down to the present day. Although here the centre of interest is the progress of reform during the years of the Weimar Republic, to see this in perspective one must trace back the lines of development to the time of the Second Empire, for it is here, with Germany's rapid industrialization, that one must look for the origins of what, after the Great War, was to determine the shape of educational thinking and attempts at reform. In this various threads can be discerned.

The Autonomy of Education

In the closing decades of the nineteenth century the concept of educational autonomy gained wider acceptance. By this is meant the view that the methods and aims of education should be defined solely by reference to those who are involved in the educational process. In other words, education should not be the servant of political, social, or economic ends, but should rather concern itself primarily with the requirements of each pupil, so that the maximum personal development might be attained. To define educational policy one should not look beyond the welfare of the individual child. Rousseau, a century earlier, had believed this, and the work of Pestalozzi and Froebel shows that such ideas gained some acceptance in Germany. However, by the middle of the nineteenth century, Herbart had become the mentor of educationalists, and it was not until the end of the century that Pestalozzi's views returned to favour. That this happened was due partly to the fact

that Pestalozzi's observations now seemed to be confirmed by the findings of men working in the new academic fields of psychology and sociology.

Psychology in Germany owed its acceptance as an approved academic study to the work of Wilhelm Wundt, for it was he who devised the methods of experimental psychology which produced scientifically acceptable data. Before long the fruits of such work were being applied to the study of child behaviour, with obvious relevance to education. This can be seen in a number of important publications[1]. Furthermore, the German Association for Child Psychology was established in 1897. The two most noteworthy figures working in this field were Ernst Meumann and August Ley. The former, a professor for a time in Hamburg, believed that by experimentation it would soon be possible to arrive at a comprehensive set of scientific laws by which the whole of education could be organised. The latter showed more awareness of the moral aspects of education - and preferred observation in the classroom to individual testing in the laboratory.

The results of such work were to change the contemporary way of looking at the child. It was seen that the child could no longer be regarded as an adult in miniature. The methods of teaching adults could not be used with children, for both had reached different stages of development. It was now felt to be wrong that a child should be expected to sit without moving for long periods and to learn unrelated, examinable facts by rote memorization, for it was seen that his natural urge was to move about and explore his surroundings. He wanted to see and touch objects, learn about their characteristics by feeling them and observing them in use. On the other hand, his powers of abstraction and generalization were almost non-existent. Education, then, rather than impose adult standards, should exploit these natural

tendencies of the child in the interests of more effective learning. It was held that each stage of growth must be properly completed. Thus by teaching the child in a manner appropriate to his age, one was ensuring the possibility of further growth and the attainment of maturity. Yet, since each person matured at a different rate and since each displayed differing potentialities, it was not possible to teach all in the same manner and at the same speed. The school should be transformed into a place where the child could move about freely, devoting his attention to those objects which engaged his interest. Subject divisions should no longer exist, for these were adult compartmentalization of the real, undivided world, which the child should study making use of whatever branches of knowledge were appropriate to the matter in hand and the pupils' needs. The teacher should not impose uniformity but should function as an advisor, discerning the needs of the individual, creating an environment in which the child was stimulated to learn, and guiding each child to his own understanding of the world about him. Activity - not passivity, individuality - not uniformity, reality - not theory, were the watchwords.

Allied to this acceptance of the findings of psychology it is possible to outline the following developments. The child was regarded by some, as growing quite independently according to the laws of his own development. He carried the seeds of his own perfection within him, and education was a matter of warding off any negative influences which might interfere with their germination. The most influential expression of this point of view, according to which the child was held in almost reverential awe, was found in the Century of the Child by the Swedish educationalist, Ellen Key[2)], first published in German translation in 1902. Also one may mention "personality pedagogy". This derived its name from a book by Ernst Linde[3)] which asserted that the

aim of education was no longer to impart knowledge but rather to promote the full development of the child's personality. The teacher was no longer a man of learning but a man of charisma. The corner-stone of the curriculum was to be the study of the lives of great men. The most important exponents of this view in the classroom were probably Heinrich Scharrelmann and Hugo Gaudig.[4)]

At the same time as the developments outlined above, the related study of sociology was establishing itself as a reputable academic discipline, the findings of which, too, had application to education. The work of Ferdinand Tönnies, although not explicitly about education, was very influential. In 1887 he published his Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft (Community and Society) in which he gave a rationalised account of a phenomenon about which many Germans had an intuitive feeling. A Gemeinschaft was defined as a social unit in which all the members worked together and contributed to their mutual welfare. Each person was bound to his neighbour by a bond of common interdependence. Tönnies presumably had in mind the older rural communities in which all the villagers knew each other and worked together as a self-sufficient unit. As a result each member knew his place in the group, knew what others expected of him and what he could expect of others. There was a sense of belonging and a point of reference about which life could be organised. With this Tönnies compares, unfavourably, life in a Gesellschaft, which he defines as an arbitrary grouping of people. These live in the same neighbourhood but beyond this have no common link. Work is done outside the locality and has no obvious place in the maintenance of the group. Presumably the new industrial towns provided the model for this, for here the bond of a common fate no longer existed, the feeling of mutual dependence grew weak, and the purpose of life became obscured. As a result social ills flourished in

the towns. The consequence which the educationalists drew from this was that education in the school should seek to recreate the atmosphere of a Gemeinschaft, in the hope that social co-operation learned here would be carried into later life. For the socialists life, made drab by the tedium of factory work, would gain a new depth; for the nationalists it meant a return to the traditional Germanic way of life that industrialization threatened to destroy. It is not without significance that the experimental schools of Hamburg, as well as the new kind of Volksschule which it was hoped to introduce in the Weimar period, were known as Gemeinschaftsschulen.

Tönnies' views illustrate the sociological insight that a man's very being could only be understood by reference to the society in which he lived. It was this which gave him his language, customs, and culture. Some went as far as to assert that the individual was like a cell in the body; each cell has a distinct function, but when it dies it is soon replaced by another, so that the body continues to exist, whereas no one cell can on its own exist outside its allotted place. Society was, then, a force outside and superior to each individual, and education must fit the individual to sacrifice himself in the service of society. Perhaps Paul Natorp[5)] gave best expression to this point of view, and the link with socialist thought is unmistakable, However, it was soon realized that the existing social conditions in Wilhelminian Germany were an unsuitable foundation for putting these equalitarian ideas into practice. Indeed it seemed possible that through the means of education, it would be possible to change society so that a greater degree of equality would result. The most notable contribution to this discussion came from Georg Kerschensteiner in his Begriff der staatsbürgerlichen Erziehung (Concept of Education in Citizenship) of 1910. Here he advanced a programme for awakening a sense of moral responsibility based on social

co-operation.

The Youth Movement.

The youth movement had modest beginnings. It grew from a week-end rambling club attached to an evening class in shorthand, held in 1896 in the Berlin suburb of Steglitz. In 1901 the club became a registered society with the name Wandervögel. In the following years many splits occurred and various other groups formed of young people who chose to spend their free time tramping through Germany's extensive woodlands in the company of their friends. As these rambles became more ambitious overnight stopping places were needed, and in this way the youth hostel movement was born[6]. The climax of the youth movement came in the meeting of all the youth groups on the Hohe Meissner (a mountain near Kassel) on 11th October, 1913, when it was hoped to bring all the independent groups into greater unity and to found a branch (to be known as the Free German Youth) for those who were beyond school age. Their differences were such that their objective was not entirely achieved, but one declaration found common assent. The so-called Meissner Formula stated that it was the aim of German youth "to mould its own life, in accordance with its own nature, on its own responsibility and in inner integrity."[7] After the war the ethos of the movement changed and political commitment became more important. The spirit was changed from that of the itinerant student to that of a crusader seeking a cause to which he might pledge his service.

The youth movement originated and drew its main support from teen-age boys from Protestant, upper-middle class homes in central Germany, These young people were rebelling against the materialist values of their homes and an education which took no account of their individuality, imagination, and need for friendship. They were not so much interested in the countryside per se but were instinctively responding

to that German national trait of feeling that the true destiny of their people was mystically linked to the soil. Industrialization had broken this link and was thus at the root of their present discontent. The aim was a return to the Gemeinschaft atmosphere of the peer group where a more satisfying existence could be found in the mutual dependence, the loyalty, comradeship, and the sense of belonging that prevailed there. Although the Wandervögel, at least before the war, claimed to be non-political, their attitudes make it clear that they were in tacit agreement with nationalist ideas; a fact further demonstrated by their anti-semitism and their anti-feminism.

The influence of the youth movement on education was oblique. The school, only in that it was a part of an unacceptable social system, was the object of attack. Yet, clearly, the demand was for the recognition that young people had ideals, hopes, and aspirations of their own. Apart from the monthly "ramble day", introduced into schools after 1918, the main relevance of the youth movement was to demonstrate that education, in its preoccupation with intellectual training, had neglected to give the opportunity for physical exercise and social development. By organising their own activities young people could gain useful experience in exercising judgment and accepting responsibility, and the resulting sense of service led many former members of the youth movement to become teachers when they had reached maturity. Hermann Nohl summarises the relevance of the youth movement thus: "The Youth Movement is not merely so exciting educationally because it radically changed the basic relationship of the generations, but also because it knew itself to be educational, and because the leading members of the pedagogical movement were drawn from it and carried its spirit into every educational task"[8]. Laqueur amplifies this: "Many a Wandervogel had chosen to become a teacher; and it followed that the youth

movement had a great, albeit indirect, influence upon educational theory and practice: this was conspicuous in the work of such leading pedagogues of the day as Spranger, Flitner, and Nohl. Both the Free Germans and the right-wingers established adult education centres in the early twenties: others founded private 'progressive' schools, often on the lines of Wyneken's Wickersdorf, which were strongly influenced by the spirit and style of the youth movement."[9] Also, as will be seen later, the youth movement was closely associated with the experimental schools of Hamburg.

The Art Education Movement

The art education movement was born in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Its original impulse became from beyond the sphere of education and can be located in the disillusionment felt by some Germans at the growing materialism among the people in general. Instead of pursuing mammon, a new set of spiritual values were demanded, and these were to be provided by a study of the inspired insights of art. Friedrich Nietzsche was the apostle of such a view, and the following revival of public interest in art found application in education in two ways.

The first of these can be attributed to Julius Langbehn, who in 1887 published Rembrandt als Erzieher (Rembrandt as a Teacher), a book that proved so popular that it went through seventy-six editions by 1926. Its thesis was that the life and work of Rembrandt should serve as a model for German education. Langbehn was much concerned by the absence of truly German elements in contemporary education. The rise in status of natural science in the schools seemed to him to be out of harmony with the essential German character. Scholarship and scientific objectivity were mechanical and abstract, and as such were not suitable for bringing out the unique qualities of the German

character. Langbehn proposed that more time should be devoted to art in schools, for its characteristics of imagination, intuition, and originality would better serve to develop the individualism which he held to be the central trait of Rembrandt, as well as of every true German.

The second impulse to give art more prominence in education came from Alfred Lichtwark. A native of Hamburg, he was appointed director of the art gallery in that city in 1886. Though not a teacher in the narrow sense, Lichtwark was well aware of the relevance of his views for education. In 1888 he organised his first series of lectures for schoolchildren on art, designed to produce a wider public understanding of artistic activity. He wrote: "With its exclusive concern with material to be memorized the school, as I can never repeat sufficiently often, has made [the pupils] replete. It ought to make [them] hungry."[10] Hamburg was a leading industrial centre, and Lichtwark was aware that a sense of artistic values could increase the quality of factory-made products, as well as both giving the worker more satisfaction from his job and helping to make life in industrial surroundings more pleasant. For Lichtwark, then, art was the answer to overcome the stultifying effects of life in general and of education in particular.

As a result of these two influences, the nationalist and the social, the art education movement grew and reached its culmination in the series of three Art Education Days held in Dresden (1901), Weimar (1903), and Hamburg (1905). Initially the movement had set out to reform the teaching of drawing. Instead of meticulously copying lifeless shapes, it was proposed that the pupils should draw themes taken from real life which would have the capacity to awaken imagination and expressive powers. Gradually the emphasis came to be laid on the pupil developing his personality by artistic expression rather than that he

should produce a work of art, and thus from drawing these ideas were extended to music, drama, and even gymnastics. The followers of Langbehn even suggested that all subjects should be treated exclusively from the point of view of their aesthetic values, whereas Lichtwark's supporters were more interested in applying the pupils' own energy, as displayed in art lessons, to the acquisition of the other subjects in the curriculum.

In practical terms the achievement of the art education movement with reference to the post-1918 period was the brightening up of classrooms and the improvement in the architectural design of the schools. However, it was more important because of its insistence that education was more than simply filling a pupil's head with facts. Instead it maintained that the development of the whole personality was the aim, and that this was best achieved by enlisting the pupils' own efforts. The children were expected to be creative and in this way develop a rounded, harmonious individuality, better adjusted to the complexities of modern life. In this the art education movement came to share many features of the programme put forward by the proponents of the Arbeitsschule, into whose camp the art educationalists were eventually absorbed.

The Arbeitsschule

That schooling should include instruction in matters of future vocational relevance can be traced back many centuries. However, the principle was firmly entrenched in Germany that full-time schools should be strictly allgemeinbildend (liberal, in the Aristotelean sense), a view which began to be challenged with the coming of industrialization to Germany. Whereas previously a child had learned how to earn his living by watching his father at work, this was no longer possible. Increasing technical complexity meant that formal instruc-

tion in industrial processes was now necessary, and the division of labour had transferred the father's workplace from the home to the factory. In this way a large measure of the educational function of the family was destroyed. In addition, the worker now repeated a single manipulation time and time again so that only a small part of a man's potential ability was being harnessed. He was no longer fulfilled by his job and, not seeing the finished product, felt little responsibility for it. The consequences of this for education were threefold. Firstly, education in school now had to assume the task of imparting the knowledge and the skills which a child would need in his later working life, and secondly, it had to give the opportunity for the full development of all abilities if a man's full powers were to be released. Lastly, it had to provide an explanation for the way in which modern society was organised and of the individual's place within it. It can be said that these were the essential factors in the socialist view of the Arbeitsschule.

At the same time, however, other trends were at work to produce a more middle-class interpretation of the term, one in which the stress lay on personal development. Germany's industrial expansion had produced an unprecedented number of opportunities for personal action and initiative, so that the ideals of a leisured élite were being replaced slowly by the need for managerial skills. This, then, offered a new centre around which the curriculum could be built, since the influence of the Classics was in decline and being replaced by an incoherent encyclopaedism. In this way the demand arose for an education to be based on doing rather than listening. Supported by the recent advances in psychology, the progressive ideas in education came to demand that the schools should be so organised as to give the pupils the chance to engage in various forms of activity, deliberately

seeking out the things they wished to know according to their age, interests, needs, and abilities.

At the beginning the concept of the Arbeitsschule had merely meant that more manual subjects should be included in the Volksschule curriculum, and to this end the German Association for Boys' Work (later, for Vocational Education) was founded in 1886. Yet, in the main, the teachers remained unenthusiastic, so firmly was the liberal tradition entrenched. However, individual schools gradually started to experiment, not just with more manual work in the curriculum but also making the activity principle the basis for their work in all subjects. The first school to do so was the Augusta-Schule in Dortmund, and this was followed by the Elias-Holl-Schule in Augsburg. In Leipzig activity methods were introduced simultaneously into twenty-two of the city's schools. Dresden was less adventurous, but by 1913 it had one entire school organised on such lines. The most notable pioneering work was done by Oskar Seinig in his school in Berlin-Charlottenburg which was established in 1896. Seinig felt that most schools placed too much emphasis on words and not enough emphasis on making sure that the pupils understood the reality for which the words were the labels. "In his conviction that all abstractions are derived from observation lies Seinig's greatness. From this he changes the form of the entire instruction and educates the children to be consciously willing and consciously "acting" personalities who understand their age."[11] For him visual and tactile experiences were more important and so he put at the centre of his curriculum drawing and model-making (which included detailed working models of some complex machines).

The man who provided the most coherent theoretical justification of the Arbeitsschule was Georg Kerschensteiner who was appointed director of education for Munich in 1895. Dissatisfied with the trad-

itional curriculum, Kerschensteiner wondered how best to reform the schools in his care so that the pupils' interest might be aroused and sustained, as well as providing them with an education in accord with the new industrial age. His answer to these problems was the Arbeitsschule. Kerschensteiner argued that the pupils would show interest if they could see the relevance of the work they were doing, and for them relevance would come from preparing for the job which they, as adults, would later have to earn a living. Therefore Kerschensteiner set about introducing into the Volkschulen of Munich an education based on training for work, with special emphasis given to mathematics and science since these were the subjects most relevant to modern industrial methods. Because work involved making objects and exercising skills, and because psychology had shown that children learn better by doing, the whole curriculum was geared to activity methods. Yet Kerschensteiner was not solely interested in producing an efficient work force. "It is the great desire of all earnest reformers of our day to make the Volksschule the instrument for the formation of character, even for the great majority of intellectually weak pupils. The experience of past centuries has taught us and is still teaching us that the cultivation of that memory knowledge, which is the predominating spirit of our Volks- and höhere Schulen, will never lead to the building up of that kind of individual which modern states have more need of every day."[12] For Kerschensteiner, then, the Arbeitsschule was the means to moral education as well. If pupils worked together to complete a given project, they would come to realize that the effort of each one of them was necessary for the success of the whole enterprise and that the needs of the group took precedence over the selfish wishes of the individual. However, Kerschensteiner saw that the immaturity of many Volksschule pupils prevented them from grasping the ethical content of such methods. This caused Kerschensteiner to turn his attention to the

vocational schools, where older pupils with experience of work would more easily comprehend. By 1907 day release for all the relevant young people in Munich had been made compulsory. Apart from vocational instruction civics was made an integral part of the course. The students were to learn a trade whereby to earn their living and at the same time ensuring a steady supply of skilled workers so vital for the proper functioning of an industrial society. The moral aspect aimed not so much at producing a well adjusted individual but rather at the creation of an autonomous citizen playing an informed and responsible part in the running of the state. Here Kerschensteiner is important because, "his ideas for revitalizing the contemporary German educational system were a pointer to the flags of educational reform movements hoisted in the 1920s in Germany."[13)]

The other leading theoretician of the Arbeitsschule was Hugo Gaudig, principal of the Second Girls' Höhere Schule and, at the same time, of the Teachers' Seminar - both in Leipzig. He considered that the primary aim of the school was still intellectual development, and therefore activity methods were not a replacement for but rather a complement to book learning. His aim was the "free, developing personality"[14)] to be achieved by "free, intellectual activity"[15)]. By this he meant that the pupils should not passively accept information from the teacher. Instead they should acquire knowledge by their inquiries, and in the process they would become independent, discerning people, freely contributing to and drawing sustenance from their environment. In practice, lessons were so organised that the teacher would not take the initiative, but he would try to answer as fully as possible any questions from the pupils. They, in turn, were expected to be inquisitive and constantly putting questions. By doing this each pupil continually reviewed what he knew, located and articulated that which he did not

know, with the result that his understanding grew from his own persistent efforts.

The Private Boarding Schools

In 1898 Hermann Lietz founded his first private boarding school at Ilsenburg in the Harz mountains. This was the first of a number of such foundations which sprang up in Germany in the following decades. The young Lietz had had a happy home life in the country and was horrified, when he left home to go to school in the town, at the opportunities for sinfulness which urban life offered. After a stay with Cecil Reddie at Abbotsholme[16], Lietz returned to Germany to open his own school, to which he later added Haubinda (1901) and Bieberstein (1904). All three were given the collective title of Landerziehungsheime, a name which clearly indicated the basic principles of the schools: Land (country, i.e. removed from the temptations of the town), Erziehung (education, and not mere formal training), and Heim (home, i.e. an atmosphere of affection and respect). Although these schools prepared their pupils to the same academic standards as in the state schools, they had great freedom in their own internal organisation. Activity methods were used and stress laid on using the local environment as the starting place from which much lesson material could grow. Particularly advantageous was that in such schools there was time for other educational activities in addition to classroom instruction. Mornings were devoted to lessons, the afternoons were free for work in and around the estate, and the evenings were occupied with informal cultural activities. The pupils had greater opportunities for decision taking and for exercising authority than in the state schools, but the prevailing atmosphere was one of paternalism, since Lietz saw himself as the affectionate, yet stern, father of an outsized family. Lietz, it has been said[17], had no detailed educational philosophy and could not

apply himself to the details of day-to-day organisation, preferring to establish a series of new schools and then leave their running to others, in whom he was able to awaken lasting trust and loyalty.

In 1906 two teachers, Gustav Wyneken and Paul Geheeb, left Lietz's employ to establish their own school at Wickersdorf to be known as the Free School Community. They disagreed with Lietz on two points. Firstly, both favoured co-education, which Lietz did not, and secondly, they both believed in involving the pupils more in the administration of the school. The academic work was fairly formal since Wyneken, in contrast to the individualism of much contemporary reform thinking, believed in objective values. Yet he held that, in order to help young people towards a deeper appreciation of these values, they should be left to develop freely, away from the preconceived notions of the adult world. Thus Wyneken was a supporter of the youth movement, and he tried to recreate its spirit within his school. " The school must be transformed into the spiritual home of youth, whose physical home it is anyway for half of the day."[18] Accordingly, the staff and the pupils co-operated in the organisation of the school and shared many of the administrative tasks.

Geheeb, on the other hand, could not agree with Wyneken[19], and he left in 1909 to set up his own school in the Odenwald near Heidelberg. Here co-education was extended to mean almost complete equality in treatment for boys and girls. Yet, it is in the matter of the curriculum that Geheeb is more significant, for it was he who devised the so-called "course system". Instead of the usual arrangement of the time-table the Odenwaldschule offered courses in various subjects at various levels, which ran throughout one term. The pupils were free to choose which courses they would attend, bearing in mind their interests and level of attainment. Having thus devoted their time to a limited

number of subjects given in concentrated units, a new set of subjects could be chosen in the following term.

Following the lead of Lietz, Wyneken, and Geheeb, many other private boarding schools were established before and after the Great War. Only two of these, however, deserve special mention. Salem was founded in 1920 by Prince Max of Baden, the last imperial chancellor. Its aim was to act as a haven in which the old monarchist, militarist values could be kept alive in the days of national defeat and foreign domination. The Free Waldorf School was opened in Stuttgart on 7th September, 1919, ~~Georg~~ Rudolf Steiner having accepted the invitation to be its headmaster. It was avowedly anti-Marxist and set out to give an education based on non-materialist, "anthroposophical" principles. These were based on a semi-mystical concept involving close attention to the appropriate kind of education according to the developmental stage of each individual pupil. Formal learning was delayed until adolescence, and emphasis was laid on emotional and physical health. Dancing, too, was greatly stressed. The organisation of the school was informal with no fixed classes, no time-table of the traditional kind, and close co-operation between the pupils and the staff in the running of the school.

The disadvantage of the pupil boarding schools was their exclusiveness, for only the wealthier sections of the population could afford to send their children there. They also enabled, regrettably, some parents to withdraw their children from the state-run schools, especially in the post-war years when the tenor of school reform threatened the traditional privileges of the rich. Yet the significance of these schools to the present theme lies in their freedom to experiment. Experimentation in the ~~pupil~~ public sector required official approval and thus lacked spontaneity, whereas in the private schools adjustments could be made at any time and, providing certain minimum standards were fulfilled,

it was possible to gain experience in less formal administration, more flexible time-tabling, extra-curricular activities, and more relaxed pupil-teacher relationships. Despite their post-war development as the guardians of élitism, the private schools had previously been the source of many innovations which were to find their way into the work of the school reformers of the Weimar period.

The Einheitsschule

That the German school system was, in a sense, the mirror of a divided society will be evident from what has been said above. The progressive educationalists sought to overcome this by proposing the establishment of an Einheitsschule[20]. The term originated at the time of Humboldt, and although it was never put into practice it found favour in various quarters. The socialists thought it would overcome the gulf between the capitalists and the workers, the liberals thought it would enable those of talent to gain an education commensurate with their ability regardless of their social origin, and the nationalists hoped it would create a greater sense of national unity. The Volksschule teachers were especially eager proponents of the idea, and at the conferences of their representative body, the German Volksschule Teachers' Association, in 1904 and 1914 resolutions were carried calling for the introduction of the Einheitsschule. In fact, it will be recalled, it was the höhere Schulen which had made most progress in this direction by the development of the Reformgymnasien.

The extent to which the principle of the Einheitsschule was translated into accomplished fact during the period of the Weimar Republic will be discussed later. At this point it is sufficient to refer to the heirs of the Pedagogical Movement, who were mainly responsible for keeping alive the ideals of the movement, and especially that of the Einheitsschule, in the post-war years.

Although many of the important figures in the Pedagogical Movement survived the war, the initiative passed to the younger generation of educationalists, many of whom formed themselves into the League of Determined School Reformers. The group was formed in 1919 under the chairmanship of Paul Oestreich, who in common with other leading members was a practising school teacher. Without accepting orthodox Marxist dogma, the League was generally in sympathy with socialist educational ideals. Yet since the SPD had compromised with the traditional German ruling élite, in the setting up of the republic, to the detriment of its revolutionary zeal, the Determined School Reformers were closer to the USPD in spirit and became severe critics of the half-hearted attempts at reform which the SPD tried to carry through. Indeed, the undisguised hostility between the Determined School Reformers and various ministers of education may be regarded as one reason why the proposals of the League were invariably rejected. The constitution of the League set out its aims. Paragraph One states:

> The League of Determined School Reformers among qualified masters and mistresses in German schools seeks the union of all professionally trained masters and mistresses, in as far as they are willing to co-operate in the moral and spiritual rejuvenation of German education in the spirit of the new age for mankind, which demands a balance between the interests of the individual personality and the community.

Paragraph Four continues:

> The aim of the new school is the education of the young person to be a physically developed, intellectually free, socially inclined, and resolute member of the national community and of humanity.[21])

Through a series of conferences, publications, deputations, and its influential journal Neue Erziehung (New Education), the League never tired of reminding those in charge of education of the balance between the needs of the individual and those of society which socialist theory postulated but which the SPD, in particular, by not being determined school reformers, had betrayed.

The school system proposed by the League of Determined School Reformers was referred to by various names, some of them a further refinement of declared aims, some of them alternative names or references to a special aspect they wished to highlight. Thus they called for the establishment of the "elastic Einheitsschule". This was an Einheitsschule in that all the children in a community were to attend it, it was "elastic" in that there would be sufficient internal differentiation for the individual needs of all the pupils to be met. After a kindergarten for all children between the ages of three and six, such a school would firstly consist of a Grundschule organised in two stages, six to ten year olds and ten to sixteen year olds. Here there would operate a system of "core and elective" subjects[22]. The teachers would be responsible only to their sense of professional responsibility, and the running of the school would be on a "collegiate"[23] basis. After sixteen those who wished to continue their education could go to one of four types of school - academic, commercial, artistic, or social. Another facet of their concept of the school was implied when the League called their proposed school a Lebensschule. This term had often been used to imply the opposite of the traditional Lernschule[24], but for the Determined School Reformers it had more precise connotations. It was to be a microcosm of the real world. Located on the outskirts of a town, it would do away with the artificial divisions found in most schools but not in life, and also, as in life, the pupils would be expected to engage in productive work. All manner of activities would be provided - woodwork, art, needlework, horticulture - and by pursuing these their application to life would be appreciated and the learning therefore more thorough. The League also named its school an Erlebnisschule[25], but since this term seemed to imply the non-rational absorption of educationally structured experiences the name

was dropped in favour of Arbeitsschule. This in turn was rejected, for it was most widely accepted to mean only a place for single individual development, and since for the League this was just one aim of its programme it finally chose the name Produktionsschule[26] instead. This too had been used by other left-wing theoreticians[27] to describe a form of Einheitsschule which emphasised polytechnical training, and so, to distinguish their version, the Determined School Reformers coined the term "pedagogical production" to indicate that production was the servant of pedagogy and not vice versa. However, the League did not succeed fully in making the public aware of how far their ideas were different from other contemporary proposals. The League was dissolved in 1933, soon after Hitler's accession to power, having fought resolutely for the implementation of many of the ideas which the Pedagogical Movement had expected to see introduced once the Kaiser's regime had been overthrown. We now pass on to see to what extent their hopes were realized.

Notes

1. e.g. Wilhelm Preyer Die Seele des Kindes (1882), Wilhelm Ament Die Entwicklung von Denken und Sprechen beim Kinde (1897), William Stern Psychologie der frühen Kindheit (1914), Karl Bühler Die geistige Entwicklung des Kindes (1918).

2. Hay one extract suffice to illustrate the tone of the book. "Unless fathers and mothers bow their heads to the dust before the nobility of the child, unless they realise that the word child is only another expression for the concept of majesty, unless they feel that it is the future which in the form of a child is slumbering in their arms, history which is playing at their feet - they will also not comprehend that they have neither the power nor the right to prescribe laws for this new being, just as they possess neither the power nor the right to prescribe them for the paths of the stars. Yet when the mother experiences the same reverence for the unknown universes which encounter her in the glances of her child as for the universes which scatter their white blossoms across the blue darkness of the heavens, when the father sees in his son a crown prince whom he shall serve in humility with all his strength - then the child will have its true deserts." Quoted in K. F. Sturm, Deutsche Erziehung im Werden (Osterwieck/Harz: A. W. Zickfeld Verlag, 1939), p. 35. Writer's translation.

3. Ernst Linde, Persönlichkeitspädagogik, (1936)

4. Heinrich Scharrelmann - cf. p.177 Hugo Gaudig - cf. p.45.

5. Paul Natorp, Sozialpädagogik, (1899).

6. The first youth hostel was opened by R. Schirrmann at Burg Altena in 1909.

7. Quoted in R. H. Samuel & R. Hinton Thomas, Education and Society in Modern Germany (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1949), p. 19.

8. Hermann Nohl, Die Pädagogische Bewegung in Deutschland und ihre Theorie (Frankfurt a. M. Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 6.Aufl., 1963) p. 12, Writer's translation.

9. W. Z. Laqueur, Young Germany (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1962), pp. 195-96.

10. Quoted in K. F. Sturm, op. cit., p.24. Writer's translation.

11. Fritz Karsen, Deutsche Versuchsschulen der Gegenwart (Leipzig: Dürr'sche Buchhandlung, 1923), p. 23. Writer's translation.

12. Georg Kerschensteiner, The Idea of the Industrial School (New York: Macmillan, 1913), p. 76.

13. D. Simons, Georg Kerschensteiner (London: Methuen, 1966), p. 53.

14. " The free, developing personality is that individuality; which, conscious of itself, feels and desires to exist in a civilised environment; which draws its strength from this environment; which asserts itself and develops in its acceptance of the general aims of civilised living; which absorbs the idealist philosophies, customs, and laws of this cultural circle, and decisively rejects

all that is inferior." Quoted in K.F. Sturm, op. cit., pp. 32-33. Writer's translation.

15. "Free, intellectual activity is that mode of working according to which the entire work process is carried through by the pupil's own initiative from the setting of the problem to its solution." Hugo Gaudig (Hrsg.), Freie geistige Schularbeit in Theorie und Praxis (5. Aufl. Breslau: Ferdinand Hirt, 1925), p. 17. Writer's translation.

16. Progressive school founded in Derbyshire in 1889. cf. Cecil Reddie, "was zur gründung von abbotsholme führte" (sic), Die Erziehung, Vol.III, (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Mayer, 1928), pp. 577 ff.

17. cf. Friedrich Heichert, "Rückblick auf die erste Zeit der Deutschen Landerziehungsheime", ibid., pp. 589 ff.

18. Gustav Wyneken, Der Kampf für die Jugend (Jena: Eugen Diederichs Verlag, 1919), p. 100. Writer's translation.

19. Wyneken appears to have been a natural controversialist. He quarrelled with his associates and was even excluded from Wickersdorf by the local education authorities.

20. Literally "unity school".

21. Quoted in Paul Oestreich (Hrsg.), Entschiedene Schulreform (Berlin: Erich Reiss Verlag, 1920), p. 158. Writer's translation.

22. i.e. Some basic subjects would be studied by all the pupils, whereas the rest of a child's time-table would be made up of subjects which he had chosen for himself.

23. i.e. The staff were all equally responsible for the running of the school, the headmaster being chosen from one of their number.

24. Lebensschule - literally "life school"; Lernschule - literally "learn school".

25. Literally - "experience school".

26. The League of Determined School Reformers defined the Produktionsschule as, - ... achieving, " ... by the use, production, and exploitation of necessary, useful, and beautiful objects, and by the practice given in community living and service, the healthy self-development of the child's body and that of his spiritual and intellectual powers; it allows his moral sense to grow stronger in work in which one is conscious of one's responsibility to the team, while at the same time it always does justice to the totality of society." Quoted in Georg Grunwald, Die Pädagogik des 20. Jahrhunderts (Freiburg i. B.: Herder und Co., 1927), p. 44. Writer's translation.

27. e.g. P.P. Blonsky's work written upon commission of the executive committee of the Communist Youth Internationale and published in Germany under the title of Die Produktionsschule, (Berlin, 1921).

CHAPTER IV

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

We have seen that for at least two decades before the Great War strong impulses towards educational reform were building up inside Germany. The collapse of the monarchy, unexpected as it was for all but the last few weeks of the war, did not leave Germany in a cultural vacuum until new policies could be devised to suit the new circumstances. On the contrary, the situation in November, 1918 seemed to indicate that all the ideas and proposals which formerly had had little chance of gaining official approval could now be put into practice without hindrance. The political parties of the left dominated the stage, cheered on by the broad mass of the war-weary population, and they felt confident that the time was ripe to undertake a reform of the educational system based on the ideas of the Pedagogical Movement. For the first time for many years progressive educational opinion agreed with official policy, and the prospects for success were good. The new Bavarian government declared in late November, 1918:

> "The entire school system is to be organised as one unit, being an educational institution for all regardless of social origin. We demand the same freedom for the school as for the church, the passing of a Volksschule law to include school inspection by professionally qualified personnel, acceptance by the state of the financial burden of the Volksschule, the reform of teacher training, readjustments in the administration of the schools, the inclusion of pupils to co-operate in the shaping of the practical organisation of their schools, the dissemination of learning throughout all sections of the nation, and the participation of the broad masses in art."[1]

While believing in increasing the opportunities for decision taking at the lowest level, socialists, as illustrated by this declaration, were at the same time in favour of strengthening the central authorities to ensure that their aims were uniformly realized. In the Germany of late 1918 this was felt to be more than ever necessary for the nation defeated in war, bereft of some of its former territories,

its system of government in ruins, was in danger of losing all sense of national identity and purpose. The new state then placed great reliance on education as the means to the attainment of its social objectives. It therefore followed that education would have to be put under stricter central control. In fact, the 1871 Reich constitution did not refer to education at all, the implication being that the provision of education was to be left to each of the constituent kingdoms, etc. It seemed then that each province was free to organise its education as it wished, but the pre-eminent position of Prussia meant that the other provinces followed to a greater or lesser extent wherever Prussia led. However, the need for greater control from the centre became increasingly apparent, and after 1912 the SPD was constantly calling for the creation of a Reich School Office to supervise education at national level.

The Weimar Constitution and Education

When the delegates assembled in Weimar in February, 1919, to draw up the new constitution it was intended then to create a state with a greatly strengthened central government. To achieve this it was proposed that the former kingdoms etc. should be totally abolished and replaced by new provinces, all approximately equal in size. In this way the old rivalries would be overcome and allegiance to the new state more easily won. Yet before the deliberations of the national assembly were complete, the phase of enthusiasm for left-wing politics was already beginning to fade and the old particularist tendencies were beginning to re-assert themselves. The result was that the former provincial boundaries remained, with the difference that they now contained republican democracies in miniature with the official title of Länder. Already the hopes for a more unified educational system were waning.

In this atmosphere of already declining support for left-wing ideals the definition of the role of the new Reich government vis-à-vis the Länder with regard to education proved rather difficult. It was eventually regulated by Article Ten of the Weimar Constitution, which stated: "The Reich government may by law prescribe fundamental principles with respect to . . . . 2) Education, including higher education and scientific libraries."[2] In the second part of the constitution, the Rights and Duties of the Citizen, Articles 142-49 inclusive went on to outline in more detail the principles to which Article Ten was alluding.[3] One further direct reference to education was included, in Article 174, which stated: "Until such time as a . . . Reich School Law is passed, the existing laws remain in force."[4] Although included in the constitution out of understandable motives, this article was to prove a considerable hindrance to the progress of educational reform, as we shall see below.[5] Finally, it should be mentioned that some articles dealing with other aspects of the organisation of the state contained implications for education, but these articles need not be discussed here.

A study of the educational articles of the Weimar Constitution shows that the governing coalition was aware of and tried to include many of the points current in the reform thinking of the period. Article 142 gave all citizens the right to an education and, by making it free, guaranteed that all could avail themselves of this right. Article 143 was a miscellany of various ideas, affirming all in the same article that the Reich was just one partner (and not necessarily the dominant one) in the administration of education, that teacher training should be re-organized as an important corollary to any reforms undertaken in the schools, and that teachers should have the same security of employment as other public servants. Article 144 in

essence aimed at further dividing church and state by removing the churches from a position in which they could interfere with the professional work of the teachers. Article 145 acknowledged the work of Kerschensteiner in that it stipulated some form of education for all young people until at least the age of eighteen. It also reaffirmed that education in schools for which attendance was compulsory should be free. Article 146 was the longest, possibly most important, and certainly the most hotly debated article in this whole section. Paragraph One was inspired by the ideal of the Einheitsschule, although references to the Volksschule and to the höhere Schulen made it clear that it was not intended to change radically the skeleton of the existing system, (a fact which perhaps prompted the formation of the League of Determined School Reformers.) At least it was maintained that entry to the höhere Schulen should no longer depend upon the wealth and social status of one's parents. Paragraph Two dealt with the most controversial point in the whole of education during the Weimar period, namely the relationship between the churches and the state in educational matters. The discussion of this matter occupied the delegates for many weeks, two drafts were rejected before it was accepted in its final form. This bears all the marks of a compromise among the coalition partners, the SPD being generally in favour of a secular school whereas the Centre Party was really only prepared to accept an arrangement in which the traditional rights of the Catholics were not impaired. The final solution (which was complemented by Article 174) was left to a subsequent Reich law, a delaying tactic which was to have fateful consequences for later developments in this field. Paragraph Three was an extension of Paragraph One in that it assured the necessary financial support for the able, but less wealthy, children to attend those schools which still charged fees. Article 147 developed out of the preceding

two articles and attempted to regulate the position of the private schools, primarily the Vorschulen, within the new circumstances by placing more stringent conditions on their establishment. Article 148 turned to matters of the curriculum. It insisted on the use of activity methods and the importance of education in citizenship. Article 149 returned once more to the problem of religion. It attempted to lay down the principles governing the position of religious instruction in schools including a reaffirmation of the rights of both those who did not wish to give, and those who did not wish to receive such instruction.

For the organisation of a whole system of national education the provisions of the constitution form the merest outline, and an outline at that which had certain flaws. This may be attributed to a number of reasons. Reference has already been made to the fact that there were unmistakable signs of compromise among the coalition partners, but in justification of this one might add that the members of the SPD possibly believed that the German "revolution" was complete and that therefore the forces of reaction would never again seriously challenge the eventual attainment of their goals. In fact, in the midst of the discussions on the new constitution the reluctant government was compelled to put its signature to the Treaty of Versailles. The SPD as the major party in the coalition became associated in the mind of the public with what many Germans regarded as a great national betrayal and the SPD never regained in subsequent elections the popularity it had enjoyed since the abdication of the Kaiser. Furthermore, it is probably reasonable to assume that the politicians were expecting that the framework which they had prepared could be left to the educationalists for elaboration at the proposed Reich School Conference.

The major fault, however, with the education section of the

constitution was its lack of clarity and precision. This is seen most strikingly in the contradiction which existed between Article 149 and Article 174. The former allowed pupils and staff to opt out of being concerned with religious instruction, thereby creating the possibility of a completely secular school, whereas the latter forbade any change in the existing arrangements until a Reich law could be passed. It was not clear which of the two articles had precedence. Also, Article 10 had established that the constitution contained only principles, but it was not easy to discover what the legal status of these principles was. Articles 143, 146, and 174 all referred explicitly to a subsequent Reich law to give effect to their proposals. Yet how was one to regard the others? Because no explicit mention was made of additional legislation, was one to assume that they already had the force of law, or was one to assume that, as with Article 143 etc., all the principles laid down by the constitution required further legislation before they could take effect? If the latter interpretation was correct, what were the Länder to do in the meantime? Generally it seemed agreed that the constitution merely indicated in advance the lines along which future legislation would proceed, but nonetheless the resulting confusion did leave the Länder in a dilemma. They did not know whether they should just do nothing and allow the situation as it was before the ratification of the constitution to continue, or whether they should proceed on their own, each interpreting for itself the meaning of the artide in question, and hope that a later Reich law did not compel them to change any new measures which had already cost much scarce money to make in the first place. Article 174 had been assumed to be binding when Saxony and Hamburg were made to re-introduce religious instruction in 1920, yet the only official lead given to the Länder came in the Reich Supreme Court Ruling of 19th May, 1926. The details of the case will be explained

later but, briefly, the ruling made it clear that the Länder were perfectly free to make whatever arrangements they wished, no matter how contrary to the spirit of the constitution, until such time as any promised Reich law was enacted. This would, then, of course, take precedence over any Land law. The date of the ruling makes it clear both how long the state of confusion had existed and how slim the chances were of ever getting the promised Reich laws passed.

Thus it came about that much of the initiative for educational reform was left to the Länder. As a result, this prevented the uniform development of education throughout the country, for those Länder which were in the main governed by parties of the left went ahead with making their own versions of what they interpreted to be the intention of the constitution, whereas the other Länder used all the difficulties and uncertainties as a justification for inaction. In this latter course the Länder were further encouraged by an undertaking of the Reich government to pay a major share of the costs incurred by the Länder as the result of Reich legislation. Plainly, few Länder were willing to pay the cost of reform if there was a chance of the Reich providing the money, but if one recalls the severe financial difficulties which prevailed almost uninterruptedly throughout the lifetime of the republic it is equally plain that the Reich was seldom in a position to afford even the most uncontroversial of reforms.

The Reich Grundschule Law

There was, however, one bill dealing with education which the Reich government did manage to enact. Acting on Article 146, paragraph one, of the constitution a start was made on unifying the disparate elements of the school system to form the foundations of the Einheitsschule. This involved abolishing the Vorschulen and insisting that all the nation's children should attend the same, state-run school for

the first four years of schooling. The task was to be taken over by the junior division of the Volksschule, the first four years of which were to be known as the Grundschule. On 28th April, 1920, the Law concerning the Grundschule and the Dissolution of the Vorschulen[6] (referred to for short as the Reich Grundschule Law) was passed. In essense it was a simple measure but it was going to take a number of years before its objectives could be fully realized. It was envisaged that it would be 1929 before all the Vorschulen had been closed down, a period long enough for the opponents of the law to drive home their attack.

Although the duration of the Grundschule as fixed for four years represented a compromise and many of those associated with the Pedagogical Movement would have liked to have seen a longer period, the law still met with considerable opposition in political circles. Not only did the four-year Grundschule provoke a hostile reaction from some quarters because it imposed one additional year's schooling on those who would otherwise have attended the Vorschule, but also there was some opposition to the abolition of the Vorschule itself. It is not clear how much parliamentary support the law had, but even within the sphere of education sufficient opposition was shown for the Reich government, in the following year, to reaffirm in unequivocal terms its resolve that the Grundschule should be regarded as a four-year school for everybody. On 18th June, 1921, the Reich Ministry of the Interior published its Suggestions for Determining the Aims and the Internal Structure of the Grundschule[7]. Here it was argued that the Grundschule had its own raison d'être as an independent type of school, a unified and integrated unit, which it would be inappropriate to regard as merely the preparatory stage for any other given kind of further schooling. The full four years represented, therefore, a rounded course of instruction which

was complete in itself and which consequently could not be shortened without an undesirable imbalance resulting.

Although this was evidence of the government's determination that its will should be obeyed, the opponents of the Reich Grundschule Law were not ready to accept this as the final word. The opportunity for practical action to change the law arose in 1925 when the government, a right-wing coalition at the time, passed on April 18th the Law concerning the Duration of the Grundschule Course. It was concise in its wording, simply stating:

> 1. The course of the Grundschule consists of four, yearly stages. In individual cases pupils of special ability may after examination by the Grundschule teacher and with the permission of the school inspectorate be allowed admission to a Mittel- or höhere Schule after three years' attendance at the Grundschule.
>
> 2. This law comes into force on the day of its promulgation[8].

Again the Ministry of the Interior had to clarify the new situation arising from the law and this it did in the Suggestions published on 18th January, 1926. In this way one of the basic motives behind the Reich Grundschule Law was reversed, the attack on the abolition of the Vorschulen following two years later. On 26th February, 1927, the Law concerning the Amendment of the Reich Grundschule Law was passed by the Reichstag. It set out to deal with the controversial problem of financial compensation for those suffering hardship as the result of the enforced closure of the Vorschulen. To Paragraph Two, section two, of the Reich Grundschule Law it added the following amendment:

> Before this compensation from public means or any compensation from other public resources is regulated by means of a Reich law and its effective implementation is assured, the gradual abandonment or the dissolution of the private Vorschulen may not proceed.[9]

The tone of the amendment is mild and it was undeniably just that those compelled to dispose of their property and/or livelihood should be guaranteed adequate compensation, yet one must not forget the prevailing conditions at the time. It is perhaps true to say that the

government was not entirely blind to the implications which the constant financial difficulties would have for their amendment. Indeed, a bill designed to make the money for compensation available was withdrawn from the Reichstag early in 1930 because the funds were simply not there for such a project. In effect, then, the amendment meant the continued survival of the Vorschulen until Hitler, with less ceremony, swept them away. The other basic motive of the Reich Grundschule Law was thus also reversed. On the other hand, it has to be admitted that the spirit of the law of 28th April, 1920, was not so easily eradicated. Throughout the Weimar period the popularity of the three-year period of preparation for admission to a höhere Schule declined in favour of the four years of the Grundschule proper.

The Reich School Conference

We have seen that it was intended to debate and amplify the provisions of the Weimar Constitution at a Reich school conference. As it happened the Reich Grundschule Law was passed before the conference met, so that Article 145 was already a fait accompli before the leaders of educational opinion were able to discuss its interpretation. However, there still remained much for such a conference to deal with.

The idea of a Reich school conference was not a new one for such gatherings had already met in 1890 and 1900, resulting in the reform of certain aspects of the höhere Schulen. In the Weimar Republic, true to the democratic ideals of the constitution, the occasion was a conference in the true meaning of the word. Early in 1917 the SPD had suggested that a Reich school conference should be called as soon as the hostilities had ceased so that the new circumstances arising as the result of the war could be debated and their implications for education assessed. The suggestion was not taken up, but the idea was not forgotten. On 1st December, 1918, the Prussian Minister of Science,

Art, and Popular Education suggested a Reich School conference once more to the Reich government. This time the idea was received with approval, and on 4th January, 1919, the Reich Minister of the Interior sent out a letter to all interested parties calling for a Reich school conference later in the same year. The following months were occupied with the drafting of the constitution, but once this had been done the Minister, in a letter dated 22nd September, 1919, further defined the object, as he saw it, that such a conference might serve.

> The constitution of the German Reich of 11th August, 1919, confers upon the Reich a series of important tasks of a politico-cultural nature. To deal with them according to their merits I have set up in the Reich Ministry of the Interior a new department which is to work out the politico-cultural tasks of the Reich, particularly the legal measures dealing with education which in the coming days are so urgently necessary. In this I place great emphasis from the outset on the close and fruitful co-operation of my ministry with the Länder ministries of culture and the local school authorities. Only if the work dome by these bodies up to the present and the politico-cultural experience they have gained in the course of time can be made available to the Reich with its new legislative functions, and the resulting fruitful exchange between the Länder, the local authorities, and the Reich causes them to be linked together, can the politico-cultural provisions of the constitution become living reality. Even in the future most of the work concerning schools and national education will have to be done by the Länder and the local authorities. The Reich can only stimulate, mediate, and work out unifying principles from the experience gained by partnership. But for this mutual confidence and the will for active support all-round is an essential precondition.[10)]

However, unrest within the country caused the postponement of the conference and it was not until 6th March, 1920, that the invitations to attend were sent out. The conference finally met from 11th to 19th June, 1920, in the Reichstag building. The arrangements for the conference were made with meticulous care. Great pains were taken to ensure that all participants were fully informed about the issues under discussion and that all shades of opinion were represented and given a fair hearing. Approximately 700 people took part, either as the representatives of the Reich and Länder governments, local councils, official and professional educational associations, or as private

individuals renowned for their interest and expertise in educational matters. In fact, most of the educationalists mentioned in these pages, still alive in 1920, as well as many others besides, were present. Before the conference met a book, Die Deutsche Schulreform (The German School Reform),[11] was published by the Central Institute of Education and Instruction[12] in which all the topics to be debated were explained by a series of experts, who endeavoured to give a balanced summary of all the influential opinions current at the time. In addition, various educationalists known for their distinct views on certain aspects of education were invited to introduce each topic in the debate. There were usually about four such people for each topic and, to save time, and to familiarize the other delegates with the key points of the arguments to be presented, each of the experts drew up a list of the points they were going to raise, which was then sent to the delegates for their perusal before the conference began. The first four days of the conference itself were spent in plenary session debating the Einheitsschule, the methods of the Arbeitsschule, teacher training, and wider participation in the administration of the schools. These subjects were introduced by, among others, such emminent names as Georg Kerschenstainer, Fritz Karsen, Johannes Tews, Paul Natorp, and Eduard Spranger. Then the discussions were opened for contributions from the floor. For the fifth and sixth days the conference divided into eighteen committees, each discussing a separate aspect of the school system[13]. The remaining three days were spent presenting the reports of all these committees. No discussion was possible on the recommendations made by these committees but delegates were permitted to add the official resolution of the organisation they represented at the end of each report.

Despite some overlap between the topics debated in full session and those debated in committee the actual agenda was formidable and the

amount of ground covered prodigious. Every aspect of the school system was reviewed and suggestions made for reform in every department. Detailed discussion of these suggestions will be left for later, when specific items are referred to, but some assessment of the value of the Reich School Conference is possible.

It was an achievement in itself to draw together so many of the leading men and women in the field of education to debate their ideas on the shape of education in the new republic. It is also an indication of how important they themselves considered such a meeting to be. The conference was organised with efficiency and, although tempers ran high in some of the debates, that the business was conducted without disruption and delay was due to the skill of Heinrich Schulz as chairman. A summary of the proceedings was published[14], and later a full verbatim report[15], both of which served to make more widely known the recommendations of the conference as well as being a permanent record of what had been said. For those authorities intent on school reform the conference produced clear guide-lines of the course which such reform was expected to take, and, as we shall see, much of the school reform which was finally achieved was based on the work of the conference. On the other hand, nobody was compelled to adopt any of the recommendation so that those authorities which were resisting reform were quite free to ignore them. It was also a little naive to expect that such a large gathering of disparate groups and individuals would express with one voice the ideals which had first motivated the calling of the conference. Compromise was inevitable and some of the more controversial measures reduced to the lowest common denominator. No votes were taken, no binding decisions reached, which in turn meant that for the most of the delegates there was no need to listen and try to understand the views of others, or to defend their own opinions in

earnest debate. It was sufficient for them to mouth the statements which their associations had drawn up in advance. In short, although the conference could claim some positive achievements, the hopes which first inspired it were far from fully realized. Once the delegates had dispersed, that was the end of the matter for most of them; only very few remained who were intent on keeping alive the ideals to which the Reich School Conference had acceded.

The Reich School Law

That the Reich Grundschule Law was the only successful piece of legislation ever enacted by the Reich government in the field of education does not mean that this was the only attempt made to give legal force to the provisions of the constitution. Both teacher training and vocational education, in particular, were felt to need some regulation and bills were drafted on these topics, even if they were never introduced into the Reichstag for debate. The most urgent matter, however, was the question of the denominational character of the Volksschulen. Article 174 of the constitution had aimed at stopping the various Länder devising their own individual schemes by preserving the status quo until the matter could be uniformly regulated for the whole Reich. Yet Articles 145 and 146 seemed to suggest that the Volksschule should henceforth be a non-denominational school for all pupils, with a few denominational schools as an exceptional type, should they be demanded. It was clearly a situation which required immediate action by the Reich government, and, although in the long run the Reich government was never able to come to a successful solution of the problem, the attempts that it made to deal with the matter illustrate well the difficulties faced by educational reformers in the Weimar Republic.

The first bill to try to create a non-denominational Volksschule was introduced into the Reichstag on 22nd April, 1921. It

proposed that the Volksschule should be organised as a tripartite system. To the existing two types, the denominational and the inter-denominational Volksschule, should be added a third type, the secular school, to be known as the Gemeinschaftsschule. Since this last type was to be the ground floor upon which the other storeys of the Einheitsschule were to be reared, it was intended that it should be the dominant type, the other two becoming merely schools for minority groups. Up to this point the intentions of the constitution had been preserved intact, but difficulties arose over some of the finer points of definition. One such difficulty lay in determining which criteria were relevant when deciding if permission might be granted to organise a separate, denominational school. One answer was to stipulate the minimum number of places necessary to produce a school of a viable size, which, once attained, would give the applicants an automatic right to have that school established. Another was to say that permission would only be granted as long as the numbers of denominational schools in no way threatened the predominant position of the Gemeinschaftsschule. The government steered a middle course, but a greater difficulty lay in the concept of the Volksschule as a secular school. The government had possibly underestimated the extent to which the general public was still in favour of some kind of religious education in the Volksschule, yet it was proposed that all such schools would automatically become Gemeinschaftsschulen unless an application for exemption were successful. The pre-1918 situation had been the outcome of a protracted wrangle which the individual provinces had conducted with the churches and in the main they felt they lacked the necessary public support for upsetting this balance. Finally, there was some doubt about the religious character of the Gemeinschaftsschule. Was it fundamentally Christian even though not specifically tied to one denomination? Or was it secular to the point of being atheistic? Discussions of these problems

dragged on for two and a half years until on 4th December, 1923, after 160 sessions on the committee stage of the bill, the government decided to withdraw the measure.

In September 1925 the government prepared another bill but did not present it to the Reichstag. In the autumn of 1927 a third and final attempt was made. By this time the government was a right-wing coalition when the Minister of the Interior, von Keudell, introduced his Bill for the Implementation of Articles 146, para. 2, and 149 of the Reich Constitution. Its main differences from the 1921 bill was that it tried to include Article 149 within its provisions and that, more significantly, it changed the status of the proposed secular school. Again there was to be a tripartite system, only this time it was the interdenominational schools which were to be named Gemeinschaftsschulen (implying that this type was now expected to be responsible for the elementary education of most of the nation's children), whereas the non-denominational school was to be known as the Weltanschauungsschule. The assimilation of the old system into the new was to proceed so that the existing religious affiliations of the schools did not change. The only de facto secular schools already in existence were the Prussian Sammelschulen[16] of which proportionally there was a very small number, so that they would never be generally regarded as the equal of the other two types. Despite the claims of parity for all three types the effect in reality was to rob the secular school of its claim to stand above political and sectarian strife as the school to unify the conflicting elements of the nation, as the constitution seemed to envisage. Instead the secular school was relegated to being just the educational branch of a distinct political outlook. In addition, for any school to change its status a two-thirds majority was required among the parents of the children attending the school. Hence, even if the Weltanschauungsschule was in a minority to begin with, it was unlikely, under

the scheme as proposed, that there would ever be a chance of its obtaining over the years such a high majority among parents that it would eventually become the dominant type. Furthermore, the right of parents alone to determine the category of the school was another point of controversy. It was objected that the bulk of the community, as represented by their elected spokesmen, were denied any say in the matter. Instead absolute power was to be put into the hands of a relatively small, changing group which was especially susceptible to pressure from the churches. Some went as far as to maintain that the proposals were carrying sectarian debate into the homes of the nation and in some cases causing family discord.

Only the Catholics supported the bill unanimously. From other quarters it met with considerable opposition, largely because it was felt to be unconstitutional. Its declared opponents included Thomas and Heinrich Mann, Albert Einstein, as well as 1700 university teachers and such organisations as the Conference of German Municipalities, the Reich League for Religious Instruction and Education, and the Association of German Volksschule Teachers. Nevertheless it was considerations of finance which finally secured the defeat of the bill. It had been suggested that forty should be the minimum number of applications before the establishment of a separate school, having broken away from an existing one, could be approved. This was felt by many to be too small to create an educationally and economically viable unit. In Saxony it was calculated that if only one per cent of the Volksschulen were affected by secessions of this sort it would cost thirty-seven million marks plus an extra three and a half million annual running costs. The Ministry of Finance was prepared to offer thirty million marks for the whole country, with the result that the bill was inevitably defeated in the Reichsrat.[17] A proposed amendment suggested

that the Reich should eventually undertake to subsidize the Weltanschauungsschulen to guarantee their survival but the German Peoples Party, one of the partners in the governing coalition, was opposed to this and by resigning from the government caused the government to fall on 15th February, 1928.

New elections brought a weak left-wing coalition to power, and neither this nor subsequent governments were ever strong enough to risk reviving the struggle to pass the law as promised by Article 174. Thus when all else failed the Länder got together and tried to come to some mutually acceptable agreement. This they did in the Länder Agreement of 24th January, 1928, but this proved so imprecise that a second, rephrased agreement was approved on 6th August, 1930. This, too, was not a satisfactory solution to the problem of the place of religion in the new republican schools.

The Central Institute of Education and Instruction

So far we have seen how little progress the central government was able to make in the matter of educational reform. The hopes expressed at the outset produced few tangible results in the end. There was, however, one aspect of Reich involvement in reform without which reform at any level would have been almost unthinkable. Whatever progress was made, whatever new ideas were disseminated, whatever plans were formulated, were in large measure due to the encouragement of the Central Institute of Education and Instruction. In 1914 the then Prussian government set up the Jubilee Foundation for Education and Instruction which set up the Central Institute under its aegis on 21st March, 1915. Its director was chosen to be Ludwig Pallat, a man closely associated with the art education movement. Despite its original status as an office of the Prussian government, it assumed nationwide responsibilities once the war was over. Pallat explained to the Reich School

Conference, "According to its statutes the Central Institute is a workshop and central collecting and information agency, and as such serves not only Prussia but also the whole of Germany and beyond that the German schools abroad."[18] This notwithstanding, the institute did not just play a passive role. Apart from recording what was going on in education it was also very active in publicizing the new developments and encouraging further experimentation. Otto Boelitz, Prussian Minister of Education between 1920 and 1925, described the help he had received in planning the reform of the Prussian schools thus: "Prussian efforts in all departments of the school system have redeived from the Central Institute eager encouragement and the strongest support. Important pedagogical problems have been mulled over there by scholars and men of experience; much has been reduced to its essentials and in dedicated workgroups the practical application of theoretically arresting ideas has been tried out."[19]

The Central Institute of Education and Instruction was organised in five departments to deal with the following responsibilities: general educational affairs, educational exhibitions, artistic matters, education abroad, and a picture library. Of these the first mentioned was the largest and most important. The institute was centrally involved in the planning and organisation of the Reich School Conference and in publishing its findings. It also actively promoted the introduction of activity methods, local studies, education for citizenship, and the scientific study of the special features of adolescence. This was done by organising "pedagogical weeks", such as the one in Leipzig in 1921 so that Gaudig's work could be observed in the classroom situation. Between 1919 and 1924 twenty-six such weeks were held. The institute also organised other conferences and exhibitions as well as issuing numerous publications which included reports and assessments of

various schemes, statistics, and an annual review of all educational developments in Germany. In conclusion, it was the Central Institute rather than the Reich School Committee, which had been established in November, 1919 as a standing committee to promote co-operation between the central government and the Länder, that played the most important role in encouraging school reform at all levels.

Notes

1. Quoted in Jahrbuch des Zentralinstituts für Erziehung und Unterricht, 2. Jahrgang 1920 (Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1920), p.151. Writer's translation.

2. Quoted in I. L. Kandel & T. Alexander, Reorganisation of Education in Prussia (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927), p. xvii.

3. cf. Appendix B.

4. Quoted in Erich Hylla, "Legal Status of Religious Education", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College columbia University 1932, (ed. I. L. Kandel) New York: 1933, p.205

5. Immediately after the end of the war Hamburg and Saxony, in particular, passed laws in which, i.a., religious instruction was banned from schools. It was to prevent a series of such developments at Länder level without regard for the introduction of a uniform national policy that Article 174 was included.

6. cf. Appendix VII.

7. cf. Allendix VII.

8. Quoted in Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht, Das deutsche Schulwesen, Jahrbuch 1927 (Berlin, E. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1928), p.99. Writer's translation.

9. Quoted in ibid., pp.99-100. Writer's translation.

10. Quoted in Reichsministerium des Innern (erstattet von), Die Reichsschulkonferenz 1920, amtlicher Bericht (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1921), p.14.

11. Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht, Die deutsche Schulreform - Ein Handbuch für die Reichsschulkonferenz (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1919)

12. cf. below, p.73

13. These were:- education for citizenship, art education, the school and the home, physical education, German schools abroad, school administration, greater unification of the school system, private schools, kindergartens, the welfare of juveniles, activity methods, vocational education, adult education, the problems of school-children, parents & parents' councils, the administration of the Reich school system, the structure of the school system, and teacher training.

14. Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht (Hrsg.), Die Reichsschulkonferenz in ihren Ergebnissen (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1920).

15. Reichsministerium des Innern (erstattet von), Die Reichsschulkonferenz 1920, amtlicher Bericht (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1921).

16. These were schools in which pupils and teachers using their rights under Article 149 had opted out of religious instruction. Although de jure they were still denominational schools they were de facto secular.

17. Upper house of the German parliament, composed of representatives

from the constituent Länder.

18. Quoted in Reichsministerium des Innern, op. cit., p.929.

19. Otto Boelitz, Der Aufbau des preussischen Bildungswesens, (2. Aufl.; Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer, 1925), p.175. Writer's translation.

CHAPTER V

THE LÄNDER AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

With the exception of Baden and Oldenburg, the constitutions of all the constituent Länder of the Weimar Republic either implicitly or explicitly accepted the principles laid down in the Reich Constitution and were, therefore, committed to whatever reforms the central government might introduce. Yet, as we have seen, the Reich was unable in the main to give legal force to its declared principles, so that each Land was left to take whatever measures it thought necessary itself. Because the so-called revolution of 1918 had been in effect only the peaceful transference of political power from monarchists to republicans, there had been no abrupt hiatus in public life with the result that, except in the political sphere, the structure of Wilhelminian society continued its unbroken existence into the new republic. Accordingly, the legal statutes and regulations governing all education in the pre-war period continued in force, although it would have of course helped the progress of reform if one could have started with tabula rasa rather than try to amend that which already existed in the statute books of the nation. Special circumstances were therefore necessary before any one Land felt itself obliged to embark upon a revision of the state of education. The Reich had failed to insist upon this, and some of the politicians who now held the reins of power had so little experience of practical government that they were uncertain where to begin.

Obviously, political motives were the strongest force in stimulating certain of the Länder to try to put into effect within their own borders the principles which the central government had been unable to impose on the country as a whole. For this reason the main impetus for reform was centred in the northern half of Germany since it was here

that the greatest support for the republican parties was shown. However, one should also note other factors. Both Saxony and Hessen had school laws which in any case were in need of modernization since their existing regulations dated from about half a century before. Thuringia was a newly created Land, being composed of seven small former duchies, and thus was able to make a clean start with its educational legislation. Prussia's civil service lacked any revolutionary zeal but was in the main directed by able men of Liberal tendencies who were ready to work to strengthen the new republic and who were particularly mindful of the tradition of their predecessors at the time of Humboldt. (Such had been their devotion to promoting the progressive ideas of the time that trainee teachers had been sent from Prussia to Switzerland to study under Pestalozzi.) Bremen, Lübeck, and, especially, Hamburg were Germany's most important ports with a long history of independence and an openminded approach to new ideas. Bavaria, on the other hand, after a brief spell under a left-wing government became the home of right-wing politics as well as taking perverse delight in demonstrating the impotence of the Reich in Bavaria's own internal affairs by often doing the reverse of what the Reich or the other Länder thought desirable.

Administration

The separation of church and state, as has already been demonstrated in the case of the Reich School Law, was a controversial question. The custom of making the local vicar ex officio the local school inspector was one aspect of this which aroused great resentment within the ranks of the teachers. Officially the practice had been discontinued in Prussia in 1872, but in fact ninety per cent of the local school inspectors before 1914 were clergymen, with no special qualifications in pedagogy. In those Länder where this still persisted in 1918, (namely Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony), laws had been passed in each case

which resolved the matter by simply abolishing the office of local school inspector before Article 144 set the final seal on the problem. Similarly, it was hoped that the custom of the local schoolmaster having to act in rural areas as the sexton or other lay church official was discouraged, but by 1930 only forty per cent of such posts had been reformed.

In addition to the tendency towards greater secularization, the new state, in that it was intent on acting democratically, sought more participation by the citizens in the conduct of public affairs at all levels. In the case of education this meant a greater role in decision making for parents, pupils, and teachers. For parents this took the form of parents' councils. These had been recommended by the Reich School Conference but, aware of the difficulties of defining the conditions of appointment and the duties of the members, the conference had left the task of precise interpretation to the Länder. For the Volksschulen four patterns emerged, and for höhere Schulen there were three types.[1)] Prussia was the first Land to organise such councils, in höhere Schulen, in its edict of 1st October, 1918, and they were extended to all schools by the edict of 5th November, 1919. Here parents were allowed to elect one of their number to serve on the council for two years. There was one member for every fifty pupils. Yet the council could act in an advisory capacity only. It is difficult to assess the value of these arrangements, but it seems that the councils became on the whole merely a platform for petty local politics.

Wyneken, one will recall, had introduced greater pupil responsibility for the running of his school at Wickersdorf and it was to him that the Reich Minister of Culture, Hänisch, turned early in 1919 to organise a reform of the school system. Wyneken's first proposal was that all pupils over the age of fourteen should have a voice in the running of their schools, and he called for elections to be organised

so that pupils' committees could be set up. However, few teachers and, more significantly, few pupils showed any enthusiasm for the idea and most failed to vote. Whereupon Wyneken withdrew from any further schemes. Yet pupil involvement in the running of the school was not forgotten, for it was introduced in Prussia, Saxony, Hamburg, and Baden, although the precise form which these experiments took is not clear.

Teachers, too, wanted a greater voice in the running of the school they worked in. The matter was discussed at the Reich School Conference whose recommendations included the immediate introduction of "collegiate school administration". This involved that the headmaster should henceforth be elected by the staff of the school, that the headmaster's position was now that of primus inter pares, that the teachers were responsible only to themselves for their work, that all school inspectors should be professionally qualified, and that teachers should be represented on all educational bodies. Among the Länder these proposals were implemented to a greater or lesser degree. The Prussian Ordinance of 2oth September, 1919, allowed for greater teacher participation in administration. That the headmaster should be elected from among the staff was to be found in the Saxon Transitional Law of 22nd July, 1919, a Thuringian law of 19th May, 1920, and a Bremen law of 30th May, 1923. Teacher representation on educational bodies was introduced in Prussia, Saxony, Hessen, Thuringia, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Hamburg, Bremen, and Bavaria. Of these it was Hamburg which went furthest towards attaining the collegiate ideal. Here the Workers' and Soldiers Soviet, which had been set up in November 1918, decreed in March 1919 that all headmasters must be elected to office, for a two-year period, by the staff and three parents' representatives. This was later confirmed in the law of 12th April, 1920. In the first elections held after this ruling had been made

twenty-five per cent of the existing headmasters lost their positions.

Articles 145 and 146 of the Reich Constitution expressed the resolve that family financial difficulties should not prevent any child from benefitting from the type of education to which he was best suited. This meant that subsidies and grants were to be made widely available from public funds. Yet the economic difficulties which dominated so much of the Weimar period were such that these were never as widely available as was desired. Nevertheless the Weimar period did see the complete removal of all fees for the Volksschulen and vocational schools. The provision of free teaching materials was widely introduced, and where fees still continued to be charged these were often on a sliding scale so that the poorer families received greater financial support. It has to be admitted, however, that in Prussia the maximum amount of such support only accounted for thirty per cent of the total cost, and in southern Germany the percentage was much lower. The seven cadet academies of Imperial Germany lost their raison d'être under the Treaty of Versailles, and so they were converted into schools where the sons of ex-servicemen could receive a free education. All of this was undoubtedly important if the ideals of the constitution were to be realized, but it cannot be claimed that it resulted in any major change in the general pattern that the school one attended depended far more on the social status of one's parents rather than on innate ability.

Finally, the Reich School Conference devoted some time to the problem of attaining greater uniformity among the Länder in matters such as the length of the holidays, the date of the start of the school year, and a system of common nomenclature for the various types of schools. With the failure of the Reich to impose greater uniformity on the national educational system the Länder tried in various instances to come to an agreement among themselves as to the standards they would

impose. However, complete agreement was always difficult to achieve and then only possible in questions concerning the mutual recognition of certificates, and the like. In questions, such as those mentioned above, where there was no pressing reason why all should conform to a common yardstick there was, as far as is known, no agreement ever reached.

The Grundschule

The creation of the Grundschule in the law of 28th April, 1920 carried with it two main implications for the Länder. Firstly, since this school took all the children in the population of the appropriate age, rich as well as poor, and also since it was not preparing the pupils for any one type of education beyond the age of ten, the old curriculum for the lower grades of the Volksschule was hence in urgent need of reform. In Hamburg this was undertaken with the edict of 16th March, 1922, basing its proposals on four declared principles: a) the child to be seen as an active, productive, creative being, b) closer links with the world of work, c) greater unity within the school system, and d) more emphasis on German culture. Yet the most interesting attempt to produce a curriculum in agreement with the spirit of the times is to be found in the Suggestions for formulating the curriculum of the Grundschule published by the Prussian authorities on 16th March, 1921. This has several features worthy of comment. The title used the expression "suggestions" which carried with it the implication that instead of the minister dictating to the schools he was now just simply offering advice for them to follow if they wanted to. The indivisibility of the four-year course was reaffirmed, and activity methods were recommended with a corresponding decrease in the amount of rote learning. No fixed timetable was laid down but it was hoped that teaching would include the following subject areas, a more

detailed delineation depending on the pupil's own individual needs: religious instruction or moral education, local studies, German, arithmetic, drawing, music, and physical education. While the list is perhaps not remarkable in itself, the important point is the new emphasis certain subjects received. Moral education was offered for pupils in the Sammelschulen. Drawing and music were invested with greater status as the result of the Art Education Movement, physical education found new importance since it was to combat the bad effects of the privations caused by the war, and all three were now granted recognition as being of equal importance to the more 'academic' subjects.[2] Most significantly, the first year in particular was to be devoted to integrated instruction; that is to say, subject divisions were ignored, work was centred on a given topic, and information was drawn from a variety of sources as and when required.

The second effect of the Reich Grundschule Law was that the Grundschule became part of the machinery for selecting those pupils who were to go to the Mittel-or höhere Schulen. Ideally the procedure should have excluded the influence of parental wealth but since the schools still charged fees, and grants from public funds were scarce, this factor could never be removed. Nonetheless it was the arrangements made in Hamburg which went furthest towards reducing this. The city was divided into districts with six to eight Grundschulen feeding one höhere Schule. A child was selected on the basis of an application from his parents and a favourable report from his last teacher. In 1925 this was further refined by the addition of an examination, intelligence tests, and a period of probation. Saxony was similar but pupil assessment was the responsibility of the receiving school. In Baden high grades in basic subjects were alone sufficient to ensure selection. In Mecklenburg-Strelitz a parent could demand a test for his child if

the latter had not been selected by teacher recommendation. The Prussian edict of 10th February, 1931, made the report of the Grundschule teacher the sole criterion, but coupled with this was the stipulation that, in view of the need at the time for economies in public spending, teachers should be more exacting in their standards for selection. This point was also echoed in new regulations issued in the same period in Saxony, Brunswick, and Mecklenburg-Schwerin.

Attempts to extend the Einheitsschule

The Grundschule was clearly intended to be the foundation stone of the Einheitsschule which, it was hoped, would replace the existing fragmented German school system. The problem now became to devise an acceptable form of Einheitsschule for pupils who had already been at school for at least four years. Accordingly, the Einheitsschule stood in the forefront of the discussion at the Reich School Conference where it soon became clear that basically there existed two schools of thought on the subject. These, for the sake of succinctness, will be referred to as the evolutionary and revolutionary approaches. Briefly, the former believed that the school system already in existence should remain the same in outline, but also that its disparate parts should be more closely linked together to form a more unified whole, whereas the latter was in favour of dismantling the existing arrangements and substituting in their place one school for everybody in which selection would be delayed and social cohesion promoted. Die Deutsche Schulreform[3] enumerated the various proposed plans current in the immediate post-war period, and of these the one which seemed to find most approval was that proposed by Karl Reinhardt, a senior civil servant in the Prussian Ministry of Culture. According to this the Grundschule should last for six years, after which pupils would be divided into those wishing to go to the Volksschule for the final two years and those who

intended to transfer to a so-called Mittelschule for three years to be followed, if required, by three years at an Oberschule. However, we have already seen that the Reich Grundschule Law was passed before the Reich School Conference could meet so that the discussions, to which Die Deutsche Schulreform was supposed to serve as an introduction, had to now start from the fact that the Grundschule course was already set at four years. Accordingly, the recommendations of the Reich School Conference produced a plan somewhat different from Reinhardt's proposal. After four years at the Grundschule it was possible for the pupils to either continue for the final four years at the Volksschule before going to the vocational school, or transfer to a Mittelschule for three years at which point they could choose a further three years in the Mittelschule, a Realschule, or a Lyzeum, or else they could go to a höhere Schule for six years. It was hoped that some six-year Grundschulen would nonetheless be established on an experimental basis, but this never came about. The scheme as recommended by the Reich School Conference was thus a compromise between the two camps in that many of the existing schools continued their existence in an amended form, although the Mittel- and höhere Schulen were drawn more closely together in one unit. It would seem though that the evolutionists had got the better bargain, and this explains why the League of Determined School Reformers was so opposed to official policy.

Thuringia was in fact the only Land which attempted to introduce the Einheitsschule on anything like 'revolutionary' lines. By the law of 22nd February, 1922, the Thuringian Minister of Education, Herr Greil, set up a reformed system.[4] The controversy which this law inevitably provoked centred on the disappearance of the traditional type of Classical Gymnasium, and in the Land election of 1924 the right-wing opposition used this as the very core of its campaign. The exist-

ing government was defeated, a new right-wing coalition took its place, the law was immediately repealed, and the process of reorganisation was reversed.

Lübeck was the only other Land prepared to be so radical, but then only with one school in the city. In 1929 one 'flexible Einheitsschule" was established, in which all pupils coming from the Grundschule were to stay for three years. Here they were divided into three streams H, M, and V.[5] After three years it was possible for pupils in the H stream to transfer to one of the ten traditional höhere Schulen in Lübeck, whereas those remaining stayed on for another one or three years depending on their stream. During the three years that the pupils spent in the same school it was possible to change from one stream to another with more ease than if they were in separate schools. It was established, also, that those pupils who had passed through the H stream proved no worse academically than those who had attended the höhere Schule in the normal way. The apparent success of the Lübeck scheme spurred the authorities in Berlin to produce a plan of their own inspired by the same ideals. Such was the proliferation of separate types of school that by the late twenties a renewed attempt to introduce the Einheitsschule became necessary.[6] In Berlin it was hoped to organise a six-year Grundschule followed by a six-year Volksmittelschule (the last two years being optional) leading to either vocational school or höhere Schule for three years. The Volksmittelschule was to be divided into three streams; one academic, and two practical (one for for boys and one for girls). However, because of the unsettled political climate of the time the plan was never approved by the Prussian government.

Of the remaining Länder willing to take some substantial steps towards school reform, Prussia and Saxony are the prominent represent-

atives of the 'evolutionary' viewpoint. Prussia was conscious of being by far the largest Land, for apart from being the most diverse it also felt a duty to set a good example to the rest of the country. Consequently it tried to abide by the recommendations of the Reich School Conference but fell somewhat short of these probably out of a mixture of lack of money and the predominantly Liberal outlook of its senior civil servants. As a result the aim of the Prussian school reform was proclaimed to be the "differentiated Einheitsschule", a scheme which, many would maintain, had nothing to do with the essential meaning of Einheitsschule as it was commonly used in the post-war years. What this amounted to was that the Prussian government decided, "while completely recognising the need for creating an organic Einheitsschule system with possibilities of promotion and all kinds of transfers, not to allow any changes to occur in the traditional educational objectives of the various types of schools, to their teaching methods, and to the length of their courses."[7] All that it set out to do was to make gradual adjustments to the existing schools and to set up some new types where there were gaps in the range of opportunities offered.

The result of this was the above-mentioned proliferation of separate types of schools. Paradoxically, this was the exact opposite intention to what most of the reformers were striving for, and recognising this the Reich government presented a bill to the Reichstag in February 1925 to curb this by reducing the number of types of höhere Schule. Unfortunately, the bill did not get beyond the committee stage. Saxony tried to deal with the problem on its own in the plan to reorganise the Saxon höhere Schulen which the government of that Land published in 1926. Details will be given below of how Saxony, as well as Prussia and some other Länder, approached the reform of their schools in a piecemeal way, but it is sufficient here to note that

Saxony, too, thought only in terms of tinkering with the existing structure, rather than pulling it down and beginning again.

It was certainly the failure of the Länder generally to take a bolder line in school reform which caused the Reich Minister of the Interior, in conjunction with the Central Institute of Education and Instruction, to organise a conference in late 1931 to discuss specifically the fifth to the tenth year of the German schools in the hope of introducing some unity in this sector. The conference called for the full implementation of the Reich School Conference recommendations as well as proposing closer ties between the Volksschulen and the vocational schools on the one hand, and between the Mittel- and höhere Schulen on the other. However, no action resulted from this, although some reduction in the number of types of höhere Schulen was aimed at by the Länder Agreement of 30th January, 1932. By this it was agreed to make French the first foreign language in all höhere Schulen, but since Saxony, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Brunswick, Oldenburg, Bremen, and Lübeck did not ratify the agreement this, too, had only limited effect.

The Upper Grades of the Volksschule

Since then the pre-war school system was scarcely changed in its external structure during the republican period, a survey must now be begun of the adjustments made within each of the various types of school for pupils over the age of ten. Firstly, we consider the upper grades of the Volksschule, starting with a look at curriculum reform. In this matter it is the Prussian edict of 15th October, 1922, (Suggestions for formulating the curriculum of the upper grades of the Volksschule) which is of greatest interest. Boelitz [8] confessed that the edict was not in the vanguard of educational thinking, but he saw it as a synthesis of all that teachers had been working towards over recent

decades, in that it was based on four, commonly accepted principles; a) freedom and variety, b) "start with the child"[9], c) close ties with local life and culture, and d) the concept of the Arbeitsschule. In comparison with the corresponding edict for the Grundschule one notes that the arrangement of the timetable is quite similar, with much the same weight being given to the various subjects. The most striking innovation is the inclusion of history combined with education in citizenship. This topic had been discussed at the Reich School Conference where it had been taken for granted that such instruction would be given in all schools so that young people might be better prepared to take their place in a democratic society. This was felt to be so self-evident that the Reich School Conference recommended precise details about who was to give this civic instruction, how many hours were to be devoted to it, and the age of those who were to receive it. In fact, it seems that the curricula of the höhere Schulen were so rigidly controlled by the universities that the Volksschule was the only school in which education for citizenship was introduced as a regular part of the teaching. At least the Prussian authorities did implement the recommendation of the Reich School Conference in as far as this was possible in the Volksschule alone. In this same context it should perhaps be noted that the Reich government provided every school-leaver with a copy of the constitution and that the Prussian edict of 28th May, 1927, called for the teaching of the aims of the League of Nations (in accordance with Article 148 of the constitution) and the observance of Constitution Day.

Although the upper grades of the Volksschule normally extended over four years, if the ideal of the Einheitsschule was to mean anything and the Volksschule was to be adequately linked with the other schools for young people, it was necessary for it to offer a further two,

optional, years of study to its pupils. In this way a Volksschule pupil could attain approximately the same standard as a pupil from the Mittelschule. At Easter 1922 Prussia established such extension classes in forty-seven schools and by 1927 they were also available in Dresden, Leipzig, Hamburg, and Bremen. In some cases the completion of the course was marked by the award of the mittlere Reife[10] but not without objections from those schools which regarded this as their exclusive prerogative. In all the numbers of these extension classes were not great, but in a way this reflects the public demand for them. With the growing unemployment of the early thirties the need for such classes was more acute since this was one way of preventing young people from flooding an already swollen labour market. Prussia and Baden, in particular, made special efforts to increase their numbers but once more they met with little public response.

The Mittelschule

The Prussian Mittelschule, occupying its intermediate position, was the one type of school most threatened with extinction in the new, post-war circumstances. As we have seen, various schemes for school reform favoured the absorption of the Mittelschule into either the Volksschule or the höhere Schule. With the abolition of military service, moreover, the previous one-year's reduction gained by completing ten years at school became meaningless. It seemed as if there was no more justification for the existence of the Mittelschule. However, the fact that it survived cannot probably be attributed to educational considerations so much as to inertia and a widespread public desire to preserve an institution of proven worth. Nonetheless it was not until 1st June, 1925, that Prussia issued an edict reaffirming the former functions of the Mittelschule and modernizing its curriculum in the same spirit as that for the upper grades of the Volksschule. Thuringia,

Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Brunswick, Oldenburg, Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, and Lübeck also adopted the Mittelschule on the Prussian pattern, but elsewhere the Volksschule extension classes were generally preferred for performing the same function.

The viability of the Mittelschule depended in part on the qualification which one could gain upon completion of its six-year course. The Reich School Conference discussed the problem of a certificate for those pupils who had successfully completed at least ten years at school and proposed the award of the so-called mittlere Reife. This, it was thought, would be a useful measure of ability for those wishing to enter certain intermediate grades of the civil service, industry, and commerce. It will be noted that once more educational considerations seem to have played little part. In 1922 Saxony, Thuringia, Brunswick, and Anhalt had introduced the certificate, but Prussia delayed official approval until 22nd January, 1927. By the Länder Agreement of 31st March, 1931, the mittlere Reife was recognised by all Länder, even if some of the Länder had no schools themselves in which the certificate was awarded. Although intended in the main as the target for the Mittelschulen, a pupil could also gain the mittlere Reife upon completion of the Lyzeum, the Realschule, certain Volksschule extension classes, certain vocational schools, and the sixth grade of a höhere Schule. In educational circles this parity was observed, but this was not always the case with, in particular, the civil service, the very body for which the mittlere Reife had primarily been devised.

The höhere Schule

The repercussions of the Reich Grundschule Law extended as far as the höhere Schulen in that the Grundschule course was one year longer than that of the Vorschule. Thus, if the length of the höhere Schule

course remained unchanged, its pupils would be at least nineteen instead of eighteen before they could take the Abitur examination. The objections to this were largely financial for it involved extra expense for both parents and local authorities at a time when money was beginning to lose its value. Broadly there were two ways of dealing with the problem. Firstly, one could shorten the length of time spent in the Grundschule, a course of action which was partially achieved by the 1925 Amendment to the Reich Grundschule Law, or, secondly, one could reduce the duration of the full höhere Schule course from nine years to eight. To adopt the latter method would mean that the Länder authorities and the universities would have to agree to accept as valid an Abitur certificate awarded after eight years study; and this they were unwilling or unable to do. In the Länder Agreement of 19th December, 1922, the Länder would only agree to recognise a certificate gained after at least nine years spent in a höhere Schule. Bavaria and Hamburg did not sign the agreement, and the latter insisted on offering only an eight-year course by omitting the work normally done in the first year of the usual höhere Schule. However, Hamburg would have met with considerable obstacles preventing its students from gaining admission to a university in any of the other Länder, and accordingly Hamburg fell into line with the other Länder in 1925. The nine-year course was upheld in the Länder Agreement of 25th March, 1931. This time it had been thought that a one year reduction might produce much needed economies in a period of financial crisis, but no mutually acceptable way of doing this could be found with the result that the nine year Abitur course remained.

Reference has already been made to the "reform type" of höhere Schule which had been introduced in certain parts of Germany in the pre-war period. This, in that it delayed for three years the final choice as to which of the three basic types of höhere Schule a pupil might

attend, was one of the earliest attempts to realize the Einheitsschule ideal. Consequently the "reform type" increased in popularity during the Weimar Republic and, it will be recalled, the recommendations of the Reich School Conference had given implied support to this principle. Latin was essentially the centre of the problem, for, it was argued, if in those schools where Latin was taught one could delay teaching it from the first to the fourth year, then a modern language could be the firs t foreign language in all schools. It would thus be possible for all höhere Schulen to have a common curriculum for the first three years. At Easter 1922 fifty-one Prussian höhere Schulen were adjusted so as to delay the start of Latin instruction, with the result that now over fifty-five per cent of all Prussian boys'höhere Schulen no longer offered Latin as the first foreign language. By 1925 all such schools in Prussia, except the Gymnasium and the Realgymnasium, had a "reform type" junior section, and the Prussian edict of 14th March 1925 gave the Gymnasium and the Realgymnasium a common first three years as well. Starting also in 1922 Anhalt and Brunswick changed the junior sections of all their höhere Schulen to conform with the "reform" pattern, and at the same time Saxony did likewise in twenty of its schools. In the reorganisation, which Saxony announced in 1926 and which was gradually put into effect over the following years, the Saxon authorities set out to introduce a common first six years for all its höhere Schulen, postponing still further the time when specialisation would have to begin. Yet it must be remembered that the multiplicity of höhere Schulen could only make sense if there was a genuine choice for the pupil to make. It was all very well to provide a range of schools so that a pupil might attend the one best suited to his abilities, but in the smaller towns and country areas this range was simply not available and the pupil was forced to go to the one type which was within reach locally.

This problem, too, was in part overcome by the extension of the "reform" principle.

While in the lower grades of the höhere Schulen attempts were being made to unify all the various types of school by using the "reform" method, there was a corresponding development in the senior section whereby a greater degree of flexibility was introduced into the timetable in the hope of taking into better account a given pupil's individual interests and talents. The matter was discussed at a meeting of the Reich School Committee[11] on 6th-9th June, 1921, and the Länder agreement concerning the Abitur of 19th December, 1922, which was one of the consequences of this meeting, did allow some choice of subjects offered for the Abitur as long as certain core subjects were retained. It was Saxony which largely set the pace in this matter. The Saxon Ordinance of 11th February, 1919, had made a more flexible timetable compulsory for the final two years of the höhere Schule. This was achieved by a system known as Gabelung[12] which, after 1919, was extended in 1922 and then again in 1925. Then in 1926 Saxony embarked upon the above-mentioned reorganisation of its höhere Schulen which envisaged that the pupils should have a free choice of a range of courses with a vocational bias for the final three years. "In contrast to the Prussian reform with its fundamentally rigid types of school, the Saxon Ministry is going in for a 'differentiated höhere Einheitschule' with as far as possible uniform junior and intermediate sections and with a senior division flexibly arranged according to vocational grouping and making use of Gabelung, or here and there 'core' and 'course' instruction."[13] Württemberg introduced Gabelung by the edict of 1st September, 1921, and experimented with "group work"[14] in four schools. Hessen organised similar experiments in three schools, but it was optional for pupils

to participate and most of them therefore chose to follow the normal system. In Prussia the whole matter was regulated by the edict of 24th January, 1922, which encouraged schools to submit for official approval their own schemes for "group work", Gabelung, and inter-school transfers. By April 1922 thirteen schools had submitted their plans, but the authorities ruled that this freedom had resulted in some unacceptable proposals and the edict of 14th February, 1923, which sought to prevent any more similar "mistakes", laid down such stringent conditions that no subsequent applications were able to satisfy them. It seems that this situation was much regretted by the teachers in the höhere Schulen[15], but the reorganisation of the höhere Schulen, which Prussia undertook as from 1924, did set aside six periods a week for pupils in their final year to choose from a range of informal activities that which most interested them. Unfortunately in the financial difficulties of the early thirties these periods were the first to be sacrificed in the interests of economy.

Thus the "evolutionary" Einheitsschule began to assume a skeletal shape. Yet there were gaps which still remained to be filled. Carl Heinrich Becker[16], a former professor of Islamic studies and Prussian Minister of Culture in 1921 and from 1925 to 1930, argued that the unifying force of the German nation had formerly been the military, but now that had been smashed in the war so that a new centre for national existence had to be found. In his opinion this role could be fulfilled by the concept of Deutschtum (those unique characteristics which marked out the special qualities of the German people) and he saw that education had a major part to play in promoting this. The höhere Schulen, in particular, devoted much time to the study of foreign cultures with the result that the leaders of the nation were, arguably, not sufficiently acquainted with their own national heritage.

The representatives of the existing höhere Schulen were not, however, prepared to have their traditional form modified, so that the only course to increase the time devoted to German subjects was to establish a completely new type of höhere Schule, in which such subjects would be dominant. In the immediately post-war period this was thought of as a school in which able Volksschule pupils would be able to continue their education after the age of fourteen up to Abitur standard. The advantages of this arrangement, it was felt, would be that country children could to a certain extent be spared the necessity of having to be exposed to the undesirable influence of the larger towns in order to receive an academic education, that the flight from the land and the corresponding weakening of the bond with the springs of German national identity could be reduced, and that this would be a convenient way of giving intending Volksschule teachers the requisite höhere Schule qualifications as implicitly demanded by Article 143 of the constitution. Yet once more the position of foreign languages was the major stumbling block, for in a shortened course of this type it was extremely unlikely that the same standard in foreign languages could be reached as in the "complete" höhere Schule. This in turn would cause difficulties concerning recognition of any Abitur certificate awarded after such a truncated course. Consequently, at the Reich School Conference it was recommended that not one but two new types of höhere Schule should be established. The first, the Deutsche Oberschule, was to offer the full nine-year course with major emphasis on German subjects, whereas the second, the Aufbauschule, was to provide the shortened course for leavers from the Volksschule.

In Prussia it fell to Hans Richert[17] to define and plan the exact character of the Deutsche Oberschule. He argued that in

the modern world encyclopaedism was no longer an attainable educational ideal and that a new basis must therefore be found on which to build a sound general education. While not denying the validity of the answers to this problem as adopted by the existing three types of höhere Schule he also felt that the study of one's own national culture could serve as an effective centre of gravity around which to build a new type of school. Thus the new school should concentrate on German language and literature as well as the history, geography, and culture of the nation. Clearly the Deutsche Oberschule originated with those of nationalist views, but Richert was not an extreme chauvinist. He says, "The adjective 'German' in the name of the school is not intended to be a value judgement but only to emphasise its central subject. It includes under the heading of German a group of subjects which link together to form one unit - religious education, German, philosophy, history, geography, and art. But it also presses all other subjects into the service of its overall idea, so that it develops into a new type of school".[18)]

The first Deutsche Oberschule opened in 1922, and there were four of them in Prussia in 1924, by which time the curriculum had been finally settled[19)]. It was financial difficulties which accounted for such a slow beginning, together with the fact that in a period of a decline in the numbers of children of school age due to the war it was difficult to justify opening new schools. However, by 1928 there were twenty-eight Deutsche Oberschulen in Prussia. In Saxony, which had authorized the establishment of Deutsche Oberschulen in the edicts of 4th January, 1921 and 22nd October, 1922, there were twenty-four by 1928. At the same time there were six in Hamburg, two in Bremen, and one in Lübeck. Bavaria, while not setting up any Deutsche Oberschulen itself, did at least accept those students with

an Abitur from a Deutsche Oberschule into Bavarian universities.

It was obvious, then, that acceptance of the Deutsche Oberschule was neither rapid nor universal, and in this the problem of foreign languages played a part. The German universities were insistent that evidence of having studied two foreign languages was a sine qua non for the award of the Abitur, and therefore for university admission. Yet it was, of course, this very preponderance of foreign culture which the Deutsche Oberschule was trying to counterbalance. In Richert's plan for the curriculum of the Prussian Deutsche Oberschulen two foreign languages were included, for Richert rightly foresaw that without them the Deutsche Oberschule would never gain parity with the other höhere Schulen. Other Länder - Saxony, Thuringia, Anhalt, Brunswick, Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck - were of the opinion that one foreign language ought to be sufficient. The Länder Agreement of 28th March, 1925, represents a compromise in that here the Länder finally agreed to accept for Abitur purposes two foreign languages, the first studied for the full nine years but the second studied to only a much lower standard. Baden rejected the Deutsche Oberschule completely on the grounds that it was a further division in an already fragmented school system.

The Aufbauschule owed its existence to a petition introduced at the Reich School Conference by Tews, Wittsack, Gagelmann et alii. which demanded that Volksschule pupils be given a chance of gaining the Abitur by offering those with ability a shortened course in a new type of abbreviated höhere Schule. The idea, however, can at least be traced back to the Begabtenschulen[20] opened in Berlin just before the end of the war. The intention was that the Aufbauschule should give a four-year course after completion of the full eight years at the Volksschule. Yet this was plainly impracticable for it would

have been almost impossible for a young person of only awakening academic ability to do in four years what a normal höhere Schule pupil did in nine. Accordingly the concept of the Aufbauschule was changed to that of a school offering a six-year course after completion of only seven years at the Volksschule. (In Baden this ratio was reversed.) Foreign languages again posed a problem because of the shortness of the time available, so that it came to be accepted that the Aufbausschulen could only model their curriculum on the two kinds of höhere Schule, the Oberrealschule and the Deutsche Oberschule, where the position of foreign languages was less central. In other respects the Aufbauschulen did not pose as many difficulties as the Deutsche Oberschulen. The buildings in the main were provided by converting to this purpose the premises of the former Präparandanstalten, which were no longer needed because of the provisions of Article 143 of the Reich Constitution. In view of the lack of problems agreement was soon reached among the Länder about the acceptability of the Aufbauschule and incorporated into the above-mentioned Länder Agreement of 19th December, 1922.

In Prussia the details of the Aufbauschule were likewise left to Hans Richert[21]. He followed the original idea in that he insisted the Aufbauschule should be primarily a school for country children. Now a child could live at home until the age of thirteen and still pursue his education beyond that point in one of the smaller centres of population. "The present demands that justice should be done to the healthgiving strength, the sureness of instinct, and the security of community life, which are to be found in villages and smaller towns."[22] By 1924 there were six Aufbauschulen[23] in Prussia, and in the following years their numbers grew rapidly, so that by 1929 there were 119 in Prussia; eleven in both Saxony and Oldenburg; four

in Hessen; three in both Baden and the Saargebeit; two each in Thuringia, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and Brunswick; and one each in Hamburg, Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, and Bremen. It is interesting to note that fifty-eight per cent of these were situated in towns with less than ten thousand inhabitants, whereas only eleven per cent were in towns of more than one hundred thousand.

The problems which the Aufbauschule had to overcome are quite apparent, and opinions vary as to how successfully they were tackled. For some the Abitur results after the shortened six-year course were satisfactory, whereas for others the Aufbauschule was attempting the impossible in this matter. Robert Ulich[24)] maintains that teachers were too ready to overestimate their pupils, that the curriculum was too full, that the pupils were often drawn from homes indifferent or even hostile to education, and that by being linked in the public's mind with the Deutsche Oberschule the Aufbauschule suffered because of the former's lack of status. Nonetheless the Aufbauschule did enable children from poorer homes to enjoy the benefits of education in a höhere Schule and it gained wider acceptance than the Deutsche Oberschule as a result. The fact remains, however, that neither of the two new types of höhere Schule effected any substantial change in the existing topography of the school system. Despite all the adjustments and innovations made in the spirit of the Einheitsschule to knit all the various parts together more tightly, the Gymnasium retained its almost monopolistic position as the school to which most prestige was attached. Social attitudes, then, clearly lagged behind the ideas of the progressive educationalists.

Girls' education

The Weimar Constitution accorded to the women of Germany an hitherto unprecented degree of emancipation. It followed, therefore,

that education now had the task of helping to prepare the nation's female population for its newly-won rights and privileges. Two leading members of the feminist movement were Helene Lange and Gertrud Bäumer, both of whom were present at the Reich School Conference. They expressed disappointment that specific discussion of girls' education was not on the agenda, but they were told that they had raised the matter too late for the organisation of the conference to be changed. However, they did succeed in having accepted as a recommendation that girls' education should be organised on the same principles as that of boys. In practice this meant giving girls the same educational opportunities at höhere Schule level, for the Volksschule had always been co-educational. Yet it is interesting to note that the demand was not for co-educational höhere Schulen, but rather for segregated schools catering for the particular needs of young women while at the same time giving them equal educational opportunities.

It was the Prussian government which proved itself most willing to make reforms, although the 1908 reform was too recent for anything very extensive to be attempted. By the edict of 9th January, 1926, the Kottbus Plan, the Oberlyzeum in Kottbus was restructured so that it took on the character of an Oberrealschule. The former lessons in pedagogy were replaced by extra science, modern languages, and German, but it was adjudged that the last three years of the Lyzeum preceding this had not been a sufficient preparation and the experiment was discontinued. To sound out opinion in the absence of guide-lines from the Reich School Conference the Prussian authorities organised their own conference to discuss girls' education in August 1921. The results of these discussions formed the basis of the edict of 21st March, 1923, which sought to incorporate girls' education into the Prussian concept of the Einheitsschule. According to this trans-

fer to a Studienanstalt was possible after three years, as before, but now there was added a Studienanstalt of the Deutsche Oberschule type. (There were thirteen of these in Prussia by 1927). For those girls who stayed at the Lyzeum beyond the age of thirteen and yet wished to study for the Abitur, it was decided to remodel the Oberlyzeum. The older type of Oberlyzeum was to be gradually phased out, and to overcome the weaknesses of the Kottbus Plan the curriculum of the Lyzeum was to be strengthened to include more mathematics and history and the composition of the staff was to be changed to include more teachers with university qualifications. In this way the Oberlyzeum offered the chance of an Abitur certificate to those girls who had been late in developing their academic abilities or who had just been tardy in making up their minds about the matter. Also, since few girls wanted to stay at school longer than the six years of the Lyzeum, it was decided to modify the final year of the Lyzeum so that the school should be a more rounded entity. Therefore, the last year was split into two streams, the first working as before, the second doing less work in modern languages and having instead more practical subjects, history, religious education and mathematics.

In the late twenties the emphasis in reforming girls' education swung away from these modest attempts to increase the opportunities for girls up to the same level as those for boys. Instead the stress came to be laid on devising a type of school in which the differences, and not the similarities, between men and women were to the fore. After the Prussian regulations of 31st December, 1917, the Frauenschule had grown in popularity. It was also well established in Wurttemberg and Bavaria, and later, in the Länder Agreement of 24th October, 1931, it was granted the status of a höhere Schule. Yet it was felt in some circles that its one, or sometimes two, year course

was too short. Consequently most of the time at a conference organised by the Central Institute for Education and Instruction from 2nd to 4th April, 1928, was devoted to working out for girls remaining at school beyond the age of sixteen a coherent course, complete in itself. (This was instead of working for the Abitur which was really a preparatory stage on the way to academic study at a university). As a result Prussia and Thuringia experimented with a three-year Frauenoberschule as a continuation of the Lyzeum. These were divided into three sets, specializing in either domestic subjects, or social service, or practical and artistic studies, and it was hoped to devote the extra time to the theoretical aspects of these topics. The first such schools opened in Kreuznach, Hildesheim, Halle, Münster, and Düsseldorf, and by 1929 there was a total of twenty in Prussia. The edict of 1st February, 1932, put an end to their status as experimental schools and thereafter they were accepted as a regular part of the school system.

Thus we see what happened in education to the ideal of sexual equality as expressed in the Reich Constitution. The changes which this brought about in girls' education were but a ripple on the pond of the school system. And even this was diverted as time went by from giving girls the same education as boys to merely bolstering up the German woman's traditional role as a subordinate partner in charge of merely the domestic arrangements.

Vocational education

Article 145 of the Reich Constitution spoke of providing education for all up to at least the age of eighteen. In the case of those who were already in employment this was to be achieved by part-time attendance at a Fortbildungsschule, or, as it became known in the republican period, the Berufsschule. It is the struggle to

implement this which is the most notable characteristic of vocational education and reform after the Great War. The Reich School Conference debated the matter and it was hoped that the recommendations of the committee would become the basis for a future Reich law to back up Article 145. By 1922, it was proposed, there should be a Berufsschule in every locality, although that attendance should be compulsory to eighteen was hotly disputed and only narrowly carried. In addition, it was decided, that exemption would be allowed only if a young person was receiving more than twenty-four hours teaching a week, that students must attend for 320 hours a year, and that the curriculum must include physical education and civics. However, no Reich law was enacted and it fell to the Länder to deal with the matter. In southern and central Germany, particularly, attendance at such schools was already compulsory for boys, but the other Länder did nothing until the Third Reich Budget Ordinance of 14th February, 1924, explicitly informed the Länder that they could not expect financial support from the Reich in any reforms they undertook, and that therefore the Länder were free to proceed with their own plans without Reich interference. Thus compulsory attendance at a Berufsschule for both boys and girls came to be required in Bavaria, Saxony, Wuttemberg, Baden, Thuringia, Hessen, Brunswick, Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck, even though a shortage of suitably qualified teachers in some places made full enforcement of this impossible. Another difficulty was that in some Länder the Berufsschulen were not administered by the same ministry as that responsible for the other schools. In Prussia, for instance, this task fell to the Ministry of Commerce. The employers, too, were expected to make some contribution to the cost of providing the Berufsschulen, the actual amount becoming often the subject of much wrangling. Prussia, however, despite its influential position, did not introduce

compulsory attendance, a lead which was followed by Oldenburg, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and Anhalt. In the law of 31st July, 1923, (later simplified but not substantially changed by the directive of 19th March, 1931) Prussia placed the responsibility for organising Berufsschulen and enforcing attendance on the local authorities. By Easter 1926 Greater Berlin was able to insist on compulsory attendance for all, but to do this in the whole of Prussia it would have cost, it was estimated, an additional ninety-six million marks in educational spending. By 1929 sixty-seven per cent of all young Germans eligible to attend a Berufsschule (approximately eighty-five per cent of the boys and fifty per cent of the girls) were in actual attendance, a not inconsiderable achievement in view of the economic problems which prevailed, even though the intention of Article 145 was not realized in the lifetime of the Weimar Republic.

Adult Education

Adult education was the final link in the chain of the Einheitsschule, for by this means former generations of schoolchildren could make up for the lack of opportunities when they themselves were at school. Although the Volkshochschulen increased their numbers during the republican period, it is not the desire to make up for deficiencies in general education so much as the wish to gain formal qualifications which is more relevant to the topic of educational reform. The Abitur was the only passport to higher education, and many able people had formerly not been able to gain this qualification because at the age of six they had not attended a Vorschule. To compensate for this the Abitur became available to restricted numbers of young workers by the establishment of the Abendgymnasien and similar institutions. The impetus for this usually came from private individuals but the Reich and the Länder offered encourage-

ment and moral support. The first such venture was made in Wurttemberg in 1919. Here nineteen young men embarked upon a three-year course of evening lessons leading to the Abitur, but only seven finally passed and the experiment was not repeated. In 1923 twenty-four similar candidates in Altona set out with the same aim, but after five years study only eleven were successful. Berlin was the location of the most noteworthy experiments. At the Kaiser-Friedrich-Gymnasium in Neukölln, so-called Workers' Abitur Courses were organised. Open to any former Volksschule pupil between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, these courses followed the curriculum of the Deutsche Oberschule. About thirty lessons a week were given, in the mornings before normal employment commenced. Of the sixty-four pupils in the first group, which began in 1923, only fifteen finally passed the Abitur, but by 1930 the number of those passing had risen to sixty-two. The courses were discontinued in 1932. A similar venture was the Berlin Evening Gymnasium which opened on 1st December, 1927, in the Luisen-Oberlyzeum. Its driving force and first principal was P. A. Silbermann, who the previous year had returned from the United States inspired by the work done there in this field. The Evening Gymnasium offered a five-year course modelled on the Deutsche Oberschule pattern. Classes were held five evenings a week for three hours each evening. The maximum fee charged was twenty marks a year. Student selection was especially difficult for in the first year 3000 applications were received, and 1000 the following year. From these 120 were selected and despite the rigours of the course there was only a twenty per cent drop-out rate. So successful was the idea of the Evening Gymnasium that others soon followed, in Cologne, Hanover, Essen, Gelsenkirchen, and Hamelin. Yet it must be remembered that the total number of those involved in all the courses mentioned was relatively very small. Also,

they were compelled to work within the framework of the existing examination pattern; there was no reform of the Abitur itself to take into account the special circumstances of adult learners. Furthermore, it has to be admitted that one of the aims which motivated the organisers of these courses, i.e. that the students would be able to employ their new knowledge for the benefit of their workmates in the factory or workshop, was seldom achieved, for with their new qualifications these young workers tended to move away from their original place of work and seek employment at a higher level on the vocational ladder.

Notes

1. These were for the Volksschule a) parents' representation on local school board; b) parents' representation on governing board - Bavaria, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz; c) independent parents' councils - Prussia, Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, Schaumburg-Lippe; and d) a combination of 'a' and 'c' - Thuringia, Hamburg, Lübeck. For höhere Schulen they were a) committees consisting solely of parents - Prussia, Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, Schaumburg-Lippe, Baden, Bavaria, Saxony; b) parents' representation on the governing board - Mecklenburg-Schwerin; and c) committees consisting of parents, pupils, and teachers, responsible for the total running of the school - Lübeck, Thuringia, Hamburg.

2. Both art education and physical education had been discussed by special committees at the Reich School Conference which had recommended that the two subjects should have the same status as all the other subjects in the curriculum. The monthly "ramble day", too, was one of the recommendations.

3. Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht, Die deutsche Schulreform (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1919), pp. 17ff.

4. cf. Appendix V.

5. H - hohere Schule, M - Mittelschule, V - Volksschule.

6. Gertrud Bäumer states that, taking into account all the various possible combinations including those for foreign languages, there were thirty-seven different types of höhere Schule by the late twenties. Deutsche Schulpolitik (Karlsruhe: Verlag C. Braun, 1928), p. 134.

7. Otto Boelitz, Der Aufbau des preussischen Bildungswesens (2. Aufl.; Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1925), p. 69. Writer's translation.

8. Ibid., p. 42.

9. "Von Kinde aus", an expression first used by Neumann, it became the motto of the ~~protagonists~~ reformers of the Hamburg Gemeinschaftsschulen, in particular.

10. cf, below, p. 93.

11. Established in November 1919 to promote co-operation between Reich and Länder. In 1924 it was reduced to eight members and renamed the Committee for the School System at the Reich Ministry of the Interior.

12. Literally "forking"; this allowed pupils to study a fixed core of subjects and then choose, in addition, one group from a range of grouped subjects in accordance with their interests and abilities.

13. "Kern- und Kursunterricht". Here the pupils were obliged to study a fixed core of subjects and then choose whatever additional subjects they wished. It was particularly associated with the Oberrealschule zum Dom in Lübeck.

Fritz Kanning, "Zur Neuordnung des höheren Schulwesens in Sachsen", Die Erziehung (Bd. II.; Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1927), p. 335.

14. Here pupils freely chose the subjects they studied. They were, therefore, in groups with pupils of like interests and attainment, instead of being in the traditional class with an imposed time-table.

15. cf. Adolf Bohlen, Auswirkungen der preussischen Schulreform (Leipzig; Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1925), pp. 4ff.

16. In Kulturpolitische Aufgaben des Reichs (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1919).

17. cf, "Die Deutsche Oberschule, eine Schule des deutschen Idealismus", Jahrbuch des Zentralinstituts für Erziehung und Unterricht (4. Jahrgang: 1922; Berlin: E. S. Mittler u. Sohn, 1923), pp.53ff. Also Die Ober- und Aufbauschule (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1923).

18. Ibid., p. 119. Writer's translation.

19. cf. Appendix IVa.

20. Literally "school for the talented".

21. Ibid.

22. Denkschrift über die Aufbauschule 18/2/22 (reprinted ibid., p.12).

23. For curriculum cf. Appendix IVb.

24. "Significant Trends in Education during the Republican Era", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, 1936 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University), pp. 339-61.

CHAPTER VI

THE EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS

Thus far we have seen how the upsurge of reformist tendencies in education which occurred in Germany in the years immediately before the Great War, as synthesized in the Weimar Constitution and crystallized in the Reich School Conference, was made almost totally impotent by the inability of the Reich government to enact the necessary legislation and the uneven interpretation of its spirit by the Länder. There remained one way by which the educationalists could free themselves to some extent from the restrictions imposed on their work at the political level. That was to establish experimental schools, which were either completely independent of the state school system or at least guaranteed internal freedom by the school administrative bodies. The former kind, the private boarding schools, as we have seen, were influential in the pre-war period, whereas the latter kind, the public experimental Volksschulen, are more relevant to the survey of the Weimar period.

The experimental Volksschulen, then, shared certain features with the private boarding schools, but their differences are also very marked. The former set out to achieve their aims within the limitations of the normal school week, i.e. only six mornings a week, working usually with pupils from quite average homes, whereas the latter were total institutions and therefore much more potent in their influence on their pupils. Also, the experimental schools were pronouncedly left-wing in their underlying spirit and sought therefore to balance the claims of society with the needs of the individual, whereas the Landerziehungsheime, in particular, grew increasingly more nationalist in outlook and in the Weimar period tended to become

refuges for counter-revolutionary spirits at a time when more open expressions of discontent were not possible.

The cradle of the experimental school movement was Hamburg. As early as 1912 the Volksschule teachers of that city were asking for permission to set up experimental schools, but the war intervened and temporarily halted such plans. Immediately after the war, however, on 12th November, 1918 already, the first teachers' soviet in Germany was organised in Hamburg. Straight away the demand for experimental schools was made. Yet it was found that no buildings could be spared for this purpose, whereupon some armed members of the Hamburg workers' soviet forcibly ejected the existing occupants of the school in Breitenfeldstrasse and handed it over to the Wende Circle[1)]. At the same time the freedom to function as experimental schools was granted to two other schools, one in Telemannstrasse and one by the Berliner Tor. The following year the workers in the district of Barmbeck demanded an experimental school of their own, and this was organised at Tieloh-Süd under the guiding hand of Wilhelm Paulsen. Thereafter seven further schools elected to change gradually into experimental schools, in addition to the Lichtwarkschule, a Deutsche Oberschule, which became associated with the movement, even though it was the original four on which the others modelled themselves.

The Wendeschule, as the school in the Breitenfeldstrasse became known, started with a completely clean slate, for none of the arrangements hitherto thought necessary for the proper running of a school were employed here. For the first year there were no pre-conceptions, no rules, and no curriculum, by which to organise the 650 pupils, and deliberately encouraged chaos prevailed. At the end of the year the situation was reviewed and most of the staff agreed that some kind of formal organisation was now accepted by the pupils

as being necessary if any worthwhile objective was to be attained; those staff who did not agree resigned. In this way it was thought that the pupils could rid themselves of their previously acquired notions of how to behave in school, while at the same time coming to see that some form of discipline is required if any social group is to reach the aims for which it has come together. Telemannstrasse and Berliner Tor were not prepared to be quite so radical but followed the Wendeschule in everything except the encouragement to total anarchy. Tieloh-Süd, being a year younger, escaped the "year of chaos", yet a clear indication of the conditions prevailing there was given by Washburne and Stearns[2]. In a class of younger pupils the teacher was observed using a discussion of a pupil's birthday as the starting point for a lesson in numbers leading on to more conventional arithmetic. Meanwhile the pupils whose attention was not engaged by this continued with their own, sometimes noisy, pursuits unchecked. Later, in a class of older pupils a teacher was reading a story to which some were listening with rapt attention. Then a continuous din from outside disturbed their concentration. The teacher read on, but one girl went to the door and sent the two boys away who were making the disturbance in the corridor, returning to her seat then to continue listening.

From this it is possible to glimpse something of the Gemeinschaftsschulen[3], as the experimental schools of Hamburg chose to be called. They originated in the working class and rejected most of what the traditional, bourgeois school thought desirable. Adopting as their motto "Vom Kinde aus" (Start with the child), the schools had no fixed curriculum. The lesson material grew from an event or an object familiar to the pupils and was developed by means of project work either with groups or singly. The pupils were then free to

follow up those particular aspects of the work in which they were interested by participating in any of the more specialized courses offered as a means of imparting the more formal subject knowledge. The only discipline expected was self-discipline and conformity to the wishes of the majority of the group, the only punishment being to exclude offenders from the activities of the group. The teachers were friendly and relaxed, and tried to guide each of their pupils towards the kind of education best suited to their abilities and interests.[4] The classrooms were arranged informally in as far as it was possible to replace the old, fixed schoolbenches with chairs and tables. There were no forms as such, but rather groups of friends and brothers and sisters all working together so that the able could help the weak and the older ones the young. Parents were encouraged to join in the life of the school, and this they did by conferring regularly with the staff, publishing a news-sheet, doing odd jobs in the school, and raising money to pay for additional equipment. A special feature was the amount of travelling done by the schools. Apart from local trips, they planned and corresponded with pupils in similar schools elsewhere till eventually, on an exchange basis, they could go and spend some time in a new environment, studying history and geography in new surroundings.

The Hamburg Gemeinschaftschulen, then, emphasised the individual's dependence on and contribution to the community. According to Karstadt[5] their two achievements were, "in realizing the concept of community in its most profound meaning, and the development of activity as well as the child's intellectual growth out of the needs and circumstances of the child's life within a community". Academically the pupils were possibly less advanced, but "on the other hand, the children were more spontaneous, more natural, more likeable, and more

self-reliant than those to be found in other schools[6]. Washburne and Stearns conclude: "Perhaps the most startling thought that the Hamburg experiment gives, is that, throwing away everything the traditional methods of education hold to be necessary, it still achieves results almost as good as, and in some cases better than, those obtained under the old system. It is rather staggering to realize that here we have a demonstration that we could scrap our entire educational system and create overnight, without plan, without preparation, without anything whatever except buildings and well educated, idealistic teachers something almost as good."[7] However, in the account given by Wilhelm Lamszus [8] one can nevertheless detect a note of disillusionment. The problems of contemporary Germany, the insistence by the authorities that only formally qualified teachers be appointed, and the inability of the Gemeinschaftsschulen to shake off the label of being merely the school of a single political outlook seem to have robbed the experiments of some of their vitality.

Bremen opened its first experimental school at Easter 1920 in Schleswigerstrasse. The teachers insisted on a large measure of autonomy and elected Heinrich Scharrelmann as their leader. Parents were free to remove their children if they so wished, but few did. For Scharrelmann the child was inviolate, and the pupils enjoyed almost total freedom in organising their work. Activity methods were the rule, pupil creativity was encouraged, and a special social worker was employed as a liaison officer between the school and the home. Soon after the opening of the school a review of progress was held in which most of the staff felt that the high degree of individual freedom was such that selfishness was causing chaos and preventing the attainment of the corporate aims of the school. Scharrelemann was not prepared to compromise, so that the dissenting teachers resigned

and set up their own school in Theodorstrasse. Here it was insisted that a pupil must finish one piece of work before starting on the next. A special feature was the school assembly at the start of the school day. By giving a shared experience, this was a valuable way of creating a sense of community within the school. Parents, too, were welcome, but it seems that it took some time before their confidence could be fully won.

The third Bremen school was opened in 1921 in Staderstrasse. As at Schleswigerstrasse there were difficulties among the staff; some left and a fresh start was made the following year with a more clearly defined organisation. Difficulties also arose from the fact that the school shared its building with two other schools, that the pupils already accustomed to the more formal discipline of the traditional school found it hard to adjust to a freer atmosphere, and that the staff were overworked and the parents again somewhat suspicious.

In Berlin it was the Sammelschulen which formed the basis upon which the experimental schools were established. Here the Sammelschulen were especially common, and by 1928 there were forty-two in the city. They contained many progressive elements. The headmaster was elected by the staff, pupils had a voice in some aspects of the administration of the school, the parents were closely involved, and activity methods as well as school excursions and school meals were an integral part of the programme. It was, then, from these schools that ten of the eleven Berlin Gemeinschaftsschulen (they adopted the Hamburg name) were drawn. The credit for their establishment belonged to Wilhelm Paulsen, who moved from Tieloh-Süd in Hamburg in 1921 to become director of education for Berlin. It took two years for his plans to be approved, and even then the Berlin experimental schools were hedged around with certain bureaucratic restrictions.

The first Berlin Gemeinschaftsschule opened on 12th April, 1923 in Rütlistrasse, Neukölln, under the direction of Adolf Jensen, who had also been associated with the new schools in Hamburg and was an adherent of the art education movement. Yet, once more, there were differences of opinion among the staff which caused the school to split into three different branches. Other schools which laid special emphasis on the aims of the art education movement included those in Mittelstrasse, Neukölln, and Bismarckstrasse, Niederschönhausen. The school in the Leopoldsplatz and the section of the Rütlistrasse school under Witbrodt were strongly proletarian in character and used the environment of the home as the starting point for much learning. The school in Kaiser-Friedrich-Strasse based its work as far as possible on geography and made a special attempt to so structure the pupils' experiences that they led on from small precise units towards an overall understanding.

In addition to the schools mentioned above there were in Berlin eight horticultural schools, the first of which opened in April 1920. Their function was to give every Volksschule pupil in their district the opportunity of learning about and gaining direct experience of gardening. Each school was allocated its own plot within which each pupil had his own ten square metres bed to cultivate. In this way the pupils were engaged in productive work and could learn about food production and its supporting sciences. The upper forms of the Volksschulen could spend two whole mornings a week at the garden-school which in turn left the Volksschulen themselves a little less crowded for the introduction of the new methods which depended on more space to be fully effective.

Experimental schools were also to be found in Leipzig, Dresden, Hellerau (Saxony), Magdeburg, Frankfurt-am-Main, Essen, Chemnitz, Gera

(Thuringia), and Lübeck. They were, then, located exclusively in north and central Germany. Enough has been said of their general features, but a cursory glance at some of the other schools will reveal a few points worthy of comment.

The Leipzig and Magdeburg schools were allotted a catchment area in their respective cities, and all children living within that area had to attend the school, whether or not the parents were in sympathy with its aims. Although it might have been an advantage to have only pupils with a clear commitment to the spirit of the schools, it was perhaps more important that a complete cross-section of the community should send its children to the one school so that the task of building a true Gemeinschaft could begin. The Leipzig system, in particular, was not without its opponents, especially among the middle class, and the system as organised in Dresden and Chemnitz did give to the parents the right to choose between an experimental school or one of the traditional type for their children. A scurrilous campaign in the press against the experimental school in Dresden caused many middle class parents who had originally agreed to send their children to the school to change their minds and remove them.

Hellerau was a new town not far from Dresden. Its foundation resulted from the desire of various groups of people, disillusioned with contemporary society, to establish a new social order free from the injustices they had encountered elsewhere. Despite its communistic organisation, it was in fact a settlement where people of a wide range of religious and political opinion lived together in harmony. The school here was built in 1914, but with the new ideas in education in the post-war era certain alterations were necessary. This in itself served as the basis for the work of the school, for the fact that the pupils themselves could participate in the work of

rebuilding, renovating, and redecorating served as a means of organising education through the medium of productive work. "The school", so its aim was defined, "should be a home for young people, a home which is created as far as possible by the children, which they can identify with and see a purpose in, and in which they should find friendly contact with adult educators; a place in which there should be every opportunity for the child to practise and develop his strengths and skills, to achieve freedom of spirit and mastery of the body, and where there is work and celebration in joyful community."[9)]

To a certain extent the schools described so far were dependent on bureaucratic approval for their existence in the first place, which did restrict their freedom of action to some extent. The school attached to the Pedagogical Institute of the University of Jena was on a different footing and, given the right director, was almost totally free to experiment. Such a man was Peter Petersen who became professor of pedagogy in the university in 1923. Previously Petersen had been headmaster of the Lichtwarkschule in Hamburg, and he admitted to four particular influences which had moulded his outlook as an educationalist; the art education movement, the Arbeitsschule, the psychology of Ley and Neumann, and Lietz's Landerziehungsheime. "It had become clear to me that something quite different was at issue, namely, making something new out of the school as a whole, i.e. radically changing the whole life of the school. Then came the task of fitting in teaching and carefully observing how this would be modified when one was compelled to promote this new life in the school and to preserve this new attitude towards schools. In brief, subordinating instruction to teaching, being an educator first and then a teacher".[10)] The Jena Plan, as Petersen's scheme was called, envisaged a ten-year school to be organised as a Gemeinschaft of

parents, pupils, and teachers and excluding interference from other quarters. This school was to be an Einheitsschule accepting all children regardless of sex, intelligence, or religion. There were to be no year-based classes, but rather the whole school would be divided into four groups in which children of similar ages would be gathered. Promotion to the next group would depend on the level of general maturity and the number of those remaining behind would be sufficiently large to give the group a stable nucleus to which newcomers would be easily assimilated. Within each of the groups the pupils were given complete freedom of movement, as long as they observed the norms of consideration for others. Also, care for the younger members was encouraged as an aid to better socialization. Normally the pupils were occupied with a project or practical work, with questions kept to an minimum. The teacher had to act as a leader for the group, owing his position not to the status invested in him by the school but to his ability to inspire and encourage the work of those in his care. The time-table was loosely organised[11]. The group work was arranged around three broad areas - cultural topics, science, and handicraft. Pupils were given an introduction to the rudiments of each area, and then they were expected to follow their own inclinations and learn for themselves by using all the facilities of the school under the guidance of a teacher who would suggest whatever method seemed appropriate to the individual pupil and the topic in question. In addition, set courses were organised for the formal aspects of the work, one afternoon of sport a week was offered, and the week began and ended with some form of corporate activity so that the identity of the school might be more firmly established by the sharing of some common experiences. The aim was to promote the development of the body, of moral and social values, of linguistic

ability, of manual skills, of the power of the senses, and of sincerity, so that each pupil would be equipped with a stock of basic knowledge and have received some help with social adjustment and the attainment of personal skills. No marks or reports were given until the pupil himself felt the need for some assessment of his progress, and parents were encouraged to add their own comments to the reports. Since 1945 Petersen's ideas have been taken up again in some quarters.[12]

The scope of the experimental schools was to a certain extent limited in that they were generally supposed to operate within the broad outline of the existing school system. There was no question that they should be regarded as anything but a special kind of Volksschule. The universities exercised such close control of Abitur requirements that they prevented, as with other aspects of höhere Schule reform, such schools from becoming in the main experimental schools. Yet there were a few exceptions where a measure of experimentation took place. The Lichtwarkschule in Hamburg was officially a Deutsche Oberschule, but it tried to overcome the practice of treating each subject as if it were an entirely independent entity by stressing broader fields of knowledge, such as man in society and the world of nature. The Oberrealschule zum Dom in Lübeck tried to introduce a more flexible organisation after the third year and was the home of the "core-course system"[13]. However, it was perhaps Berlin that was most progressive in this respect. The Grünewald-Gymnasium was an amalgamation of all three basic types of höhere Schule. The Kantschule in Karlshorst was a combined Realgymnasium and Oberrealschule with fourteen of its weekly lessons devoted to core subjects (religion, German, history, geography, and English), and thirteen others drawn from either Classics, or modern languages, or mathematics. The Kaiser-Friedrich-Gymnasium under Fritz Karsen gave an almost free

choice of subjects in the last three years, the pupils having some say in determining the syllabus. In the affiliated Aufbauschule the organisation was very reminiscent of that found in the experimental Volksschulen. The Scharfenberg Island School Farm was situated on an island in Lake Tegel. Originally a school country home it eventually became a permanent school where apart from normal lessons the pupils could gain direct experience of building (for the original farm house had to be converted into a proper school), of farming the island and of providing the food and firewood which the school needed. Also, staff and pupils could develop that closer relationship which derives from the mutual assistance necessary for the maintenance of a self-sufficient community.

The most obvious achievement of the experimental school, in that there was an almost immediate response from the ordinary schools of the state system, was the establishment of homes in the country to which the pupils could be taken at intervals throughout the year. These homes served a number of purposes. They could combat the bad effects of the privations of the war years by offering fresh air and peace. They could remove the children from the undesirable influences of the town and reacquaint them with the healthy virtues of country life. They could also be of direct relevance to the teaching of Heimatkunde (study of the local region). Teachers and pupils could live together under one roof and get to know each other better. Shared domestic chores gave the pupils a greater sense of community. Lesson material grew naturally out of the surroundings so that integrated instruction was here the most usual approach to learning. In 1919 there were only five school country homes, but their numbers grew rapidly and by 1926 there were 140. Hamburg had thirty-five, Saxony twenty-five, and Prussia twenty-nine. The growth of the school

country homes went almost unnoticed in official quarters, but at a Central Institute of Education and Instruction conference held in 1925 it became clear that these were a major area of development and in the following year the Reich League of School County Homes was established.

The experimental schools were successful to the extent that they filled a real need arising out of the circumstances of the immediate post-war years. The effects of malnutrition and the privations of war, the broken homes and the orphaned children were served by the concept of education as represented by the experimental schools. These sought to become a second home in which the pupils were members of a family presided over with affection by the staff. School meals and country excursions cared for their health, and social adjustment was possible in the co-operative tasks which formed the basis of much of their work. Yet as the effects of the war receded the weaknesses of the experimental schools became more apparent. It became clear how disunited were the ranks of the would-be reformers. While all were inspired by a vague desire to fit education more to the circumstances occasioned by the new industrial age, when it came to the actual planning of the day-to-day running of a school agreement was not so easily reached. The truth seemed to be, as with the politicians who now found themselves in power, that many teachers had theorized without having an opportunity to test out their ideas in practice. When the opportunity did present itself they had difficulty in devising a coherent, workable scheme for they had not fully worked out the problems inherent in such slogans as, say, freedom. Furthermore, while the experimental schools were free of official supervision, this freedom was never absolute. The setting-up and the duration of the experiment was dependent on the bureaucrats who could at any time curtail the work without any commitment to transfer an

element, no matter how successful it had proved, into the ordinary state schools. The reformers no doubt hoped that this weakness would be overcome by a general clamour from the public to have these methods more widely introduced once it had seen how well they worked. In fact, this public enthusiasm did not materialize. After the first few years the public settled back into a less radical mood, and the experimental schools were unable to throw off the impression that, instead of offering a better education for the whole nation, they were nothing more than the pet schemes of left-wing atheists. The experimental schools did valuable work in drawing attention to the primacy of the child, but beyond this they found little acclaim. There is no record, it seems, of any experimental school being closed down before the end of the Weimar period, but equally it appears that no new ones were founded once the initial enthusiasm had waned.[14)]

Notes

1. A group of young teachers which had published a magazine Die Wende (The Turning) at a meeting of the youth movement in Tübingen in 1918.

2. C. Washburne & M. Stearns, New Schools in the Old World (New York: The John Day Co., 1926).

3. The term has obvious affinities with Tönnies' concept and is not to be confused with the use of this term within the context of the attempted Reich School Law.

4. cf. "The problem in our school is no longer that of teacher and pupil, but one of the individual and the community. The tasks which we daily confront are to help him to find his place, to assert himself, and beyond that to give support to the weak and the timid, to reveal their inner selves and to lead them towards community living." Wilhelm Lamszus, "Der Weg der Hamburger Gemeinsschaftsschule", Die neuen Schulen in Deutschland, Hrsg. Fritz Karsen (Langensalza: Verlag von Julius Beltz, 1924), p. 42. Writer's translation.

5. O. Karstadt, "Neuere Versuchsschulen und ihre Fragestellung", Jahrbuch des Zentralinstituts für Erziehung und Unterricht, 4. Jahrgang 1922 (Berlin: E. S, Mittler u. Sohn, 1923), p. 124. Writer's translation.

6. Washburne & Stearns, op. cit., p. 126.

7. Ibid., p. 127-28.

8. Wilhelm Lamszus, op. cit.

9. Max Nitzsche, "Die Volksschule zu Hellerau", Deutsche Schulversuche, Hrsg. Franz Hilker (Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke u. Sohn, 1924), pp. 290-91. Writer's translation.

10. Peter Petersen, Der kleine Jena-Plan (46. Aufl.; Weinheim/Bergstrasse: Verlag Julius Beltz, 1965), p. 68. Writer's translation.

11. cf. Appendix VI.

12. cf. A. Rach, Sachwörterbuch zur deutschen Erziehungsgeschichte (Weinheim/Bergstr.: Verlag Julius Beltz, 1964), p. 107.

13. cf. Chapter 5, p. [illegible].

14. Since the typing of this passage further information has come to light which modifies this statement. In a reply to a letter sent by the writer to the Hamburg school authorities asking for certain details concerning the fate of the Hamburg Gemeinschaftschulen, Oberstudienrat Dr. Rudolf Scharnberg, in a letter in the possession of the writer dated 6th February, 1972, has kindly supplied the following facts. Many documents relating to the period were destroyed after 1945 to make room for more recent material. However, he was able to report that the schools Berliner Tor and Breitenfelderstrasse were both obliged to give up their experimental work in 1930, the former because its attempt to assimilate E.S.N. children into normal classes gave it the reputation of having a low academic standard, the latter because it attracted so many middle-class children that these upset the social balance it was trying to create. Telemannstrasse continued to the end of the Weimar period with some modification of its originally radical approach. Concerning Tie[illegible]loh-Süd there is no information.

CHAPTER VII

REFORM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

The German universities and institutions of similar rank[1] are known collectively as Hochschulen, and these too could not remain entirely aloof from attempts at reform. Although the organisation of the Hochschulen, as based on the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt, and the achievement of German scholarship had an international reputation, there were nonetheless certain aspects of the system which provoked criticism. The professors were almost exclusively drawn from the upper layers of society, and since in imperial days their appointment was a governmental decision only men of pronounced conservative leanings were likely to be chosen. The students, too, came overwhelmingly from the upper classes and displayed in the main the same distaste for radicalism as their teachers. Clearly, it was this facet of the Hochschulen to which the supporters of the so-called revolution of 1918 most strongly objected, but since the "revolution" was only confined to a change of political élite it follows that the Hochschulen were never properly democratized during the Weimar Republic. Thus the old, reactionary professors continued in office and resisted all attacks on their traditional privileges. Wherever the universities were involved in attempted reform, as in the case of the höhere Schulen, they opposed it, with the result that of all the areas in the educational system it was the Hochschulen which changed least. "In some faculties progressive left-wing intellectuals banded together but the majority looked over their shoulders to the imperial past, regarding the present with arrogant displeasure. Of course the professors could hardly have said what they actually wanted, only they knew they did not like things the way they were."[2]

The only real attempt to fit the Hochschulen in with the founding ideals of the new state was made in the edict of 17th May, 1919, issued by the Reich Minister of the Interior, Herr Haenisch, inviting all the universities to submit to him their proposals for accommodating themselves to the new, post-war circumstances. It is not clear what response this brought from the universities, except that it stimulated C. H. Becker to publish his own observations in his Gedanken zur Hochschulreform[3] (Thoughts on Hochschule Reform). As we know, Becker was both professor and politician and perhaps thought himself well qualified to pronounce on such matters. In fact his views were very moderate, and one might attribute to him the fact that university reform never exceeded the modest limits which he proposed. He found that "the heart of our universities is healthy"[4] and so suggested no more than some internal adjustments. "By blindly demolishing partitions in a fortnight one creates nothing but piles of rubble which just block the way; for with the walls the doors also fall down. Houses with a new ground-plan cannot be designed by builders, but only by expert architects, and not even all of these can manage it."[5] His greatest hope for reform lay in changes to the way in which tuition fees were levied and distributed, which scarcely struck at the roots of the social inequalities so evident in the Hochschulen.

Indeed, there is no evidence to suggest that any widening in the social range of those who worked in the Hochschulen did take place. It is true that the numbers of students did increase considerably. In the period between 1914 and 1925 there was a ninety per cent growth in student numbers, and this rose by a further sixty per cent by 1931. However, the extra students were not the sons of the working class. In 1931 only seven per cent of all höhere Schule pupils and just over

three per cent of university students were the children of workers. In 1923 Prussia introduced an "alternative Abitur" to enable those without the usual Abitur qualification to gain admission to a university, but by 1928 only 0.51 per cent of students had qualified in this way. The Deutsche Oberschule and the Aufbauschule had also been established to widen the opportunities of higher education but they, in the same year, only contributed 0.52 and 0.56 per cent respectively to student numbers. For an explanation of the rising student numbers one must look to the unsettled economic climate of the time. The sons of the middle class went increasingly to the university because there was a lack of attractive career opportunities at a lower level and a university education was an insurance policy against the more extreme manifestations of a flooded labour market. Even then there was not enough employment to absorb all the former students and these formed an educated nucleus of malcontents who supported those parties trying to destroy the Weimar democracy. It is, therefore, not surprising that the universities should resist reform, for, apart from other factors, they found themselves the suppliers of a service for which there was a rising demand, and as such saw no reason to change when so many people were prepared to accept them as they were.

The actual reforms, then, to be cited are rather slight. The Prussian edict of 20th March, 1923, gave all three grades of university teacher[6)] a more equal voice in the administration of the university, and at the same time it was made easier for men with outstanding ability to be appointed to a university post without previously having habilitated. The salaries of the staffs of the Technische Hochschulen were also brought into line with those for university staff. The rather deficient social welfare of the students, organised as it was in particularistic fraternities which spent their

time carousing and duelling, was improved by the establishment of the Deutsche Studentenschaft (a body which safeguarded all their interests) in 1919. This did, however, develop certain nationalistic traits which caused the Prussian government to cease recognising it in 1927 while still permitting some of its welfare work to continue.

By 1919 three new universities had been opened in Germany; in Cologne, Frankfurt am Main, and Hamburg. It is perhaps significant that all three were in large centres of population in contrast to a certain German tendency to prefer small sequestered towns. "The newest universities had the task of making the academic spirit of the future more adaptable"[7] and in a way they succeeded in this.. Cologne, which by 1924 had become the second largest university in the country, had formerly been a college of commerce and this vocational bias was preserved after its elevation. Frankfurt specialized in social sciences, and on 2nd May, 1921, the Academy of Labour was opened there with the task of giving four-month full-time courses to selected workers to train them in the organisation of industry and trade unionism. Hamburg, as we shall see, was only one Hochschule to accept practical training in teaching as part of its work.

It was, then, in the realm of teacher training that the Hochschulen underwent the greatest changes in their organisation. This was a subject which was prominent during the Weimar period as a consequence of Article 143 of the constitution. Not included in the first draft of the constitution, this article was later proposed by Richard Seyfert and accepted without a vote. The reason for this unanimous approval may lie in the vagueness of the wording which seemed to commit no one to a definite course of action, although this fact was later to become an obstacle to progress in reform. However, to give the article its widest interpretation, it seemed to imply two innovations; firstly, that all intending Volksschule teachers would

in future have to attend a höhere Schule and pass the Abitur examination, and, secondly, that such people would have to then spend some time at a Hochschule, in much the same way as their colleagues in the höhere Schulen. If the Einheitsschule meant drawing the parts of the school system into greater unity, then the two branches of the teaching profession should also be more unified.

That all intending teachers should stay in full-time general education until at least the age of nineteen was not generally disputed, (and the Deutsche Oberschule and the Aufbauschule had in part been created to facilitate this). The centre of controversy was the form of higher education most appropriate to future Volksschule teachers. There were some who felt that Article 143 did not imply any change in traditional role of the Seminare, some who favoured a separate Hochschule solely for training teachers, and some who supported a complete integration of teacher training into the existing universities. The existing Volksschule teachers were quite opposed to the first view, for the Seminar was too closely associated in their minds with the restrictive, illiberal training methods of the latter half of the nineteenth century for internal modification to be possible. The debate, therefore, centred on the other two possibilities. At the Reich School Conference, where the matter received much attention, supporters of both views were prominent. In particular, Johannes Tews favoured integration into the universities, whereas Eduard Spranger opposed this on the grounds that the university was the place for dispassionate research. On the other hand, he asserted, teaching was a matter of inspiration, enthusiasm, and personal warmth, and as such preparation for teaching belonged in a separate institution. Not surprisingly, the final recommendations of the conference were a compromise, stating inter alia:

3. The specialized training of all grades of teacher should take place at a Hochschule in a manner which is essentially the same for all yet which allows for the different aspects of the profession. This training will vary in length according to the various demands of the profession and past experience, but with Volksschule teachers in particular it is to occupy in all at least three years.

5. The professional training of the teachers is to be organised at Hochschulen by the establishment of relatively independent pedagogical institutes which would allow the use of staff already employed in the Hochschule, despite faculty and departmental divisions, in the special tasks of professional training in pedagogy. Beyond this separate pedagogical Hochschulen with full Hochschule status are to be permitted according to either demand or for experimental purposes. Furthermore, the faculties of philosophy in the universities or the liberal education departments of the Technische Hochschulen can in given cases take over the professional training of teachers. On the other hand the establishment of special pedagogical faculties in the universities is forbidden, as is also the taking over of the professional training of Volksschule teachers by pedagogical academies organised exclusively for them.[8)]

Previously, at the first meeting of the Reich School Committee (27th November - 3rd December, 1919) an agreement had been reached which, it was felt, could form the basis for a Reich law on teacher training. This had left the nature of the Hochschule for teacher training open, but when acting on these proposals the Minister of the Interior introduced into the Reichstag on 20th October, 1921, a bill to implement Article 143 in which the Reich School Conference recommendations were incorporated. However, financial problems caused the Minister of the Interior to declare on 12th January, 1923, that he could not comply with a demand from the Länder that the Reich should pay the greater part of any costs arising from teacher training reform and that therefore the Reich could not continue with its legislation. Five weeks later Saxony, Thuringia, Anhalt, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Lippe-Detmold, Hamburg, and Bremen published an agreement setting out the principles they should like to see applied to teacher training and reiterating that the Hochschulen should be responsible for the academic part and associated pedagog-

ical institutes for the professional preparation. The Third Budget Ordinance of 14th February, 1924, again made it clear that the Reich could not afford to subsidize the Länder, although the Reich made three further attempts (twice in 1925 and once in 1927 - all unsuccessful) to legislate on teacher training. This shows how urgent it was that the matter should be sorted out, for already some of the Länder were making their own separate arrangements and also some Länder had begun to dismantle their Seminare and now needed to know what to replace them with. The only definite ruling was the decision of the Reich Supreme Court on 19th May, 1926, that the system of teacher training as proposed by Mecklenburg-Schwerin was not unconstitutional, although contrary to Article 143, until a Reich law could be passed giving this article legal force. Unsatisfactory as the situation still was, those Länder wanting to make reforms now knew that the constitution did not yet demand of them an obligation to work together to create a uniform system for the whole country. The pattern that then emerged for teacher training in the various Länder can be divided into four sections.

The first section includes those Länder which introduced a three-year course at a Hochschule for intending Volksschule teachers. Thuringia was one of the first Länder to act, passing on 8th July, 1922, a law dissolving the Seminare. In December 1924 the Minister of Education published his plan by which all Volksschule teachers would in future study in a pedagogical institute to be linked to the University of Jena. In 1926 this was amended to allow the study of one subject normally taught in the Volksschule in the appropriate department of the university itself. Practical experience was gained in one further, probationary year. The plan was largely the work of Professor Wilhelm Rein but its implementation was left to his successor

Peter Petersen. The architect of reform in Saxony was Richard Seyfert. On 8th April, 1922, a law was passed organising teacher training in the pedagogical institutes which were to be affiliated to the university in Leipzig and the Technische Hochschule in Dresden. The Leipzig institute was very independent of the university and dealt with all aspects of training except for the adademic studies of the students and the specialized disciplines of relevance to education. In Dresden the function of the institute was more restricted, dealing only with the practical aspects of the students' training. In Hamburg teacher training was reorganised with the law of 20th December, 1926, which confined both further academic study and the theory of pedagogy to the new university in that city. Practical experience was gained in the following three probationary years. Brunswick, the fourth member of the group, centred teacher training in its Technische Hochschule. After 1922 students worked for two years in a country school before being transferred to Brunswick for a year where a third of their time was spent studying at the Institute of Philosophy, Psychology and Pedagogics. Then another two years at a country school was required. In 1926 this was reorganised so that now three years full-time study at the institute was demanded. No special arrangements for teaching practice were necessary for now practical pedagogy was an integral part of the course. Anhalt, Lippe-Detmold, Schaumburg-Lippe, and Bremen, while having no centres themselves, did arrange with various of the Länder above for their students to study at one of their institutions.

The second section comprises those Länder which preferrred the Hochschule principle but could only offer a two-year course. Foremost of these was Hessen. The Technische Hochschule in Darmstadt gave, after 1919, a two-year course in pedagogy. On 25th October,

1921, regulations were introduced which required an Abitur pass and two extra years probation. Then, in 1925, the education part of the work was transferred to a newly-created pedagogical institute, and because of pressure from Catholic quarters a similar institute was set up in Mainz, even though the students in Mainz had to travel to Darmstadt for the academic section of their studies. The course was later extended to two and a half years, although financial problems in the early thirties caused the closure of the institute in Darmstadt (sic). The other Land in this group is Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Originally it was planned to have a five-year course after the Volksschule at a special college, after which two further years would have to be spent at the pedagogical institute attached to Rostock University. This was the plan which brought the celebrated Reich Supreme Court ruling, but the following year political changes led to the introduction of a law stipulating an Abitur pass as a condition for acceptance at Rostock.

The third section contains those Länder which organised their teacher training in institutions not of Hochschule status. Prussia was the most notable in this context, for despite its influential position as the largest Land it ignored the Reich School Conference recommendations and set up so-called pedagogical academies. Their creation was the work of C. H. Becker who staked his political career on this project which went so far towards putting into practice the ideas of Eduard Spranger. Believing that the university could not do justice to the special nature of training Volksschule teachers, that the universities would be swamped if they admitted all intending teachers, Becker set up a small Gemeinschaft of 250 students and twenty staff offering a two-year post-Abitur course[9]. His plans were published in the Prussian memorandum of 30th June, 1925.

Becker saw the pedagogical academies as his greatest contribution to the Pedagogical Movement with which he had considerable sympathy without regarding himself as a member. However, his scheme was attacked for being so similar to the old Seminare and also for having so short a course. While not wishing to doubt the sincerity of Becker's motives it has to be admitted that he was possibly under strong financial and denominational pressures which restricted his freedom of action.

The first pedagogical academies opened at Easter 1926 in Bonn, Elbing, and Kiel. It is worthy of note that the locations chosen (and the men appointed to direct them) indicate that they were intended to be bastions of German culture in border areas where its strength might need to be reinforced. Over the next seven years a further twenty-seven academies were planned, but only twelve of them actually opened[10]. All of them were Protestant in religious affiliation, except for Bonn and Beuthen, which were Catholic, and Frankfurt am Main which, was de jure interdenominational. A Reich Supreme Court ruling of 16th October, 1926, had laid down that Article 174 of the constitution did not apply to teacher training and that therefore the establishment of an interdenominational academy was not unconstitutional. However, the Catholic church refused to endorse the qualifications to be gained at Frankfurt so that the acadeny became de facto a Protestant institution. The Second Reich Economy Ordinance of 23rd December, 1931, called for a reduction in the number of pedagogical academies from fifteen to only six. In the event Kiel was reprieved so that it survived along with Bonn, Elbing, Frankfurt am Main, Beuthen, Dortmund, and Halle.

The other Länder which favoured the pedagogical academy were Baden (with academies in Freiburg, Heidelberg, and Karlsruhe, until

the last-mentioned had to be closed for economy reasons), Oldenburg, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Waldeck (before its incorporation in Prussia in 1929). The last two had no academies of their own but arranged with Prussia to send their students there.

The final section comprises those Länder in which no reforms were achieved. It includes Lübeck (which allowed its students to study anywhere), Wurttemberg, and Bavaria. Wurttemberg intended to follow the Prussian model but the money was not available. Bavaria wanted to set up six-year Aufbauschulen to prepare intending Volksschule teachers for the Abitur and following this with an institution also similar to the pedagogical academy, but the three Bavarian universities both doubted effectiveness of the Aufbauschule and objected to the duplication of the work of their own faculties of philosophy. As a result the pre-war system, for lack of agreement, continued to be used.

Notes

1. These included Technische Hochschulen (colleges of advanced technology), and institutions of the same standard for agriculture, forestry, and mining. Because of the one-sided, practical nature of some of their work they could not be considered as having the same independent search for truth as the universities proper.

2. Golo Mann, Deutsche Geschichte 1919-1945 (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Bucherei, 1961), p. 41. Writer's translation.

3. C. H. Becker, Gedanken zur Hochschulreform (Leipzig: Quelle u. Meyer, 1919)

4. Ibid., p. 17. Writer's translation.

5. Ibid., p. 16. Writer's translation.

6. These were a) Ordinarius - professor with responsibility for organising the work in his department, b) Extraordinarius - professor without such duties, and c) Privatdozent - lecturer who had habilitated and was waiting to be summoned to be a professor.

7. Golo Mann, loc. cit. Writer's translation.

8. Reichsministerium des Innern (erstattet von), Die Reichschulkonferenz 1920 - amtlicher Bericht (Leipzig; Quelle u. Meyer, 1921), p. 775. Writer's translation.

9. For syllabus cf. Appendix IV, c.

10. These were situated in Frankfurt am Main, Beuthen, Dortmund, Halle, Breslau, Erfurt, Frankfurt an der Oder, Hanover, Kassel, Stettin, Kottbus, and Altona.

CONCLUSION

In January 1933 Adolf Hitler became the new chancellor of Germany and, although he never abrogated the Reich Constitution of 11th August, 1919, democracy in Germany was now effectively at an end. The task now remains to look at the essential character of educational reform in the Weimar Republic, and to compare this with that which preceded and succeeded it.

Taking the Pedagogical Movement as a whole, it is possible to summarize its underlying idea as a search for unity. Despite the fact that many of the men working for educational reform were perhaps unaware that they were members of an informal school of pedagogical opinion, one can nevertheless discern in their work a unifying commitment to reconciling many of the existing dichotomies of German public life and education. To begin with, there was the political disunity of the country, which the Pedagogical Movement sought to overcome by stressing a national culture and a pure, common heritage as a solution to both particularist tendencies and the lack of the other usual marks of nationhood. There was also the religious disunity, which the Pedagogical Movement sought to overcome by a more rigorous separation of church and state and the advocacy of a form of education in which sectarian differences were minimized. Then there was the social disunity (particularly heightened in Germany by the absence of the small entrepreneur) which the Pedagogical Movement tried to reduce by a policy of fusing the two sectors of the bi-partite school system into one and thereby increasing educational opportunity. Within the realm of education proper, there were such divisions as that between theory and practice, or Allgemeinbildung and vocational preparation,

which the idea of the Arbeitsschule was supposed to solve. There was also the division between the intellect and the other facets of the human personality. The separation of the rational from the spiritual was attacked by the art education movement, and the separation of the mind and the body by activity methods. The individual and the community were reconciled by attempts to give pupils direct experience of the interdependence of both. The balance between the material taught and the person taught was readjusted to give the latter some of the prominence it had lost. In some cases, no doubt, the reformers over-emphasized the new direction in their desire to compensate for the deficiencies of the past, yet it is still true to say that the concept of the Einheitsschule represents the synthesis of all that the Pedagogical Movement was striving for.

However, the Pedagogical Movement was not confined to the Weimar period. It can be said to have started in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, and its influence can still be felt at the present day. What, then, was the essential character of educational reform in the years 1918 to 1933 to justify the separate treatment it has received here? There can be little doubt that it was the rapid industrialization of Germany, particularly after the unification of 1871, rather than the Great War or the so-called German revolution which was the underlying cause for the developments we have traced. Furthermore, the creation of the Weimar Republic was achieved with so little change in the structure of German society that the impulses originating before the war can be said to continue almost unaltered into the republican age. The difference between the pre-war and the post-war period in educational reform is, then, not so much one of kind as one of degree. In the Second Empire the impetus for reform came in the main from the theorists and men with a private vision.

Against this stirring of opinion was pitted the weight of opposition of the pillars of German society. Admittedly, reform did occur, but this was a grudging concession made by the ruling elite to pressures, which it could no longer withstand, from below. In 1918 this situation was changed, in that defeat in war had temporarily discredited the Kaiser's regime and had produced a desire for national regeneration through the means of education. Now, for the first time, the ruling politicians and the educational reformers found themselves in agreement, and it was no longer a matter of theory or private experimentation but instead reform could move forward towards carrying into practice in the national state-run educational system the ideas which previously had to struggle for survival.[1] It was now the time to translate words into deeds, and the centre of interest changed from the intellectual's study to the political arena where the real struggle for educational reform was now fought out.

In looking at the attempts to get the ideas of the Pedagogical Movement accepted on the political level during the Weimar Republic one can discern two phases. The years immediately after the Great War appear as a time when the nation hoped to regain its sense of identity and repair the wrongs of the past. In this it placed great reliance on the power of education, especially as imposed by legislation at Reich and Land level. However, this approach brought little lasting success since the seeming unanimity which had prevailed immediately after the end of hostilities soon began to crumble once the threat of a Bolshevist revolution seemed averted. Consequently the middle twenties saw a decline in reformist activity, and legislation was only attempted where uncertainty threatened to prevail without it. Confusion, then, was the result of this lack of willingness to agree[2], and this allied to the confusion in public life arising

from other quarters, notably the economic recession of 1929 onwards, produced a second upsurge in the attempts to achieve educational reform. This time it was realized that the Reich government was as far as ever away from producing plans which would gain acceptance over a wide political spectrum, and so the initiative was left to the Länder to try and agree on a common policy which would produce some kind of national uniformity after their previous unco-ordinated reforms had produced the very opposite of the unity which, as we have seen, was at the heart of reform thinking. In this they did achieve a certain measure of success, but by this time it was really too late to stem the tide of events and prevent the rise of Hitler.

In looking, then, at the attempts at educational reform one is struck by how little was actually achieved. So much effort produced so few fruits. The Reich passed only one act in the field of education, and even then its effect was eroded by subsequent legislation. The Länder proved most reluctant to agree among themselves on all but the most pressing matters. The experimental schools never established themselves as a real alternative to the traditional Volksschule. The only substantial successes seem to have been the gradual public acceptance of the Grundschule, the establishment of the Aufbauschulen, and the new regulations governing teacher training. The reasons for this lack of success are in part the same as the reasons for the failure of the Weimar Republic in general. Shortage of money was certainly a crucial factor, as was also the inexperience of some of the new men in important positions. However, with particular reference to education, the fault seems most directly traceable to the fact that the reformers were unable to establish themselves as the representatives of the majority of the population in educational matters. Politically the flag of educational reform was borne by the republican

parties, but these rarely commanded a majority in the Reichstag. Democracy had only been introduced into Germany because the generals thought they could thereby secure better peace terms from the Allies in 1918. Even after the war the leading republican party, the SPD, had preferred to form an alliance with the army rather than work with those in favour of a real revolution in German society. As a result the élites, with the exception of the political élite, maintained their pre-war position, and the population as a whole, particularly once the terms of the Treaty of Versailles became known, showed no great enthusiasm for their new form of government. In this one can instance the general public inertia which kept the Mittelschule in being, even though from the purely educational standpoint it had lost its raison d'être, and which preserved the Gymnasium, despite its old-fashioned curriculum, as the school to which most prestige was attached. In the struggle for the non-denominational school greater success would have perhaps been gained if the supporters of the secular school had had the backing of moderate public opinion, but there is little sign that this was so. Thus, the advocates of school reform were only briefly (i.e. between 1918 and 1920) able to act as the spokesmen for the population at large. For the rest of the time they seemed only to represent a narrow, party-political point of view instead of projecting themselves as the defenders of Germany's total national interest. Even the successes in the field of educational reform were successes for the 'evolutionists' rather than the 'revolutionaries'; or, expressed in another way, the exclusively Socialist measures could scarcely be said to have been implemented at all, whereas if these too coincided with a point of nationalist policy they were assured of a greater degree of general acceptance. The link, as we saw, between the Socialists and the nationalists in education was their

belief in full individual development, although for the Socialists this was tempered with the necessary duty to employ these individual talents in the service of the community. Without this restriction the advance of educational reform really became a promotion of unbridled individualism which possibly helped the Nazis in their rise to power for their programme, with its glorification of irrationality and prejudice and total lack of respect for others, was a doctrine of unbridled individualism par excellence.

However, the failures of the Weimar period must not blind one to the real achievements of the educational reformers. Education became a matter of some public concern. Governments fell and elections were conducted on points of educational policy. Although the public at large were not ready for such ideas, it is monetheless instructive to note how far advanced in their thinking were the German educationalists of the 1920s. Above all one must acknowledge so many of the ideas proposed here for the first time which are now taken for granted as facts of educational practice. In comparison with elsewhere in Europe, Germany had worked out a full range of new ideas to equip the schools for the educational needs of the new industrial age. Its constitution had given official expression to these, and in many places eager reformers were at work trying to realize ideas which had scarcely been formulated in other countries. When one looks at the overall development of education in Europe in the twentieth century, one can see already in Germany of the Weimar Republic the seeds that were later to be sowed in other places at later times. The Einheitsschule was the precursor of the comprehensive schools of England, France, Sweden, and the U.S.S.R. Here we have the first attempt to devise an education in accord with democracy and educational opportunity for all. The ideal that the school should overcome social distinct-

ions and not accentuate them is found here long before other nations in western Europe tried to give effect to it.

It is, therefore, interesting to look at Germany since the Second World War to see whether the ideas which were frustrated during the Weimar Republic have now received a more favourable reception. There is, of course, no longer one Germany. It is divided into two quite separate states, and although they both claim to be democracies, they are very dissimilar and need, therefore, separate treatment.

Turning firstly to the German Democratic Republic one notes that this is a state within the Soviet bloc, so that one expects to find here the Socialist ideals, which struggled in vain for recognition during the Weimar period, to have received greater acceptance. To a certain extent this is true. The constitution of the GDR expresses certain of the ideas already met in the Weimar Constitution.

> Article 37. The schools educate young people in the spirit of the Constitution to independent thinking and responsibly acting people who are capable and ready to adept themselves to life in the community. As purveyors of culture the schools have the task of bringing up young people in the spirit of peaceful and friendly co-operation with the people of the world and of genuine democracy. Parents assist in the education of their children at school through Parents' Councils.
>
> Article 39. Every child must be given the opportunity to develop fully his physical, mental and moral capabilities. The course of young people's education must not be allowed to depend on the social or financial position of their parents. On the contrary the children who are at a disadvantage in their social position must receive special attention. Talented young people from all strata of society must be given the opportunity to attend technical schools, high schools and universities.[3)]

In addition, the varigated pattern of education which survived the Weimar period has now been replaced by a common, ten-year school (in the process of becoming increasingly a twelve-year school), much in external shape as the Einheitsschule was intended to be. However, the major influence acting on the schools of the GDR seems to be less that of the Weimar Republic and more the ideas coming from the Soviet

Union. Admittedly, both to a considerable degree have the same origins, but it will be recalled that the Communist view of education always put a proportionately greater emphasis on the school as the servant of industry. Thus, in 1956 polytechnical education was re-introduced into the Soviet Union by Nikita Krushchev, and two years later the same happened in the GDR. If, then, East Germany follows Soviet models in the structure of its school system, the atmosphere which prevails inside the schools does not seem to have changed much since the days of the Kaiser. As a recent visitor to the GDR has said: "I have never seen anywhere else such adult children, well-behaved and earnest. Nonetheless I only got to know a few youngsters who were adjusted to the system . Perhaps it can be explained thus: they grow up a bit 'schizo' - in school they act in the official way, at home in a private way; at school which, influenced by the ruling powers, is a swot school of almost Wilhelminian stupidity, a learn-by-heart school where discussions are avoided as a matter of principle and doubt does not exist - at school they learn the facts together with the prescribed opinion, at home they learn the facts and form their own opinions."[4)]

Turning to West Germany, one recognises more readily the same educational features as existed in the twenties. Indeed, in externals little has changed. There still exists the same pattern of Volksschulen, Mittelschulen, and höhere Schulen. Whereas elsewhere in Europe plans have gone ahead for a complete overhaul of the school systems, little of this nature has been undertaken in the Federal Republic. Changes, such as delaying the age for transfer to a Mittel- or höhere Schule and extending the top end of the Volksschule, have been cautiously introduced in some places, but these are strictly within the 'evolutionary' approach to reform. It is true that the Federal Republic has had unusual problems to overcome. The vacuum of

the Nazi years held up Germany's cultural development, the teachers tainted with Nazism were not easily replaced after the war, and the bombed schools not so easily rebuilt. West Germany has also had the problem of not wishing to appear too left-wing in its educational innovations for fear of blurring the distinctions between itself and the GDR. However, the system is now coming to the point where reform is imperative if the demands of the modern world are to be met. R. L. Warren's description of a rural Volksschule reveals how formal the methods still are, and how brutal at times also.[5] The universities are exceedingly overcrowded, and the ratio of professors to students very high. Not surprisingly, the Federal Republic has tended to look back to the Weimar Republic in search of a solution. The "Rahmenplan", as proposed by the German Committee for Education in 1958, bears a close resemblance to Reinhardt's plan for introducing the Einheitsschule which was received so well before the Reich School Conference. At the present time the SPD is the senior party in the governing coalition, which further provokes comparisons with the Weimar Republic. Again the government is pressing for educational reform and has set up a ministry to deal with national educational affairs, despite the fact that this is a sphere in which the Länder since 1949 have had almost complete independence. It is hoped that by 1980 the whole country will have gone over to a system of Gesamtschulen (the modern name for the Einheitsschule - about 200 exist already), but one wonders how successful the government will be, since the Länder see in this a threat to their cultural autonomy and are reluctant to co-operate.[6]

One fears that history will repeat itself. In the Weimar Republic the reformers were unable to win over the bulk of the population to their ideas, and now, fifty years later, despite their acceptance elsewhere in Europe, Germany still hovers on the brink. The

GDR has chosen to follow the Soviet path, and the Federal Republic seems undecided. Possibly Ralf Dahrendorf is right when he suggests the German concept of education is basically to treat the school as the place for formal learning only while leaving all the other functions to the family[7]. If so, perhaps the ideas, proposals, and experiments, which were found on the German educational scene between 1918 and 1933, will never take root in their native country.

Notes

1. cf. "At the turn of the century notable champions came to the fore in the Pedagogical Movement, and after the First World War it developed in the manifold, difficult tasks no less force. It is characteristic for this latter period that it was not borne by some few leading personnalities or even an outstanding figure; particularly not by eminent literary representatives. Of course in many areas single men and women stood out because of their special talents and powers for showing new directions. Yet notable for the Movement at this time is just the anonymity of its adherents. Pedagogical interests, passions, and capabilities had emerged in a fulness unusual for many years past. Without worrying too much about consistency, and only theorizing where necessary about what one did, people got down to practical work in relatively many places and sought satisfaction in direct effectiveness without strong claims to universal validity". Helmuth Kittel, Die Entwicklung der Pädagogischen Hochschulen 1926-32 (Berlin; Hermann Schroedel Verlag, 1957), p. 71. Writer's translation.

2. Theodor Litt's Führen oder Wachsenlassen (first published in 1927) was written as an attempt to reconcile conflicting educational opinions. Cf. also Gertrud Bäumer, Deutsche Politik (Karlsruhe: Verlag G. Braun, 1928). pp. 116ff. & Fritz Kanning, "Der gegenwärtige Stand des höheren Schulwesens und die Erzlehungswissenschaft", Die Erziehung Bd. III (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle u. Meyer, 1928), pp. 107ff.

3. Quoted in David J. Johnston, "Education", Profile of East Germany, Ed. Lex Hornsby (London: Harrap, 1966), p. 79.

4. Kaspar Lentow, "Derselbe Traum vom Auto - Marginalien von einer Reise in die DDR", Die Zeit, Bd. 25 Nr. 45 (Hamburg: 6/11/70), p. 72. Writer's translation.

5. R. L. Warren, Education in Rebhausen (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967). Especially pp. 55-56.

6. cf. Nina Grunenberg, "Zauberformel für die Bildung", Die Zeit Bd. 25 Nr. 44 (Hamburg: 30/10/70), p. 40.

7. cf. "The German school is indeed not in a position to render its own contribution to the education of children; and this is not because it is short of teachers or classrooms, but because of its structure as a subsidiary institution, a prolonged arm of the ultimately responsible family. The position of the school in society, the children's time conceded to it, its rank by comparison to the family the general appreciation of it, its character as a place to learn rather than to be educated, makes it virtually impossible for the school in Germany to bring its own formative force, informed by public virtues, to bear on the education of children. A school that is little more than a place to impart knowledge that the family cannot give has to be cruel, being all but forbidden any serious concern about people; it must also fail in its task to education in public virtues". Society and Democracy in Germany (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson Ltd., 1968), p. 324.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE LÄNDER OF THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC

LAND	POPULATION
Anhalt	350,000
Baden	2,310,000
Bavaria	7,480,000
Bremen	340,000
Brunswick	500,000
Hamburg	1,150,000
Hessen	1,350,000
Lippe - Detmold	160,000
Lübeck	130,000
Mecklenburg - Strelitz	110,000
Mecklenburg - Schwerin	670,000
Oldenburg	550,000
Prussia	38,790,000
Saxony	4,990,000
Schaumburg - Lippe	50,000
Thuringia	1,610,000
Waldeck	60,000
Wurttemberg	2,580,000
	63,180,000

(Figures in accordance with the census of 16th June, 1925.)

APPENDIX II

THE EDUCATION ARTICLES OF THE WEIMAR CONSTITUTION.

The German Reich Constitution of August 11th, 1919

Fundamental rights and duties of German Citizens. (Section IV: Education & Schools)

Article 142. Art, science, and instruction in them are free. The state guarantees their protection and participates in their promotion.

Article 143. The education of youth shall be provided for through public institutions. The Reich, the Lander, and the municipalities shall co-operate in their organisation.

Training of teachers shall be uniformly regulated for the Reich according to principles which apply generally to higher education.

Teachers in state schools shall have the rights and duties of state officials.

Article 144. The entire school system shall be under the supervision of the state; the latter may permit the municipalities to participate therein. Supervision of schools shall be carried out by technically trained officials who are mainly occupied with this duty.

Article 145. Compulsory education shall be universal. This purpose shall be served primarily by the Volksschule with at least eight school years, followed by the continuation school up to the completion of the eighteenth year. Instruction and school supplies shall be free in the Volksschule and continuation schools.

Article 146. The state school system shall be organically constructed. The Mittel-and höhere Schule system shall be developed on the basis of a Grundschule common to all. This development shall be governed by the varying requirements of vocations; and the admission of a child to a particular school shall be governed by his ability and aptitude and not by his economic and social position or the religious belief of his parents.

Nevertheless, within the municipalities, upon the request of those persons having the right to education, elementary schools of their own religious belief or of their Weltanschauung shall be established, provided that an organized school system in the sense of Paragraph 1 is not thereby interferred with. The wishes of those persons having the right to education, shall be considered as far as possible. Detailed regulations shall be prescribed by Land legislation on the basis of a Reich law.

To enable those in poor circumstances to attend höhere and Hochschulen, the Reich, the Länder, and the municipalities shall provide public funds, especially educational allowances, for the parents of children who are considered qualified for further education in Mittel-and höhere Schulen until the completion of such education.

Article 147. Private schools as a substitute for state schools shall require the approval of the Land and shall be subject to the laws of the Länder. Such approval shall be granted if the standard of the private schools in their curricula and equipment, as well as in professional training of their teachers, does not fall below that of state schools, and if no discrimination against pupils on account of the economic standing of their parents is fostered. Such approval shall be denied if the economic and legal status of the teacher is not sufficiently safeguarded.

Private Volksschulen shall be established only if, for a minority of those persons having a right to education whose wishes must be taken into consideration according to Article 146, Paragraph 2, there is in the municipality no state Volksschule of their religious belief or their Weltanschauung, or if the educational administration recognizes in it a special pedagogical interest.

Private Vorschulen are abolished.

The existing laws shall continue in force for private schools which do not serve as substitutes for state schools.

Article 148. In all schools effort shall be made to develop moral education, public-mindedness, and personal vocational efficiency in the spirit of the German national character and of international conciliation.

Instruction in state schools shall take care not to offend the sensibilities of those of contrary opinions.

Civic education and manual training shall be a part of the curricula of the schools. Every pupil shall at the end of his obligatory schooling receive a copy of the constitution.

The Reich, the Länder, and the municipalities shall foster popular education, including Volkssschulen.

Article 149. Religious instruction shall be part of the regular school curriculum with the exception of the non-sectarian (Weltanschauungs) schools. Such instruction shall be given in harmony with the fundamental principles of the religious association concerned, without prejudice to the right of supervision by the Land.

Teachers shall give religious instruction and conduct church ceremonies only upon declaration of the willingness to do so; participation in religious instruction and in church celebrations and acts shall depend upon a declaration of willingness by those who control the religious education of the child.

Theological faculties in institutions of higher learning shall be maintained.

Source: I. L. Kandel & T. Alexander, Reorganisation of Education in Prussia. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927), pp. 179-86. Adapted.

APPENDIX III

THE REICH GRUNDSCHULE LAW

Law concerning the Grundschule and the Dissolution of the Vorschulen of 28th April, 1920

The German Constitutional National Assembly passed the following Reich law, which, with the approval of the Reichsrat, is published herewith.

I.

The Volksschule is to be organised in its first four years as the Grundschule for all, upon which the Mittel- and höhere Schule systems shall also be built. The regulations of Article 146, Paragraph 2, and 174, of the constitution of the German Republic are likewise valid for the Grundschule.

The Grundschule classes (or sections) shall guarantee, along with a complete preservation of their principal task as part of the Volksschule also satisfactory preparation for direct entrance into either a Mittel- or höhere Schule. This regulation does not apply to classes in the special schools.

Central school authorities of the individual Länder can make provision for special cases so that still more classes of a Volksschulen can be organised as classes of the Grundschule.

II.

The existing public Vorschulen or preparatory classes are to be abolished immediately. Instead of an immediate and complete abolition, gradual dissolution can take place in the following manner:

That from the beginning of the school year 1920-21, or, where this is not feasible, at the latest at the beginning of the school year 1921-22 the lowest class will no longer be organised, and that the final closure of the school must be completed at the latest by the beginning of the school year 1924-25.

The regulations apply to private Vorschulen or classes, yet the complete dissolution may be postponed until the beginning of the school year 1929-30, in cases where an immediate dissolution or sudden abandonment would work material economic hardship upon teachers or proprietors, and where it is inadvisable for local reasons. If postponement is permitted, care must be taken that the total pupils enrolment does not exceed the previous enrolment.

If through the dissolution or gradual abandonment material economic hardships fall upon teacher or proprietors, indemnity is to be provided through other public means.

In the sense of these regulations, Paragraphs 1 and 2, those classes in the Mittel- and höhere Schulen shall be considered as preparatory classes which are attended by children in the first three years.

III.

If, in consequence of the dissolution or abandonment of the public Vorschulen or preparatory classes, regular, full-time teachers (of either sex) are no longer needed in their former positions, these teachers can be transferred, even against their wishes, to public Volksschulen, or Mittel- or höhere Schulen, without detriment however, to their salary claims.

The Edict of the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art, and Popular Education, April 13, 1921: Through this regulation the instruction of Article 87 of the Prussian Disciplinary Law of July 27, 1852, for non-judicial officials, is so changed that the new position does not need to be accompanied with like rank and salary as the former position, but it is sufficient if a possible loss in salary is compensated in another manner.

So long as teachers becoming unemployed owing to the abandonment of these schools cannot be provided for otherwise, they will continue to receive their salaries from their former employers in the same manner, as if they were still employed in their teaching positions. They are obligated during this time to take over without pay employment assigned to them at another place: for example, substitute work or work in the school administration service.

IV.

Private instruction for individual children or private group instruction for children of several families, who unite for the purpose, can be permitted in place of attendance in the Grundschule in exceptional cases only.

Exceptions can be based upon an extraordinarily dangerous condition of the child's health, upon unusual distance from school, and upon similar pressing circumstances.

An endangered condition of health does not of itself carry with it the privilege of private instruction. Generally there will arise the question of postponing instruction. In this case compulsory attendance in the Grundschule will be correspondingly extended upwards.

In Prussia the conditions for family or private instruction, as well as for their teachers, are defined by law in the State Ministerial Instruction of December 31, 1839. While sharp demarkation between a private school and a family school is only possible in individual cases, still the following general differences are to be recognised: In a private school, its proprietor (a teacher or a corporation) is supporter of the organisation, while in the family school it is the family. Accordingly, in the first case, the director of the school passes upon the enrolment of pupils, while in the second case the family, and not the teacher appointed by it. The family school usually instructs a smaller number of children in a manner that corresponds to the nature of home instruction; the private school, generally a larger number of pupils, according to the manner of school instruction.

Private and family instruction as supplementary to public instruction is limited by the foregoing law only to the extent that the supplementary private instruction may not cut short the four year's attendance at the Grundschule. See Art. 174, Reich Constitution.

V.

The provisions of this law do not apply to the instruction and education of children who are blind, deaf and dumb, hard of hearing, defective in speech, weak-minded, chronically sick, morally dangerous, or crippled, nor to the institution set aside for the instruction and education of these children. See Section 1, paragraph 1, sentence 2.

These schools and institutions mentioned are also freed from the obligation of organising their lower classes as a Grundschule, if perchance they fall under Section II of this law.

Source - Kandel & Alexander, op. cit., pp. 187-89. Adapted.

Edict of the Reich Ministry of the Interior, 18th June, 1921.

Suggestions for Determining the Aims and the Internal Structure of the Grundschule.

These suggestions are to be regarded as a stimulus to the uniform organisation of the Grundschule. In other respects, however, with regard to the inner organisation of the Grundschule, to its problems of method and curriculum the Lander maintain their full freedom and independence.

1. The Grundschule common for all children is not a special type of school. It is rather a part of the Volksschule and comprises its first four years, which forms at the same time the foundation division of all Mittel- and höhere Schule groups.

2. The first four years of the school have their own goal and a unified sphere of activity. The goal is the gradual unfolding of the child's abilities out of the instinct for play and movement towards a normal desire for works manifests itself inside the school community. Its unified sphere of activity is receptive and formative comprehension of the child's physical and spiritual environment with special consideration of the cultivation of the child's linguistic expression and well planned training of eye through his own activity as well as through observation of nature, work, and workshops. Besides, physical education is to be cultivated through games, gymnastics, excursion, and, according to season and age, through swimming, sledging, skating, and other physical activity.

3. This aim of the Grundschule demands also the conscious familiarization with the mother tongue and its treasures in poetry and language for children; that is, reading, writing, and singing; further the comprehension of spatial forms, rhythm, and number, especially that which may be developed out of practical activity with things, and by means of drawing, modelling, and cutting.

4. So there results an integrated instruction as a foundation structure which gradually develops into a concrete study based upon local environment along with and through expressional activities, language instruction, arithmetic, singing, drawing, physical training, and manual work.

Through the determination of aim out of the child's development and with an adjustment between it and the demands of culture, the Grundschule creates out of its own being the foundation of all further education, including also the höhere Schule, without thereby being burdened with the task foreign to its nature, of being a preparatory school for foreign language instruction.

Source - ibid., pp. 189-90.

APPENDIX IV

THE CURRICULA OF THE NEW EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN PRUSSIA.

a) Curriculum of the Deutsche Oberschule in Prussia.
(Number of lessons per week)

Subject / Year	1-3*	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Religion	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	18
German	16	5	5	5	5	4	4	44
History	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	25
Geography	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	18
Mathematics	13	4	4	4	4	4	4	37
Science	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	30
1st mod. language	18	6	6	4	4	4	4	46
2nd mod. language	-	-	-	4	3	3	3	13
Drawing	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	18
Singing	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Total	79	28	28	30	30	29	29	253

Plus four lessons of physical training per form.

* Junior section the same as that of the Reformrealgymnasium and Oberrealschule.

Source - Otto Boelitz, op. cit., p. 205. Writer's translation.

b) Curriculum of the Prussian Aufbauschule (number of lessons per week)

Subject / year	1		2		3		4		5		6		Total	
	a	b*	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Religion	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12	12
German	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	28	24
History	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	22	18
Geography	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	12	9
Mathematics	5	6	5	6	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	26	32
Science	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	6	5	6	5	6	27	30
1st mod.language	7	7	7	7	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	31	30
2nd mod.language	-	-	-	-	4	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	13	15
Drawing	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12	12
Total	30	30	30	30	31	31	31	31	30	30	30	30	182	182

plus in Years 1 - 6 sixteen lessons of physical training (in toto)

Years 1 - 6 eight lessons of music (")

Year 6 six lessons of group work.

* a - of the Deutsche Oberschule type; b - of the Oberrealschule type.

Source : Otto Boelitz, op. cit., p. 205. Writer's translation.

c) Curriculum of compulsory subjects in the Prussian Pedagogical Academies, as laid down early in 1927.

1st half year	2nd half year	3rd half year	4th half year
Academic lectures and practicals			
Introduction to philosophy (2)	Introduction to philosophy (2)	Psychology (2)	School hygiene (2)
Physiology & anatomy (1)	Psychology (2)	Psychology practical (1)	School organisation (1)
Psychology (2)	Psychology practical (1)	History of pedagogy (2)	School organisation practical (1)
Psychology practical (1)	History of pedagogy (2)	History of pedagogy practical (2)	Practical social pedagogy (2)
Systematic pedagogy (3)	History of pedagogy practical (2)		Exercises on social pedagogy (1)
General didactic & pedagogical practical (1)	Linguistic education (1)		
Introduction to theology (2)	Introduction to the curriculum of the Volksschule and its pedagogical assessment		
Local topography (1)	Religion (2)	Religion (2)	
Local biology(1)	German (2)	German & integrated studies (2)	
Local folklore (1)	History and civics (2)	Music (1)	
Introductions to civics & sociology (2)	Arithmetic & geometry (2)	Drawing (1)	
	Nature study (2)	Gymnastics (1)	
	Geography (1)	(Needlework)(1)	
Artistic and technical training			
Blackboard work (1)	Drawing (1)	Music (5/4)	Music (5/4)
Music (5/4)	Music (5/4)	Physical edu.(3)	Physical edu. (3)
Physical edu. (3)	Physical edu. (3)		Handicraft (1/2)
Handicraft (1/2)	Handicraft (1)		
Introduction to practical professional work			
Introduction to practical professional work (2)	School visits in the context of an introduction to the curriculum of the Volksschule	School visits, trial lessons, & discussions (8)	School visits, trial lessons & discussions (8)
Study of the educative process (3)			
Total of compulsory courses (per week)			
30	30	30	24

Source: Helmuth Kittel, Die pädagogischen Hochschulen 1926-32 (Berlin: Hermann Schroedel Verlag, 1957), p.98. Writer's translation.

APPENDIX V

THE THURINGIAN EINHEITSSCHULE

The Thuringian Einheitsschule, as proposed in the law of 24th February, 1922

<table>
<tr><td>Age</td><td>Yr. at sch.</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>17-19</td><td>11-13</td><td>Deutsche Oberschule</td><td>Real-schule</td><td>Real-gymnasium</td><td>Gymnasium</td></tr>
<tr><td>14-16</td><td>8-10</td><td>Deutsche Mittel-schule</td><td>Real-schule</td><td colspan="2">Lateinschule</td></tr>
<tr><td>11-13</td><td>5-7</td><td>Deutsche Unter-schule</td><td colspan="3">Realschule</td></tr>
<tr><td>6-10</td><td>1-4</td><td colspan="4">Grundschule</td></tr>
</table>

Source: August Messer: Pädagogik der Gegenwart (2. Aufl.; Leipzig: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1931), p. 209. Writer's translation.

APPENDIX VI

PETERSEN'S JENA PLAN

Petersen's Jena Plan (time-table)

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
7						
8		Courses				
9	Corporate Activities	Group work on cultural topics			Group work on scientific topics	Elective course (according to demand)
10	M I D - M O R N I N G B R E A K					
11	Group work on cultural topics			Group work on science topics	Handicraft.	Corporate Activities.
12	ditto.			ditto		
1						
2						
3		Sports Day			Handicraft	
4						
5						

Source: Peter Petersen, Der Kleine Jena-Plan (46. Aufl.; Weinheim/ Bergstr.: Verlag Julius Beltz, 1965), p.52. Writer's translation.

GLOSSARY

ABENDGYMNASIUM	Evening school first founded in Berlin in 1927 by P. A. Silbermann giving adults the opportunity to gain the Abitur qualification.
ABITUR	University matriculation examination taken at the end of the full höhere Schule course.
ALLGEMEINBILDEND	adj. Relating to general, strictly non-vocational education.
ALLGEMEINBILDUNG	substantive to above.
ARBEITSSCHULE	Literally - work/labour/activity school.
AUFBAUSCHULE	Six-year höhere Schule established following the recommendation of the Reich School Conference to enable Volksschule pupils to pass on to secondary education.
BERUFSSCHULE	Vocational school
DEUTSCHE OBERSCHULE	New type of nine-year höhere Schule set up in the Weimar period; its curriculum was built around "German" subjects.
EINHEITSSCHULE	Literally - unified school.
ERLEBNISSCHULE	Literally - experience school.
FORTBILDUNGSSCHULE	Continuation school.
FRAUENOBERSCHULE	Three-year girls' höhere Schule following the Lyzeum. It attempted to give theoretical depth to "feminine" subjects.
FRAUENSCHULE	One or two-year girls' höhere Schule following Lyzeum.
GABELUNG	Literally - forking. A method of curriculum arrangement by which pupils could choose for themselves a given group of subjects to combine with those prescribed as core subjects.
GEMEINSCHAFT	Term used by Tönnies to denote a close-knit, mutually dependent community.
GGEMEINSCHAFTSSCHULE	a) An experimental school, especially in Hamburg and Berlin. b) A non-denominational, or even secular, Volksschule.
GESAMTSCHULE	Post-1945 Einheitsschule.

GESELLSCHAFT	Term used by Tönnies to denote an amorphous social group with few common ties between the members.
GRUNDSCHULE	First four years of the Volksschule, as established by the Law of 28th April, 1920.
GYMNASIUM	Most prestigious boys' höhere Schule, with special emphasis on Classical studies.
HEIMATKUNDE	Method of breaking down subject divisions by organising learning around a study of the local environment.
HOCHSCHULE	University or other institution of similar standard.
HÖHERE SCHULE	Secondary school.
LAND	Official designation of the semi-autonomous German provinces.
LANDERZIEHUNGSHEIM	Private boarding school, as founded by Hermann Lietz.
LEBENSSCHULE	Literally - life school.
LERNSCHULE	Literally - learning school.
LYZEUM	Six-year girls' höhere schule.
MITTELSCHULE	Intermediate school, offering a six-year course after four years at the Volksschule.
OBERLYZEUM	Three-year girls' höhere Schule, following Lyzeum and leading to Abitur.
OBERREALSCHULE	Nine-year boys' höhere Schule stressing modern subjects.
PRÄPARANDARANSTALT	Pre-1918 three-year college for Volksschule leavers intending to enter a Seminar to become a Volksschule teacher.
PRODUKTIONSSCHULE	Literally - production school.
PROGYMNASIUM	Shortened (six-year) Gymnasium.
PROREALGYMNASIUM	Shortened (six-year) Realgymnasium.
REALGYMNASIUM	Nine-year boys'höhere Schule with less emphasis on Classical studies than at Gymnasium.
REALSCHULE	Junior and intermediate sections of the Oberrealschule.

REFORMGYMNASIUM	Type of boys' höhere Schule in the first three years of which the differences in curriculum of the three basic types of boys' höhere Schule were reduced.
REICH	Official designation of the German state. Although meaning literally "empire", its use continued in the Weimar Republic.
REICHSRAT	Upper house of the German parliament composed of representatives from the Länder.
REICHSTAG	Lower house of the German parliament.
SAMMELSCHULE	Type of Volksschule (especially in Prussia) which, de jure a denominational school, was de facto a secular school being made up of pupils and staff who had used their rights under the Weimar Constitution to withdraw from religious instruction.
SEMINAR	Pre-1918 three-year college for training Volksschule teachers.
STUDIENANSTALT	Six-year girls' höhere Schule entered after three years at a Lyzeum. In the Weimar period there were four types to correspond to the four types of boys' höhere Schule.
TECHNISCHE HOCHSCHULE	Institution of university rank but devoted especially to applied science.
VOLKSHOCHULE	Institute for informal adult education.
VOLKSSCHULE	Elementary school.
VORSCHULE	Three-year preparatory school for pupils intending to go to höhere Schule. The Law of 28th April, 1920, attempted to disband them but this was not achieved in the Weimar period.
WANDERVOGEL	Section of the youth movement for young people still at school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A) Historical Background

Childs, David. Germany since 1918. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1971.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. Society and Democracy in Germany. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson Ltd., 1968.

Heiber, Helmut. Die Republik von Weimar. 4. Aufl. Munchen: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag G.m.b.H. & Co. KG. 1969.

Kohn, Hans. The Mind of Germany. London: Macmillan, 1962.

Mann, Cole. Deutsche Geschichte 1919-1945. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Bucherei K.G., 1961.

Taylor, A. J. P. The Course of German History. London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1945.

Watt, Richard M. The Kings Depart. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson Ltd., 1969.

B) Education

Alexander, T., and Parker, B. The New Education in the German Republic. London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1930.

Bäumer, Gertrud. Deutsche Schulpolitik. Karlsruhe: Verlag C. Braun, 1928.

Becker, Carl Heinrich. Kulturpolitische Aufgaben des Reichs. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1919.

_____. Gedanken zur Hochschulreform. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1919.

_____. Vom Wesen der deutschen Universität. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1925.

Becker, H. Theodore. "The Problem of Teacher Training in Germany", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1927 (New York: 1928), pp. 521ff.

Blochmann, Elisabeth. "Die Frauenoberschule", Die Erziehung, III (Leipzig: 1928), pp. 5EBff.

Boelitz, Otto. Der Aufbau des preussischen Bildungswesens. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1925.

Bohlen, Adolf. Auswirkungen der preussischen Schulreform. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1925.

Breitenstein, Desiderius, Die sozialistische Erziehungsbewegung. Freiburg i. B.: Herder & Co. G.m.b.H., 1930.

Busch, Hugo. "Vocational Education in Germany". Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1928 (New York: 1929), pp. 321ff.

Childs, David. "Education: Mixing Mental and Manual Labour", East Germany (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1969), pp. 173ff.

Delekat, Friedrich. "Grundsätzliches zum Kampf an das Reichschulgesetz", Die Erziehung, III (Leipzig: 1928), pp. 193ff.

Deutsches Institut für Wissenschaftliche Pädagogik (Hrsg.). Lexikon der Pädagogik der Gegenwart. 2Bde. Freiburg i. B.: Herder & Co. G.m.b.H. 1930.

Gaudig, Hugo (Hrsg.). Freie geistige Schularbeit in Theorie und Praxis. 4. Aufl. Breslau: Ferdinand Hirt, 1925.

Grunenberg, Nina. "Zauberformel fur die Bildung", Die Zeit, XXV, 44 (Hamburg: 30/10/70), p.40.

Grunwald, Georg. Die Pädagogik des 20. Jahrhunderts. Freiburg i. B.: Herder & Co. G.m.b.H., 1927.

Hamburger Oberschulbehorde (Hrsg.). Das Hamburger Schulwesen 1914-24. Hamburg: 1925.

Hartlieb, F. The Free Waldorf School at Stuttgart. London: Anthroposophical Publishing Co., 1928.

Haywood F.H. The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Frobel. London: Ralph Holland & Co., 1904.

Heichert, Friedrich. "Rückblick auf die erste Zeit der Deutschen Landerziehungsheime" Die Erziehung, III (Leipzig: 1928), pp. 589ff.

Hellpach, Willy. Die Wesengestalt der deutschen Schule. 2. verbessert. Aufl. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1926.

Helmreich, E. C. Religious Education in German Schools. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. P., 1959.

Hilker, Franz (Hrsg.). Deutsche Schulversuche. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1924.

Hylla, Erich. "Legal Status of Religious Education", Educational Yearbook of the International Institut of Teachers College 1932. (New York: 1933), pp. 201ff.

Johnston, David J. "Education", Profile of East Germany. Edited by Lex Hornsby. (London: George C. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1966), pp. 77ff.

Kandel, I. L. Studies in Comparative Education. London: George C. Harrap & Co. Ltd., n.d.

Kandel, I. L., and Alexander, T. The Re-organisation of Education in Prussia. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Kanning, Fritz. "Zur Neuordnung des höheren Schulwesens in Sachsen", Die Erziehung, II (Leipzig: 1927), pp. 353ff.

_____. "Der gegenwärtige Stand des höheren Schulwesens und die Erziehungswissenschaft", Die Erziehung, III (Leipzig: 1928), pp. 107ff.

Karsen, Fritz. Deutsche Versuchsschulen der Gegenwart. Leipzig: Dürr'sche Buchhandlung, 1923.

_____. (Hrsg.). Die neuen Schulen in Deutschland: Langensalza: Verlag von Julius Beltz, 1924.

Kerschensteiner, Georg. The Idea of the Industrial School. New York: Macmillan 1913.

_____. Der Begriff der staatsbürgerlichen Erziehung. 5. erweitert. Aufl. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1923.

Kittel, Helmuth, Die Entwicklung der Pädagogischen Hochschulen 1926-32. Berlin: Hermann Schroedel Verlag K.G., 1957.

Knoll, Joachim H. The German Educational System. Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1967.

Kuhne, Alfred. "Das deutsche Berufsschulwesen", Die Erziehung, II (Leipzig: 1927), pp. 102ff.

Laqueur, W. Z. Young Germany. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Lehmann, Reinhold. "Germany: Administration of Education", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1927 (New York: 1928), pp. 131ff.

_____. "Germany", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1928 (New York: 1929), pp. 95ff.

_____. "The Federal School Law and Religious Education", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1932 (New York: 1933), pp.231ff.

Litt, Theodor. Führen oder Wachsenlassen. 11. Aufl. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1964.

Löffler, Eugen. Das öffentliche Bildungswesen in Deutschland. Berlin: Verlag von E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1931.

Messer, August. "Pädagogik der Gegenwart. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1931.

Metzner, K. Zum deutschen Bildungswesen - im Lichte schulpolitischer Entwicklung. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1930.

Meyer-Erlach, W. "The Cultural Scene in Germany Today", Germany Today. Edited by J. P. Payne. (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1971), pp. 153ff.

Nicolai, Rudolf. "Die Schullandheim-Bewegung", Die Erziehung, II (Leipzig: 1927), pp. 491ff.

Nohl, Hermann. "Die Einheit der Pädagogischen Bewegung", Die Erziehung, I (Leipzig: 1926), pp. 57ff.

_____. "Der humanistische Sinn der Arbeit in der Arbeitsschule", Die Erziehung, II (Leipzig: 1927), pp. 516ff.

_____. "Der Reichsschulgesetzentwurf (1927)". Reprinted in Pädagogik aus dreissig Jahren. Frankfurt. a. M.: Verlag C. Schulte-Bulmke, 1949.

_____. Die Pädagogischen Bewegung in Deutschland und ihre Theorie. 6. Aufl. Frankfurt a. M.: Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 1963.

Nydahl, Jens. Das Berliner Schulwesen. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben Verlag, 1928.

Ostreich, Paul (Hrsg.). Entschiedene Schulreform. Berlin: Erich Reiss Verlag, 1920.

_____. (Hrsg.). Zur Produktionsschule. Berlin: Verlag fur Sozialwissenschaft, 1921.

_____. (Hrsg.). Bausteine zur neuen Schule. München: Rösl und Cie. Verlag, 1923.

Petsch, R. "Die allgemeinen Ziele der Deutschen Oberschule", Pädagogisches Zentralblatt, I. (Berlin: 1920), pp. 261ff.

Petersen, Peter. Der kleine Jena-Plan. 42.-46. Aufl. Weinheim/Bergstrasse: Verlag Julius Beltz, 1965.

buch
Rach, A. Sachworter/zur deutschen Erziehungsgeschichte. Weinheim/Bergstrasse: Verlag Julius Beltz, 1964.

Reichsministerium des Innern (erstattet von). Die Reichsschulkonferenz. 1920. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1921.

Richert, Hans. Die Ober- und Aufbauschule. Leipzig: Verlag vom Quelle und Meyer, 1923.

Riekel, August. Die akademische Lehrerbildung - Idee und Gestalt. 2. durchgesehen. u. erweitert. Aufl. Langensalza: Verlag von Julius Beltz, 1931.

Russel, J. E. German Higher Schools. 2nd. edn. New York: Longman Green and Co., 1967.

Sachse, Arnold. "Die Entwicklung des Schulrechts seit der Staatsumwalzung", Die Erziehung, II (Leipzig: 1927), pp. 690ff.

Samuel, R. H., and Hinton-Thomas, R. Education and Society in Modern Germany. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.

Scheibe, W. (Hrsg.). Die Pädagogik im zwanzigsten Jahrundert. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1960.

Schulz, Bernhard. "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Schulgemeinden", Die Erziehung, I. (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 535ff.

Schwartz, Hermann. "Zur Lehrerbildungsfrage", Die Erziehung, I (Leipzig: 1926), pp. 190ff.

Simons, Diana, Georg Kerschensteiner. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. 1966.

Spranger, Eduard. "Die drei Motive der Schulreform", Kultur und Erziehung. 4. Aufl. (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1928), pp. 115ff.

Sturm, K. F. Deutsche Erziehung im Werden 3. Aufl. Osterwieck/Harz: A. W. Zickfeldt Verlag, 1935. 1. & 2. Aufl. entitled Die pädagogische Reformbewegung der jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit.

Ulich, Robert. "Significant Trends in Education during the Republican Era", Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College 1936 (New York: 1936), pp. 339ff.

Warren, R. L. Education in Rebhausen. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Washburne, Carleton, and Stearns, Myron M. "Schools that dare to Give Children Complete Freedom - Hamburg", New Schools in the Old World (New York: The John Day Co., 1926), pp. 110ff.

Weise, Martin. Paul Östreich und die Entschiedene Schulreform. Leipzig: Dürr'sche Buchhandlung, 1928.

Wyneken, Gustav. Der Kampf für die Jugend. Jena: Eugen Diederichs Verlag, 1919.

Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht (Hrsg.). Die deutsche Schulreform - ein Handbuch für die Reichsschulkonferenz. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1919.

_____. (Hrsg.). Die Reichsschulkonferenz in ihren Ergebnissen. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1920.

_____(Hrsg.). Theorie und Praxis der Arbeitsschule. Neubearbeitet. u. erweitert. Aufl. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht Verlag, 1925.

_____(Hrsg.). Jahrbuch. 2. Jahrgang 1920. Berlin. E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1920.

_____(Hrsg.). Jahrbuch. 4. Jahrgang 1922. Berlin: E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1923.

_____(Hrsg.). Das deutsche Schulwesen - Jahrbuch 1927. Berlin: E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1928.

_____(Hrsg.). Das deutsche Schulwesen - Jahrbuch 1928/29. Berlin: E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1930.

_____(Hrsg.). Das deutsche Schulwesen - Jahrbuch 1930/32. Berlin: E. S. Mittler und Sohn, 1933.

C) Miscellaneous

Hauptmann, Gerhardt. Das Abenteuer meiner Jugend. 2 Bde. Berlin: 1937.

Lentow, Kaspar. "Derselbe Traum vom Auto - Marginalien von einer Reise in die DDR", Die Zeit. XXV, 45 (Hamburg: 6/11/70), p. 72.

Reddie, Cecil. "Was zur gründung von abbotsholme führte" (sic), Die Erziehung, III (Leipzig: 1928), pp. 577ff.

D) Unpublished Material.

Scharnberg, Rudolf, (Oberstudienrat, Hamburg).
Letter to writer, 6th February, 1972.