Durham E-Theses

Educational ideas, in England, in the Second World War, 1938-1948

Moss, P. D.

Thesis Abstract

Educational Ideas, In England, In The Second World War, 1938-1948

P.D. MOSS

The thesis is a critical consideration of the general educational ideas in the period. A further examination is made of three issues of some importance in the period: the problem of religion in education; the Public Schools issue; and the university issue.

It is argued that the general ideas fall into three categories: those concerned with fundamental standpoints; those which attempt to find a workable, practical framework for theoretical ideas; and those which concentrate upon organisation. The three specific issues illustrate these basic approaches.

The conclusion arrived at is that a thorough appraisal of the English educational system was made in the period, but an appraisal too often conducted at the level of abstractions. Particularly evident was the tendency to use large social or political concepts to justify or condemn educational ideas, often without making a study or analysis of the concepts themselves. This was particularly true of such ideas as "equality of opportunity" and "democracy".

A brief examination has been made of the educational ideas in the post-war period in order that the war-time ideas can be placed in perspective. This has shown that little development has taken place in the general ideas in the sense that large concepts such as "equality of opportunity" still remain unexamined or inadequately defined. Secondly, that more systematic studies of the specific issues have been undertaken. This is especially true in the Public Schools issue and to a lesser extent in the university issue and religious issue. However, in all cases the problem of their function has loomed large and this itself is a further reflection of the lack of an agreed general philosophy of education.

M.Ed. 85

PETER D. MOSS

EDUCATIONAL IDEAS, IN ENGLAND, IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1938 - 1948

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION   OCTOBER, 1967

Contents

PREFACE

This thesis is not an attempt to consider the psychological or
sociological effects of war in relation to the educational system of
England, 1938-1948. Rather, it is an attempt to examine critically
the general educational ideas which were prevalent during these years.

It is hoped to show that certain features in the educational thought
of the period were well defined, so much so that they can be traced in
specific issues. In general there were three approaches to educational
problems: a strictly theoretical approach; an approach which combined
fundamental thinking with the desire for immediate, practical implementa-
tion; and an approach which was more interested in organisation than
in the consideration of theoretical assumptions. Each approach can be
seen in some detail in the university issue, the religious issue and
the Public Schools issue, respectively.

Finally, a brief examination has been made of the general educational
ideas in the post-war period in order that the war-time ideas can be
placed in perspective.

Educational Ideas In The Second World War

Political, social and organisational implications of educational practice were much debated in this period but there was also a deep concern with basic assumptions and an attempt to grapple with theoretical ideas, sometimes at the level of abstraction.   Although much of the theorising must be seen against the social conditions produced by war, the quantity of writing produced was not simply the result of an educational urge generated by war, but was rather the end-product of a movement whose catalysts were the ideas of theorists writing a generation before.   People like Campagnac, Clarke and Nunn were considering issues in the twenties which arose again in our period;   it was as though their ideas were seen by people in the war years as being relevant for their own time.

Probably the outstanding theoretical study up to 1938 was Sir Percy Nunn's, 'Education: Its Data and First Principles'.   It will be necessary here to consider the main pivots of his ideas, for his insights were seminal.

The aim of his book was "to reassert the claim of individuality to be regarded as the supreme educational end, and to protect that ideal against both the misprision of its critics and the incautious advocacy of some of its friends."(1)   He stood throughout on the proposition that nothing good enters the human world save through the free activities of individual men and women. He found that:

> "freedom for each to conduct life's adventure in his own
> way and to make the best he can of it is the one, universal,
> ideal sanctioned by nature and approved by reason; and that
> the beckoning gleams of other ideals are but broken lights
> from this.   That freedom is, in truth, the condition, if
> not the source, of all the higher goods.   Apart from it,
> duty has no meaning, self-sacrifice no value, authority no
> sanction."(2)

This view envisages life as a striving towards individuality through self-assertion(3), expressed through two types of activity, the conservative and

the creative. For Nunn, man is at his best when viewed through his creative nature:

> "The whole meaning of education is missed, unless we think of it as a process in which this creative power is to be given the best possible chances of developing and expressing itself."(4)

The question that the educational theorist must ask, and it is one that Nunn's critics considered, is whether Nunn's view of striving after a unified individuality offers the conditions for freedom in education and life. Nunn, of course, would argue that it does, and he argued from two realistic bases: the psychological nature of man; and his own, pedagogical experience.

The psychological centre of Nunn's view is the perpetual assertion of the organism over against the world of which it forms a part. In every act, conservative or creative, the least assertive personality says to the world "I am here and to be reckoned with."(5) Even life as a whole may be regarded:

> "as the unrolling of an instinct in which the activities of the special instincts are only characteristic moments. For it is a continuous, unified process of self-assertion in which a disposition to action is linked through the intermediacy of feeling to a disposition to cognize the external world."(6)

Nunn appeared to be forcing these ideas into a shapely, general pattern which cannot be convincingly maintained for very long. His generalization of the instinct of self-assertion is really little more than the assignment of a name to a group of activities. Further, any term to which 'self' is prefixed is not an ideal name for a 'developing' tendency which, by definition, is regarded as 'innate'. Further, although self-assertion is important there is also the complementary instinct of submission, which Nunn tended to ignore. It is extremely unlikely that his instinct of self-assertion could stand alone. Clearly, anything which perpetually confronts its world must also be perpetually confronted by its world; in any case, Nunn's

exposition of specific, psychological processes seems to contradict the great emphasis which he placed upon self-assertion. For example, in his description of the relationship between horme and mneme, he showed how the direction of thought in a sentence forming part of a conversation is modified as the sentence gradually unfolds. The original thought-impulse is:

> "modified and enriched by the products of its own creative
> activity in such a way that it often becomes a substantially
> new thing, fitted to be the starting point of a fresh move-
> ment of self-assertion."(7)

But this modification of the original impulse implies a submission of the self just as much as it implies an assertion of the self through creative activity. Even play, which Nunn discussed in terms of self-assertion on page 83, is really the submission of self-assertion either self-chosen or voluntarily accepted.

In his discussion of the meaning of discipline (where his own mature practical experience determined his approach), Nunn implied that there is no assertion without submission. He contended that:

> "[Discipline] consists in the submission of one's impulses
> and powers to a regulation which imposes form upon their
> chaos, and brings efficiency and economy where there would
> otherwise be ineffectiveness and waste. Though parts of
> our nature may resist this control, its acceptance must,
> on the whole, be willing acceptance - the spontaneous
> movement of a nature in which there is an inborn impulse
> towards greater perfection or 'expressiveness'."(8)

Thus the innate impulse towards perfection is not merely an assertive activity; it is also a receptive and relatively passive process.

So, Nunn's individual freedom consists of a process where loosely organised acts of native assertion are bound into an activity which seems to satisfy fully the needs of the individual; and this is obtained by an adjustment of self-assertive and submissive tendencies.

This conception is adequate as theory, as far as it goes, but it does

not indicate any organising principle which will induce the adjustment of assertive and submissive tendencies. It can be argued that the only thing liable to bring about this adjustment would be the individual's sense of value. Certainly, it was around this that criticism centred.

Professor Campagnac was the first to question Nunn's position, starting from the premise that education is the process by which men learn to subordinate themselves to an ideal society. He therefore argued that:

> "though individuality may be an educational end, it is an end which can only be attained by those who seek another and a larger end."(9)

And he summed up his position:

> "For we are not yet ready to accept individuality as the supreme, educational end, or to suppose that the end can only be stated in any simple word or formula...To seek individuality is good, but to lose it is good; to yield to society and to defy society are both proper tasks for men, who must be in the world and yet not of it; who must be themselves, but can only discover themselves by finding other selves than their own; who must die in order to live."(10)

The debate subsequently tended to polarise around self-assertive individualism on the one hand and the need to see the individual within a larger framework, on the other. There are two reasons for this polarity. One is that the critics insufficiently understood Nunn's ideas, for it could be argued that the forces which produce submissiveness by implication are social ones (**cf** his discussion of discipline). Nunn, perhaps, recognised this for in the third edition of his book he argued:

> "All this does not deny or minimize the responsibility of man to his fellows; for the individual life can only develop in terms of its own nature and that is social as truly as it is self-regarding."(11)

This is an attempt to meet Campagnac but it hardly answers his main criticism. Also he emphasised the social factor in school life in this

edition.   Secondly, Nunn confused the presentation of his main insights by
tending to emphasize only one aspect (assertion) and leaving the complementary
concept (submission) to be read by implication only.   If a fully realised
balanced argument had been offered then much of the 'individual/society'
debate might have been a more fruitful search for principles instead of rather
superficial, cursory statements of standpoints.

One piece of evidence suggestive of the fact that a more thorough debate
did occur is the defensive tone that Nunn adopted in the third edition of his
work.   He admits that:

> "our doctrine...may seem to permit no discrimination between
> good and bad ideals of life - between forms of individuality
> that ought to be encouraged and forms that ought to be
> suppressed."(12)

Although he argued for a minimum of prohibitions he did not really
resolve the difficulty, and he frankly recognised that:

> "Few things are more difficult than to foresee whether a
> new type of individuality, a new mode of expression in
> thought or action, will ultimately add to or detract from
> the real riches of the world."(13)

However, this general thesis is not the place to undertake a detailed
view of Nunn's philosophy.   It is sufficient to indicate his basic position
for it was this position which influenced the terms of the subsequent debate.

Nunn and Campagnac saw the problem of education as a tension between the
claims of the individual and the claims of his society, but in 1935 a group
appeared whose aim was to transform the ideal of society into one of citizen-
ship.   The President, Sir Ernest Simon, in a statement of aims asked:

> "Why has education not been more successful in producing
> citizens fitted to bring about a better, social order?"(14)

and his answer was that:

> "We have never given any serious thought to education for
> citizenship of a democratic state; we are not giving nearly
> enough education, nor is it generally of the right kind."(15)

The educational theory implied here is a questionable one, for 'Education' is used as a noun, as though the process were a tangible factor; one which has merely to be disseminated to produce good results. One suspects that his view of the "right kind" would mean the conforming to a pattern of which his particular orthodoxy would approve. He implied, and this is emphasised in the rest of the book, that education is simply a matter of gaining knowledge, and he wanted to see a general improvement of the mental resources capable of dealing with public questions.

He asserted:

"the good citizen of a democratic state must have:
(1) A deep concern for the freedom and good life of his fellows.
(2) Such knowledge and power of clear thinking as will enable him to form sound judgments as to the main problems of politics and to decide wisely which party will be most likely to achieve the ends he desires.
(3) The power to select men of wisdom, integrity and courage as public representatives, and such knowledge of his own limitations as will dispose him to trust and follow his chosen leaders."(16)

These aims bristle with problems and they illustrate the difficulties that occur when extreme theoretical positions are adopted; in this case, of course, a position devoted to the claims of society. His whole scheme is located in the 'here and now' and therefore it does not offer any machinery whereby an issue could be judged at any time; by emphasising 'knowledge' the scheme encapsulates the citizen in the present. Further, one would like to know at what point the citizen should defer to his "chosen leaders" after having formed his own "sound judgment" of the political situation, based on "knowledge" and "power of clear thinking".

But the basic weakness in this group's aims (which were laudable enough,

given the context of the Thirties) was their failure to understand the implications of democracy. They assumed that the conception is only political, almost a piece of machinery; whereas it is really an ideal form of society. The fundamental principle of democracy is not a matter of political choice but rather an ethical assumption: that all men ought to be free and happy by being given the opportunity to develop their individual potential. With Simon's selective democracy one would only achieve the means to elect or the means to sanction; certainly, there would be no 'spiritual' impulse to formulate ends because no total view would be possible. Simply to postulate "a deep concern for the freedom and good life of his fellows", is far too vague to be taken seriously as the formulation of ends.

It is interesting to note that similar ideas were being canvassed in the U.S.A., though the emphasis was shifted from the political to the economic plane. Professor Bagley, in his "Educational Values" (pages 107-8) argued that social efficiency is the norm against which educational practice must be judged, and his chief characteristics of the socially efficient individual were:

> "(1) Economic efficiency or ability to pull his own weight in economic life.
> (2) Negative morality or the willingness to sacrifice his own desires when their gratification would interfere with the economic efficiency of others.
> (3) Positive morality, or the willingness to sacrifice his own desires when their gratification would not contribute, directly or indirectly, to social progress."(17)

Since this is an American view little need be said, but it is interesting that Bagley implied that Economics is the basis of democracy.

During the war period this general debate, of whether an educational system should emphasise individual or society, was continued and its general shape was altered only in two respects. Firstly, it was conducted with more

vigour than in previous years; and secondly, the degree of sophistication with which arguments were developed, was increased.

The individualist case progressed at many levels, many of which adopted standpoints which can be traced to Sir Percy Nunn, although some writers, in their interpretation, bear witness to the confusion in Nunn's own ideas, as well as to their own unexamined assumptions. For example, A. Birchenough, in a review article expressed the following view:

> "If...education is conceived as the spontaneous growth of personality, a process which is lifelong and for the good of the individual himself and for no ulterior purpose, the teacher's function will be thought of in terms of the self-activity of the pupil, and education will be conceived as a process of self-education. Further, education being essentially an individual matter, there will be no searching for any universal method of instruction. There will be many methods in the attempt to lead the pupils into fields which he would never enter for himself and to train him for self-discipline and freedom."(18)

This kind of view stems from a confused view of Nunn's basic theory and this is suggested by the general nature of the ideas, which clearly have links with Nunn but only at a superficial level. The more refined ideas of creative assertion and submission, and their implications, do not appear to have been considered. For example his statement of "freedom" is far too vague. One is entitled to ask: "freedom from what?" or "freedom for what?" Further, it can be argued that the educational situation is a moral one, and it therefore makes sense to ask not only whether the children are doing what they want to do ("self-activity" in the process of "self-education"), but also whether they are doing what they ought to be doing. It should be pointed out, though, that Nunn did not satisfactorily resolve this either. Finally, the teacher's role as interested and sympathetic observer will not necessarily ensure creative freedom. There is surely a sense in which a restrictive system (that involved, for example, in learning a skill) and the tensions that

it can create, may involve an important element in achievement.

Not all interpreters of Nunn were as vague as Birchenough, however, and a good example of an adaptation of Nunn's general theory came from T. Raymont. This particular quotation is almost a parallel to Birchenough, though it is more perceptive:

> "Self-expression...is usually indicated by self-assertion,
> but self-assertion is essentially individualistic, whereas
> self-realization is not...Self-realization does not imply
> absorbtion in the self...Viewed in the light of self-
> realization, the work of education may be described as
> finding out the pupil's possibilities, and providing the
> means by which he may be enabled to realise the highest
> of them."(19)

F.C. Happold attempted to provide the moral framework for the individual by clearly presenting the educational pattern. His main ideas were set out in his book, 'Towards A New Aristocracy', where his 'individualist' approach is set against contemporary conditions, and modified in consequence. He traced the problem in the following passage:

> "Since the problems of our age are to a great extent
> technical problems, they cannot be solved by the demagogic
> but only by the scientific method. Their solution
> involves as we have seen the evolution of a capacity to
> control swift, technological advances which have not only
> outgrown existing, political and economic organisations
> but also call for patterns of thought and conduct different
> from those which were effective and useful before their
> advent."(20)

This is a fair statement and one which had an obvious relevance to a society undergoing stresses in the moral sphere, stresses which would not become manifest in social living for several years. Happold's plan was to stem what can be called 'moral lag' by providing a prior moral purpose for the whole of society. He quoted E.H. Carr's "Conditions Of Peace" to indicate his own position:

> "Our civilisation...(needs) a deliberate and avowed moral
> purpose, involving the call for common sacrifice for a
> recognised, common good."(21)

As to the agencies which will determine the "moral purpose" and "the common good" Happold was not explicit, but the implication is obvious. The ends will be determined by the sensitivity of outstanding individuals in every important sector of life. He classed these people into two groups of elites: directive elites, the leaders who will control; and permeating elites, or those who determine the basic direction which society will take. This second group is the important one for it is upon its character that the composition of the directive elites depends. The main point about this second group is that it is by their superior qualities of mind that they rise to their elite position.

It is at this point that Happold's ideas become slightly confused. He argued that the elites should be segregated and trained:

> "The particular qualities of mind and soul, which it is desirable should animate the elites of a community, can only be fully acquired in a particular type of school society."

> "This conception of the homogeneous, self-educative school community is of vital importance. It conceives of education as coming not primarily through words but through situations, not primarily through instruction but through a pattern of living, not primarily through courses of study but through an intangible spiritual atmosphere created by the community."(22)

Now the implication, clearly, is that through the moral sensitiveness of the individual, developed and refined in a particular social environment (i.e. one cut-off from the wider, mass society), common moral and spiritual purposes will be directed. However, since moral sensitiveness is crucial in this scheme it is reasonable to expect an indication as to how this factor will be refined. Happold did not convince on this point, though he did outline new ideas, based upon inter-related areas of thought rather than subject-orientated studies. But all his methods were aimed at synthesis and no time was spent on the necessary analytical stage of learning. There is a

breadth to his scheme but one feels that too much faith is pinned on the efficacy of the spiritual ambience of the community.

There is one further basic contradiction in his scheme and this relates to his attempts to establish an organic link between his elites and the masses. This is explained at the beginning of Chapter III, where he asserted that since power corrupts, then the elites should be subject to popular control and be perpetually renewed from the mass of the people. But he then went on to criticize the effectiveness of mass education:

> "It is by no means certain that so far mass education has resulted in a particularly high general standard of social awareness, general intelligence, moral sense or political competence."(23)

This may or may not be true but it is from this mass that he wanted the elites to be renewed. Happold would argue that their moral sensitiveness would separate them from their fellows(24), but in that event, how does one measure such a characteristic?

However, despite these blemishes Happold wrote an interesting book and he clearly illustrated how raw 'individualist' ideas could be modified in order to conform to actual conditions. His book amply demonstrated Niblett's contention that:

> "Books written about education since 1935 have begun to emphasize the importance to the child of life in a society which has a conscious plan and purpose."(25)

The book also suggests an attitude which developed during the war period which attempted to find a middle position between the extremes of 'individualist' and social approaches. The development of the idea of the school as a community within, yet directly related to, the larger society and within which the free growth of the individual could be fostered was the method by

which some attempted this compromise(i).

The Conservative Party put forward similar ideas to Happold's but developed their thinking on the theoretical level only, without having any regard to practical manifestations. Their document asserted that:

> "From the contemporary point of view, the individual
> must surely be regarded as the recreator of society
> itself...Beyond anything that the educator knows or
> foresees is the obscure source of power in the individual,
> which in the end sets the educator's own pace."(28)

Apart from the vagueness and recourse to magic in the second sentence, the whole passage is an unequivocal statement of faith in the 'individualist' approach. But it is only a statement of faith for there are no very clear counters which might enable one to confidently analyse the meaning. Presumably it means that the individual's unique insight will lead to a modification of society's attitudes, when applied in those sectors. This will occur after the individual himself has been educated through the traditional insights of society. If this interpretation is correct then one can fairly expect a definite statement of an individualist, educational philosophy. Unfortunately, this is not offered in the rest of the document; in fact, an important qualification is added:

> "It must be a primary duty of national education to develop
> a strong sense of national obligation in the individual
> citizen, to encourage in him an ardent understanding of
> the state's needs and to render him capable of serving
> these needs."(29)

Clearly, to make an individual capable of serving the state is not the same as that individual recreating the traditional nuances of his society's history and institutions.

(i) Happold himself argued for this on pages 83-6 of "Towards A New Aristocracy". W. Curry(26) and Spenser Leeson(27) both followed him.

This kind of confusion between individual ends and larger social ones was caused by a failure to think through the implications of "Individualism" at the one level. The writers tended to consider each man as unique and then to place him in a wider society, as a part of that society. Clearly, this is realistic and laudable, but they did not seem to have worked out their system of priorities fully. Hence, the contradictions. This can be seen in Happold, who did not satisfactorily work out how his selective moral education of the individual would permeate through to the mass of people so that their natural sensitiveness could be recognised by the elites. It would seem reasonable that the elites, given their training, would not choose anyone unless they approximated to their conception of value, but without such training how would this come about? The Conservative Party seemed to contradict themselves in their attempt to balance both conceptions. And the 'Society for Education in Citizenship', though working through the individual, would probably ossify his development by its narrowly social approach.

However, there was one 'individualist' thinker who did work out his ideas fully, and his thinking is an impressive statement. Jacques Maritain is French but he merits consideration in this thesis because his main educational thinking at this time was delivered in lecture-form in the United States, and was widely published in English. His main belief was in a religious metaphysic as expounded by Thomism. It postulated time and eternity, the love of God and the love of man, and a distinction between speculative intellect and practical intellect. All these, naturally, are suspended within a Christian framework.

His educational thinking proceeded from the view that education is an art and:

> "Now every art is a dynamic trend toward an object to be achieved, which is the aim of this art. There is no art without ends."(30)

He went on to warn that the greatest danger facing education is the disregard of ends and he sees the improvement of pedagogy (or means) as a danger sign unless it is compensated by a thorough searching for ends. His 'ends' attempt to do this:

> "The chief aspirations of a person are aspirations to freedom...that freedom which is spontaneity, expansion, or autonomy, and which we have to gain through constant effort and struggle...the prime goal of education is the conquest of internal and spiritual freedom to be achieved by the individual person."(31)

Yet, paradoxically, Maritain's book was an attack on the pragmatist view of education:

> "We may thus understand by what internal conflict democracy is now weakened. Its motive power is of a spiritual nature - the will to justice and brotherly love - but its philosophy has long been pragmatism, which cannot justify real faith in such a spiritual inspiration."(32)

And again:

> "It is an unfortunate mistake to define human thought as an organ of response to the actual stimuli and situations of the environment, that is to say, to define it in terms of animal knowledge and reaction...It is because thinking begins not only with difficulties but with insights, and ends up in insights which are made true by rational proving or experimental verifying, not by pragmatic sanction, that human thought is able to illumine experience."(33)

One can readily understand why Maritain objected to pragmatism, because basically it maintains that man creates his own values in the course of activity, and that reality awaits part of its complexion from the future. Maritain seemed to take the position that education is the dynamic aspect of philosophy since it seeks to realise the values defined by his philosophy, by selecting the experiences through which the individual will pass. In

other words, the difference between Maritain's thought and pragmatism, is
that between values and methods.

One might not want to go all the way with Maritain in his rejection but,
given his standpoint, there was certainly much to disturb him in the educa-
tional practice of the 1930's and early 1940's. Pragmatist ideas were much
in evidence, e.g. Chapter VII of Raymont's "Modern Education: Its Aims And
Methods" is a sympathetic account of the project method; a direct result of
pragmatism. J.A. Stevenson wrote a whole text entitled "The Project Method
Of Teaching'(34).

As a final example, there is a comment in the Spens Report, which is a
broad hint in favour of the pragmatic method:

> "subjects were not invented for scholastic purposes, but are
> the tools and instruments which the human race has crystallised
> out of its experience in order to understand the world in which
> it lives."(35)

It should be stated that though Maritain's position was justifiable
given his premise, nevertheless he did tend to blind himself to useful aspects
of the theory. R.R. Rusk put the corrective when he argued that we need not
accept:

> "that the only alternative to employing the pragmatic
> method is to follow a rule blindly...there is also the
> possibility of applying a rule intelligently."(36)

However, although Maritain had exacting standards he was not insensitive to
the basic problem which confronted educationists, nor did he deny the social
aspirations of man:

> "Education must remove the rift between the social claim and
> the individual claim within man himself. It must therefore
> develop both the sense of freedom and the sense of responsi-
> bility, human rights and human obligations."(37)

It could be argued that Maritain's ideas, depending as they do upon the
individual realising himself, are educationally more valuable than pragmatist

doctrine. For whereas Maritain's schemes (detailed in Chapter III) would lead to a freeing of the mind through reason, pragmatist doctrine could overburden the mind through the sheer volume of experience, lacking as it does the ordering of that experience.

Maritain's attempts to link social and individual impulses differ from other writers, so far considered, in that he consistently saw the problem to be resolved through the individual and did not intrude abstractions like 'the state' or 'the national moral purpose', and this consistency is more satisfying as a piece of theory.

The essential point about these 'individualist' approaches is that they all attempted, in differing degrees, to consider man in his uniqueness first, and then to consider him as a member of society, though an individual member. This was an important theoretical impulse in our period, but it was not the only one. Some writers concerned themselves with the problem of how education was going to face the problems thrown up by the changes consequent upon war, and how far traditional assumptions should be modified.

The planning of a new social order was a widespread concept and one of its proponents was Karl Mannheim. He considered that the planning of education was vital in the total social and economic structure because this was the means by which man could be transformed - a pre-requisite for his planned order. He argued for a kind of sociological integration of education, and at the same time indicated his objections to the 'individualist' approach:

> "What it (the sociological theory of education) objects to is
> that this theory (free development theory) is too aloof from
> history to be really helpful in concrete situations. Whoever
> tries to state such eternal values very soon realises that they
> are bound to be too abstract to lend concrete shape to education
> at any given moment. In the same way, if the final core of the
> self is something that is eternal and beyond environmental
> influence, we still have to consider that more empirical and
> historical attire in which we meet our fellow-beings as citizens

> of a given state, as workers in factories...as human
> beings striving for such satisfactions as are available
> in a given social order."(38)

This view of the importance of group influence is slightly modified and

developed in his other major work, when he answered the anticipated question

as to who should plan the institutions in any society.   He maintained:

> "The planners can recruit themselves only from already
> existing groups.   Everything will therefore depend on
> which of these groups with their existing outlooks will
> produce the energy, the decisiveness, and the capacity
> to master the vast, social machinery of modern life."(39)

Here, the suggestion is that it is the human, and therefore individual

qualities which will take an elite beyond the wider group.   'Man And Society'

is a detailed analysis of the concept of planning, one which Mannheim con-

sidered is not absolute.   According to him the sociologists would be the

advice-givers in a social context that was ever-changing, and therefore

requiring continual adjustment.   He looked to youth to provide the means to

achieve this:

> "As long as there is a will to make a new start, it will
> have to be done through youth...They will live the new
> values which the older (generation) profess in theory only.
> If this is true the specific function of youth is that it
> is a revitalising agent."(40)

Thus, though a planned society was central to Mannheim's thought he did

acknowledge the role of the individual.   However, this modification did not

alter Mannheim's position as being one occupying the extreme position where

education was to be used for the benefit of society in the first instance.

The individual was seen only as a function of society, albeit at times a

creative one.

Sir Fred Clarke was another main proponent of the claims of society and

he was perhaps the most important educational writer in the period. His views

did not go as far as Mannheim's, and in some ways he almost attempted to erect

a bridge between the two extremes of 'individual' and 'society'.

He objected to any form of extreme individualism but he would not go so far as to plan a society or an educational system to the extent that social machinery would supplant the individual. He saw the educational problem in terms of an acknowledgement of both the claims of society and of the freedom of the individual. Basically, he felt that the cultural traditions of any society are the mainspring of social cohesion but that in a period of great social change, such as war, the cultural manifestations should undergo revaluation and re-interpretation in order, on the one hand, to preserve social cohesion and on the other, to generate the social power required by the changed conditions. He argued that a continuous educational provision from infant to adult could produce this. It is within this provision that individual freedom is structured.

His views were developed in three books written between 1940 and 1947. In the first one he looked at the historical determinants of English education and he maintained a parallel between the contemporary situation and the situation that education faced in the eighteenth century. Specifically, he argued that the Dissenting Academies suggested a precedent which should be followed because they reinterpreted culture in an age when the traditional context had become irrelevant. He argued that the dominating conception throughout English education had been education for culture in the sense of high culture, i.e. divorced from mass education:

> "The mass of the English people have never yet evolved genuine schools of their own. Schools have always been provided for them from above, in a form and with a content of studies that suited the ruling interests."(41)

Although Clarke did not specifically state an exact parallel he did make it clear that the contemporary situation in England was similar. He and the

(then) senior school as the main instrument of social selection since it
represented the state-aided route to the University and adult positions of
influence. But he argued that the schools were modelling themselves on the
old Public and grammar schools, instead of providing a new kind of education,
one more relevant to the social conditions and experiences of the pupils(42).
Also, he complained that there were not enough opportunities for higher
education for the great majority of senior school pupils.

Clarke's solution was to unify the educational system over the whole
range, though he did emphasize that this should be subject to:

> "the freedom of individual schools to use and develop their
> resources in accordance with their own expert judgment of
> the needs to be met."(43)

What he would like is not a mere multiplication of separate schools, but
rather the securing of a system where:

> "all essential needs are freely met, and within which
> adaptation of provision to educational need is sure and
> easy."(44)

The most interesting part of his adaptation was that he wanted the period,
five-to-fifteen, to be treated as a unity in one school, where 'breaks'would
be determined by the nature of the progression in the education itself. This
would ensure relevancy of training at the all-important senior stage, and for
Clarke such an organisation was more important than a diversity of schools.

It will be seen that Clarke was not a philosopher but more a social
historian, though he himself claimed that he adopted the sociological stand-
point. But whatever his official identity, he did perform a useful service
by pointing out the relationship between society and its educational forms.
Clarke clearly stated that education is a function of society, and this needed
to be said, because numerous writers argued that education could somehow

change the basis of society(i). He was concerned to examine the possibilities for change in a new society planned for guaranteeing freedom for the individual personality. However, his social emphasis led him to neglect a thorough working-out of the theory of the teaching situation. For example, he hoped that the five-to-fifteen age range would be taught in one school. Many teachers would question the educational value of this because of the different needs of the children with such a large age-spread. One of the great teachers in ancient times objected to such a scheme on moral grounds as well(45). But, more importantly, there is a looseness in the basic thinking, in the attempt to adapt the need for individual freedom to a planned society. Now if education is a function of society, then the schools will represent the machinery for realising that function. Despite Clarke's provision for freedom of approach the very framework of organisation will tend to modify the full scope of the schools' adaptability.

In his next work Clarke developed the main ideas postulated in 'Education And Social Change', and concentrated on the contemporary situation, attempting to show that old attitudes were totally inadequate to meet the changed conditions:

> "It is true of every phase of our national life and most of all, true of education, first that we have to develop self-awareness and articulateness of thought about ourselves to a degree that was quite unnecessary in the days of security and leisurely improvisation."(46)

He urged that the educational service be adapted to a social purpose and in Chapter III he outlined the obstacles to such an end. He regarded the biggest problem as being the Englishman's predilection for the intuitive, emotional feel of a situation rather than rational analysis. Consequently,

---

(i)   e.g. F.C. Happold felt this in a subdued way as did Richard Livingstone in his 'Education For A World Adrift'. C.U.P. 1943.

he wanted education to develop critical intelligence which would eventually deliver English thought from the weaknesses of the traditional ethos. However, he is somewhat vague and alarmist as to the condition which he hopes to correct:

> "in the present state of English society harmful influences can disguise themselves as the authentic, poetic habit and so be free to exploit a selfish, sectional interest under the false cover of loyalty to a valued, national trait."(47)

This hardly recommends itself as a piece of rational analysis, being far too generalised and emotive to have much meaning. Such comment is untypical of Clarke but it is a danger to which his method predisposes him. On concrete sociological relationships between society and its institutions he is generally sound, but when he verges into personal, generalised intuitions he tends to lose direction.

However, Clarke does present a policy for action and the pivot is the central organising of the education service, a central authority which would plan and guide but not dominate. The central impetus in his scheme is self-awareness and critical energy. The individual within the general system would then use his new awareness to re-focus society and its institutions. This would be a continuous process as there would be a perpetual regeneration.

This system would certainly have provided the central, social purpose, but there is a central irony in the scheme which seems to have escaped Clarke at this stage of his thinking. Since the regenerative, critical intelligence is crucial then there would be the danger that only social norms would be focussed, and this would not place the individual securely in a tradition. By concentrating on institutional adaptability and establishing, therefore, practicable organisations, he is coming very near to the pragmatist position - which is surely ironic.

In Clarke's major work he drew his two previous texts together and attempted a re-thinking of the theoretical base.   In the preface he stated:

> "This book is about freedom and the strains and demands
> that 'planning for freedom' in contemporary Britain must
> impose upon the experiences that educate, whether children
> or adults."(48)

He argued, therefore, that the problem was to apply the necessary idea of the educative society in such a way that it would be compatible with individual freedom.   He defined the educative society as:

> "one which accepts as its overmastering purpose the produc-
> tion of a given type of citizen.   The type itself may be
> defined with varying degrees of precision and detail.   But
> whatever the type may be, that society may be called educative
> which consciously directs its activities and organises every
> department of its life with a view to the emergence of
> citizens bearing the character of the preferred type."(49)

This is obviously an anti-individualist approach but consistent with his conception of planning.   However, it could be argued that such an approach would produce a rigid authoritarianism(i).   Clarke would not accept this for he contended that a general knowledge and acceptance of the ideals of a society are essential for all its citizens.   This must be achieved through education, but in a form which makes such an end compatible with freedom. He reconciled this apparent contradiction by arguing that overmastering the need for a type should be the purpose to make men free, and he quoted Professor W.C. Hocking for explanation of his point:

> "...the educational purpose is to communicate the type and
> to provide for growth beyond the type."(50)

This, of course, is a repetition of the view developed in his 'The Study Of Education In England', where he argued that priority must be given to establishing within individuals the traditional basis of society, followed

---

(i)   Maritain criticised Clarke on these grounds, "Education At The Cross-
        roads", page 99.

by an education fostering regenerative criticism.

As educational theory, his view is fair comment but he has created a false tension. In a free society the apparently opposed functions of handing on traditional values and assumptions, and developing critical individuals, tend to become more and more part of the same function. This is because the traditions of democracy favour improvement and change and allow the maximum of freedom and creative membership of that society.

Thus Clarke still placed great emphasis upon the rational factor, but he modified his position to the extent that he felt education should be concerned with a common culture. He defined culture as:

> "The whole social inheritance of beliefs, habits, moral and
> aesthetic standards, institutions, techniques, vocations,
> and all that goes to make up the complex web of a community's
> inner and outer life."(51)

Cultural responses stem from the national tradition and he argued that these operate most soundly at the semi-instinctive level; this is certainly a modification of the position he adopted in "Education And Social Change', where he was alarmist about the intuitive approach.

Clarke was perhaps the most impressive thinker in this period because he created his own realistic stance in an attempt to plan a society in which freedom for all would be a basic element. In doing so he erected a bridge between the outer ends of contemporary, theoretical ideas, and in doing so reflected his own aim. For, just as he wanted to see an education for the type, followed by development beyond the type, so Clarke accepted the norm of his society (Individualism) and developed it by reference to a new social situation.

The importance of all these thinkers rests not in the differences but in the similarity of their basic approach, which was genuinely theoretical in the sense that they attempted to completely re-think the basis for an

educational system. There was also a common weakness, for some, like Nunn and Maritain, tended to emphasise the nature of man in their premises, others, like Mannheim and Clarke tended to emphasise the nature of society. It ought to be the concern of theorists to give equal emphasis to both.

There were other writers in the war period who were more concerned with practical ideas and concrete organisations rather than with theoretical premises.

M.V.C. Jeffreys in an article entitled "Brave New World' made a point which would certainly have brought agreement from Mannheim and Clarke, and which also suggested the contemporary malaise:

> "Our culture is disintegrated. Our traditional forms are
> mummified in an education which is no longer organically
> related to society. The content of education is largely
> unreal. Fundamentally the problem of our generation is
> nothing less than the re-making of our culture."(52)

A minor, though significant, illustration of the accuracy of his changes can be seen by looking at the subjects of articles published in the 'Journal Of Education' before the war. They show the polite, almost effete, concerns of some educationists and one year has been chosen to indicate the level of seriousness of these articles:

> "'Stamp Collecting And The Teaching Of Geography'
> 'Some Time-Table Problems Of The School Certificate Examination'
> 'The Pronunciation Of Latin In And Out Of School'
> 'What Shall We Read?'"(53)(i)

It should be stated that Jeffreys was a little unfair in not acknowledging the radical changes in the level of seriousness of general ideas that the war induced. The articles in 'The Journal Of Education' bear witness to this, and it was a change that took place immediately(ii). It is not claimed that

---

(i) A full list may be seen in Appendix I.
(ii) See Appendix I for the full list from 'Journal Of Education', Volume 71, for 1939.

these articles necessarily point to large movements of opinion in society but they do give some indication of the attitudes of one section of the community, as interpreted by the editorial sensitivity of the main educational journal of the period.

Whereas Jeffreys apparently saw the issue facing Britain in wide, general terms as the re-making of culture, H.C. Dent saw the issue in clear-cut terms. England must decide:

> "whether or not it desires to have an educational system that will truly educate for democracy."(54)

For Dent, this was a last chance for England to save herself from a condition which Jeffreys felt she already suffered from:

> "I believe that if we seize that opportunity (to educate for democracy) we shall as a people march forward to a grander and nobler destiny than we have yet known. But if we do not, I believe that the opportunity will be lost for ever, that national disintegration and deterioration will set in."(55)

Dent felt that it was England's last chance because he claimed to detect a national schizophrenia:

> "On the one hand there is an intense and almost universal desire for a genuinely democratic order of society, on the other a widespread reluctance to accept the implication that this must of necessity involve a complete reorientation of our attitude towards the whole idea of living in community ...and a drastic reformation and realignment of existing institutions of society."(56)

He went on to maintain that this split mind was particularly in evidence in education, where many people accepted the need for change but only on the basis of the existing structure. For Dent, all the specific reforms that were being suggested by his contemporaries were irrelevant because they ignored the only question which he felt mattered and concentrated instead upon piece-meal improvement(i). The vital question was:

(i) This was not entirely fair because H.G. Stead argued for exactly this point one year before Dent's book was published: "Towards Education For Demo-cracy". W.E.A. Pamphlet. 1941. pages 7 and 8.

> "What sort of an educational system do we require to
> meet the needs of a society which aims to become a full
> democracy?"(57)

Dent answered his own question by describing the ideal democratic society as:

> "a self-orientated, self-governed and self-disciplined
> community, which accords to everyone of its members the
> utmost possible personal freedom compatible with the
> general interest."(58)

He went on to argue that the function of education in a democracy is the development, training and enrichment of human personality. The educational system is the machinery through which such a function is realised; therefore, the system must discover, draw out and develop the "innate potentialities of every member" and must do so throughout life.

This is a very confusing analysis because, apart from indicating that it is democratic, Dent did not explain what a "self-orientated, self-governed and self-disciplined" society is. Presumably it will emerge naturally out of the educational process, a process aiming to enrich human personality. However, he did not indicate upon what basis the personality will become enriched; whether it is critical, social, artistic, or all of these. He did urge that each individual's innate potential should be discovered and drawn out, but he did not consider that that potentiality might be harmful, nor that there may be necessary aspects of social training which education should provide. Surely he was wrong in implying that the individual will supply the direction which society will eventually take (and in this sense the community will be self-orientated, self-governed, and self-disciplined), for he ignored the influence of accumulated tradition which is a kind of in-built, evolutionary mechanism operating in specific ways in different societies. Dent argued that education will be the basic force in changing society, whereas, in fact, society determines educational structures. This

is because education, at one level, is a social institution preparing human

beings for entry into a given society.   A further weakness in Dent is that

he viewed the democratic society almost as an abstraction, certainly as an

ideal, which education will attain.   But he had not provided for the initial,

general, social impulse which would ensure that society would change its

outlook.   This, of course, cannot be legislated for, but will occur gradually

as human and psychological adjustment reaches the level from which society

can naturally advance towards keeping pace with technological and scientific

development.

Someone who saw the problems much clearer than Dent was G. Vickers,

writing in a 'Christian Newsletter" supplement.   He argued:

> "Education cannot fail to reflect each generation's
> conception of what matters most and to imply its ideals
> for the future...what is being done in education reflects
> the qualities and limitations of today.   What is being
> attempted foreshadows the society of tomorrow.   Education
> is social philosophy in action and as such it can express
> better than words the choice to which each generation is
> willing to commit itself.   At the same time, to an extent
> at present unknown, education determines what kind of a
> society it shall be possible to create."(59)

He consequently found the weaknesses in contemporary education to be, at root,

weaknesses in the social order.   He claimed that the bulk of the population

was stratified in classes and categorised in economic groups; and that power:

> "resides with an industrial plutocracy which has inherited
> and still preserves some of the mentality and some of the
> institutions of feudalism."(60)

This realisation of the existence of an organic link between education

and society is a marked feature of the 'practical' writers and one suspects

that Clarke and Mannheim must have had influence, here.

Some interesting articles appeared in the 'Times Educational Supplement",

and they took this relationship further and made a comprehensive investigation.

The leader writer maintained that it should not be supposed that the sole function of an educational system was to act as a reflection of society, it had also to shape the future(61).

A similar view was taken by an anonymous writer in a 'Christian News- letter' supplement, though he worked out his argument more carefully:

> "It is a mistake to suppose that schools and universities...
> can initiate great social changes. They can do only what
> the society they serve permits them to do. Sensitiveness
> to felt needs is their first essential. If they are thus
> sensitive they can do the great service of defining needs in
> terms of a concrete plan of training, and of so criticising
> and refining the often crude indications that society offers
> as to make that society more fully aware of its own better
> desires. They are the refineries of the product of the
> social soil, not experimental forms for the propagation of
> a new species."(62)

This is clearly a much more helpful statement than the previous one, although taken in the context of the other articles in the series one can infer that this fuller statement is what the 'Times Educational Supplement' article intended to argue.

The pivot of the series was to consider a system of education around the idea of 'equality of opportunity'. This investigation began in an article entitled, 'Bases Of Reform', when the writer concluded that the basis for the conception of 'equality of opportunity':

> "must be that citizenship begins at 21, that up to that age
> all boys and girls are wards of the state and are to be
> regarded as in a state of tutelage, and that during those
> 21 years no effort must be spared to give each one, according
> to his or her capabilities, and limited by no other consideration,
> the fullest opportunity to develop every innate power."(63)

In 'Quality Of Reform' the writer argued that, though desirable, equality of opportunity could not be worked out in the educational system as it was then organised. He argued, therefore, that the aim must be:

> "not merely to extend that field (education) but to make it
> central and pivotal in the social order...that childhood and
> youth shall be regarded as a unity, and that until the age of

"citizenship is reached boys and girls shall remain
under the aegis of the education service, which shall
have full responsibility for their welfare."(64)

This series of articles was consistent in its advocacy and clearly
showed a leaning towards the planned order which some theorists had been
postulating. However, despite the wish to develop every individual's innate
power, there are features of the articles to which exception can be taken, and
which seem to indicate that the emotional aspect of planning for equality had
been assimilated, but not the full implications of the conception. What was
required, and writers like Clarke had implied this, was that the individual
had to be trained through the training of society itself, which would initially
be done through the individual, and this without having any fundamental
accepted principles on which to work. Hence the variety of aims which
different groups canvassed as essential ends. The articles only provide a
general framework without any indication as to how the change in society,
which would begin the impulse, would occur.

This failure to see the total problem concerning individual and society
can be seen again in the uncritical adoption of the concept of 'equality of
opportunity'. The concept is treated as an abstraction, which, given the
terms of the idea of state tutelage, could lead to an atomisation of society.
The individual is seen as an object, having certain intellectual or spiritual
capacities to be nurtured, but outside the total cultural and social traditions
of the nation. What the articles failed to see was that the basis of the
relationship between individual and group had become increasingly mechanised
as the scope of social institutions had increased. Their solution of helping
the individual define himself concurrently with the development of society's
institutions would merely produce the perpetuation of the atomisation of the
individual. Their ideas would have resulted in each generation being

developed according to a social pattern, but none prepared against a common

background of the national historical tradition.   This is what Clarke worked

against, and this was why he never fully accepted the educational base as one

of free individual development unless qualified by his view of the educative

society.   The "Times Educational Supplement's' conception conceives of

individual development as uncluttered and free, limited by no other considera-

tions.

A year later the leader writer took the ideas further:

> "so long as the context of education remains, as it largely
> is today, alien to the nature of the child, and irrelevant
> to the needs of society, there is no prospect that industry
> can minister to education.   But give education a social
> purpose, and relate that purpose to the social purpose of
> industry, and an integration becomes at once not merely
> desirable but inevitable.   No administrative reform can
> give education a social purpose for this can be discovered
> only in what is taught and done in schools."(65)

The detailed thought behind this passage is not indicated but the inference

that little hard consideration had been given to the problem, is not difficult

to make.   There is also a shift of emphasis from the July 1941 position, for

it has moved from the individual to social purpose, and one which is linked

with the social purposes of industry.   This is a significant passage for it

offers further evidence that this journal was accepting a mechanisation of

the individual.   The social purposes of industry would not be likely to help

the school to develop the innate powers of the individual.   In fact,

industry's conception of educational aims at this time, seemed to argue for a

stereotyping of response from a nation's citizenry.   It saw as a main task

of education:

> "bringing the youth of the country to a full understanding
> and acceptance of the personal and national duties and res-
> ponsibilities which, by heritage, are the right and obligation
> of every British subject."(66)

The statement in the 'Times Educational Supplement' offers a startling contrast to the comments made by the anonymous writer in the 'Christian Newsletter', April 5th, 1940. While accepting that administrative reform cannot give a school social purpose, one cannot claim that the social purpose will emerge necessarily from the studies developed in the schools. For these studies are themselves refinements, in practical terms, of a wider social impetus given by society.

It will have been noted that the idea of providing equality of opportunity within a democratic context has been frequently mentioned and it is necessary to consider briefly this impulse.

The event which emphasised to the population the importance of these two concepts was the evacuation of children, carried out in 1939. However, there had been distinctive indications of a move in that direction, prior to this date. For example, the Council of the English New Education Fellowship issued a manifesto at the end of 1938 entitled, 'For The Defence And Strengthening Of Democracy'. This was re-printed in 'The Journal Of Education' and included among its points the fact that:

> "we must press for an educational system which shall be fully democratic"(67)

and that emphasis should be placed:

> "upon more rapid attainment of equal educational opportunity for all children irrespective of the economic and social status of their parents."(68)

The Spens Report also suggested that the school society should have a structure based on the democratic model:

> "a typical school of the present day is to be regarded as not merely a place of learning, but as a social unit or society of a peculiar kind in which the older and younger members, the teachers and the taught, share a common life, subject to a constitution to which all are in their several ways consenting and co-operating parties."(69)

However, it was evacuation which made the great impact. One can get some indication of the shock which the experience must have occasioned when one considers the attitudes which some sections of opinion held as to the probable results of evacuation:

> "Nor is there any reason to anticipate that the children will prove difficult to manage. It must be remembered that school journeys and organised country holidays have existed for many years and that therefore large numbers of boys and girls realise that good manners and avoidance of mischief are expected of them."(70)

Compare this with the view of what actually occurred, according to H.C. Dent:

> "Evacuation had in fact lifted the lid to reveal a seething stew of social degradation, hitherto unsuspected."(71)

And:

> "Town and country were discovered to be utter strangers to each other. Social strata were shown to be far more numerous than had ever been imagined, and to be separated from each other by yawning and abysmal gulfs."(72)

The failure of central administration to understand patterns of social life and kinship was so great that a period of anarchy ensued for a short while. Schools in large cities were closed down but because the evacuation was voluntary mothers brought their children back from the country, then sent them out again later, or never allowed them to go in the first place. The confusion was so great that action was taken and the Government carried out a survey which was so startling in its results that by February 1940 compulsory attendance had been established(i).

When the results of this survey are placed beside the optimistic expectations of the 'Times Educational Supplement' leader, then an indication

---

(i) Survey figures from Hansard, Volume 357, Columns 34-40.
Children in Evacuation Areas

Type of Education	School Attendance %	Home Tuition %	No Education %
Elementary	47.5	24.6	27.9
Senior	85.5	0.9	27.6

of the "abysmal gulfs" is evident.

Another writer argued:

> "But the most far reaching consequence of evacuation was
> the impression left on the public mind that our children
> have nothing like an even chance in the opening stages of
> the battle of life; and this tended to focus attention on
> the glaring inequalities of our educational provision."(73)

Certainly, if the number of times 'democracy' and 'equal opportunity' were invoked over the war years, is anything to go by, then the above statement is accurate.   For example, the W.E.A. urged:

> "Equal opportunities for every child to develop his persona-
> lity and abilities, so that he may grow up healthy in mind
> and body, and ready to make his full contribution to the
> life of the community."(74)

And:

> "Education is to be recognised as the central, constructive
> service of society and accordingly provided on a more
> generous scale, adequate to the vast and inspiring task of
> creating for the first time in history a genuine social
> democracy."(75)

The 'Times Educational Supplement' also had something to say, here, and it argued:

> "So long as inequality of opportunity inheres in the social
> order, so long will there be ignorance, unemployment and
> the negation of life."(76)

It will be noticed that all these comments are very general and this is because they followed the widespread view that such conditions ought to be met. But they take on the complexion of injunctions and do not consider the wider implications of what these would involve in practical terms.   (This is further true of the general tone of the documents from which the statements are taken).   One reason for this is that they considered themselves as catalysts for action, but this should not have precluded consideration of the total problem.

An interesting contrast to these views and one which did recognise the difficulties was the "London School Plan", discussions for which began in 1943, though the plan itself was published in 1947:

> "Amongst other things, it is evident that it is now the duty of authorities to establish equality of opportunity for all children - a phrase that implies the provision for every pupil of a place in a school where his spiritual, physical, social and mental development can be properly nurtured. Mere equality of opportunity, however, will not meet the case unless that opportunity is at the appropriate high level and the requirement therefore involves the getting up of a standard not only of equality but of quality in educational opportunity which is high enough to satisfy the national needs."(77)

This aim was then worked out in comprehensive detail in the actual plan.

Generalising over the two principles was very common in this period and stemmed from the neglect of attempts to define adequately. Numerous groups embraced what they felt was a necessary requirement but few considered its implications. It is for this reason that so many of the practical ideas had such a uniformity about them. This is the great difference between them and the ideas of the theorists who confronted basic issues squarely and produced a range of ideas. The practical thinkers failed to ask just what the democratic ideal, or society, or system was; rather, they tended to concentrate upon suggestions which they considered to be democratic, or which opened the way to equal opportunity. Comments like the following will illustrate the point:

> "We believe in democratising the Universities; Universities should become the people's college...we support the view that there should be a great reaching out of the University, its teachers and teaching, among the people and their voluntary organisations."(78)

> "In order to secure real equality of opportunity for all children, differing widely in character, temperament and bent, there must be a considerable variety of schools in the secondary stage."(79)

> "The good life can be lived only in a community and if
> that community is democratic the complete training of every
> individual to self-sacrificing and efficient service is
> essential to the continuance of the democratic principle."(80)

What one looks for in vain in the documents containing the ideas of the

practical theorists, is the kind of statement which one finds in Dewey's,

'Democracy And Education', where his bases for a democratic society are care-

fully laid out and in such a way that practical results inevitably follow:

> "Since education is a social process, and there are many kinds
> of societies, a criterion for educational criticism and con-
> struction implies a <u>particular</u> social ideal. The two points
> selected by which to measure the worth of a form of social life
> are the extent in which the interests of a group are shared by
> all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it
> interacts with other groups...A society which makes provision
> for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms
> and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions
> through interaction of the different forms of associated life,
> is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of
> education which gives individuals a personal interest in social
> relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure
> social changes without introducing disorder."(81)

It would be useful at this point to consider the writings of Sir Richard

Livingstone. He has to be considered separately because his ideas are not

theoretical in the full sense nor are they obviously practical. His general

stance is lofty and detached and in many ways he takes up original positions.

At the same time, he did address his mind to what he considered to be the

basic educational problem, and he made some interesting practical suggestions.

His three main books indicate a significant change of emphasis and one which,

interestingly, responds to some of the pressures which have already been con-

sidered.

His first book argued that England's worst educational fault was a

refusal to define aims. He felt that an injection of a spiritual element was

necessary, and this should be the pursuit of excellence. But:

> "if our education is to be really fruitful we must recognise
> a principle which has been almost totally ignored in education -
> the cross fertilisation of theory and experience."(82)

From this standpoint he argued that the education system provided, on the one hand, a series of incomplete and unassimilated facts (about History, Literature, Politics, Philosophy) because the pupils lack experience of life, and on the other hand, a series of inert ideas, inert because the pupil possesses nothing within him which would create new combinations with those ideas. He goes on to claim that such a situation is not inevitable because life should provide a basis upon which new ideas could be created. But at the point of individual awakening, i.e. adulthood, the system makes no provision.

This is one of Livingstone's original ideas for he considered that expansion of adult education should be the national educational pivot:

> "...and we shall take them (the older adolescents) to the
> threshold of adult education, where the solution of our
> educational problems must be found."(83)

His second original point is that the system should not educate for something, or educate into something else, but that education should be an inspiring spiritual force. The blueprint for his ideas is the Danish Folk High School, and the spiritual force of education will develop from emphasis being placed upon liberal education, and he places great importance upon Poetry and History here. By implication, his scheme is one which will ignore facts, and develop idealism instead, and this on the basis of established worldly experience in the adult student. Thus he has brought his argument round to his "cross fertilisation of theory and experience."

No other major writer in the period placed so much uncompromising emphasis upon one stage of education, and stated so strongly that the essential educational experience should be a totally humanistic one. Livingstone did not regard vocational matters as irrelevant but he felt that a liberal

education would enable the individual to do all things better, whatever their basis. Since each student would gain an inspiriting effect from his studies there would be a cumulative reaction throughout society, creating the desire for excellence.

The main objection to his scheme lies in its omissions, for laudable as the ideas are they clearly are not enough. Livingstone himself would argue that education is a lifelong process (indeed, his adult scheme is a corrective to the neglect of one section of the continuum). Therefore the stages before adulthood should logically be part of a total aim. An obvious omission, for example, is a restructuring of the school system, which could supply curricula offering dynamic ideas which the pupils could pursue at the level of both fact and experience(i).

In his second book he modified his position and took a larger view which incorporated certain basic facts of twentieth century society. He saw the problem as having two aspects. Firstly, since society has to be structured for a world which is continually changing, he argued that it should be structured in order to create the framework for material civilisation. He concluded, therefore, that scientists and technologists are necessary in order that society may function, but that mere functioning is not enough, it is simply an inadequate framework for the problem of finding life's guiding principle:

> "Knowledge of science and technology and economics is not the
> end, nor are creativeness or freedom or even truth, they are
> indispensable to civilisation, but too narrow a basis for it,
> and schemes that look no further leave us where we are - able to
> make and do almost all we want,- but uncertain what we wish to
> make or do or be, ignorant of the fundamental science of good
> and evil."(85)

(i) Some interesting examples of what could be done will be found in the list of condensed syllabuses actually used in some schools. 'Education For Citizenship In Secondary Schools'(84)

Livingstone went on to consider how education would develop this sympathetic realisation of "good and evil", and significantly, his emphasis shifted from adult education to the schools. He argued that the schools should give their pupils a spiritual attitude to life and the basis for a philosophy of life. They should also inculcate standards, a sense of values, the science of good and evil. According to Livingstone these standards would be imparted through what he calls the habitual vision of greatness - a continual study of great literature and great historical figures. And this common core of values will produce good citizens and will provide the corrective for a world adrift:

> "The good citizen, like the good soldier, has learnt to feel
> and act as a member of a body, to play his part in it and, if
> need be, to sacrifice it to his interests and even his life,
> to do his duty to the state without compulsion and of his own
> free will."(86)

Overall, this book, despite its realistic modifications of his previous position was still romantic. It can certainly be argued that both social problems and life problems are made more difficult of solution if there is a flux of basic attitudes throughout society, and it would be a relief if common assumptions could be legislated. But such a condition could not develop in a democracy, and even to contemplate such a possibility seems to be ignoring the facts of twentieth century life. One has only to consider the disciplines of Literature and Philosophy to realise just how unstable twentieth century assumptions have been. Writers such as Conrad, Joyce, Lawrence, Hemingway, Camus, all offer different perspectives, and their uncertainties are paralleled in philosophical systems such as Marxism, Extentialism and Logical Positivism. In other words, education failed to offer a rule of life because no one system could be trusted sufficiently in the face of particular aspects of all other systems.

Livingstone has abstracted the problem from the total situation and translated it onto a plane which lacks real dimensions.   For example, it could be argued that the English people did possess common values and standards in their acceptance of such ideals as free speech, justice and a hatred of tyranny, or on another level, the general if vague belief in Christian values. What is missing in Livingstone's analysis is an awareness of the importance of personal aspiration within clearly realised social frameworks.   He requires, rather, a specific ordered atmosphere which would not be questioned and in which individuals would merely act out the pattern, but a pattern divorced from a definite culturally-defined tradition.   In this sense, Livingstone ignored realities.

His final book developed ideas introduced in the previous two, by looking closely at the content of education, and deciding whether it measured up to the needs of the time.   Again he criticized heavily the contemporary emphasis upon "externals of life", "machinery", "mechanism of civilisation", and he again deplored the neglect of character training and the inculcation of the good.   There is nothing new in the text, rather it is a summary of all his thinking, but the two crucial points he did make indicate his concern with the analytic nature of English society.   Both comments are accurate summaries of his total position:

> "Our current conception of democracy is inadequate.   Political
> equality, economic freedom, are stages on the road to it but
> not its goal.   A further freedom and equality are needed,
> freedom of access and equality in all those activities which
> ennoble and adorn life."(87)

And:

> "Let us at any rate beware of hypertrophy of the critical
> spirit, a disease more dangerous, because more insidious
> than its atrophy.   The strength of the modern world is in
> criticism, in analysis, and it is a weakness in modern
> education to concentrate on these at the expense of even more
> important things...It is this failure to get behind analysis
> to a sense of the reality analysed (that is important)."(88)

It will have been seen from the foregoing that Livingstone cannot be typed as a basic theorist or a practical theorist. He probably never intended to be either but rather a Cassandra voice offering, simultaneously, ideas which he felt ought to be considered because of the dangers which they highlighted. His role seems to have been a kind of individual educational House of Lords; warning against weaknesses, urging pause for reflection, but unconcerned with the working out of total policy.

At one point Livingstone favoured an emphasis on adult education and this showed him differing from the majority of schemes advocated in the period. Many ideas were centred around secondary education and it will be necessary to consider this issue as illustrative of the final type of thinking prevalent, practical organisation.

Many writers urged that the secondary school system did not reflect the existing social structure and that positive change was required. The Spens Report indicated the roots of this social irrelevance:

> "The force of tradition was so great that, when, under the Education Act, 1902, the State undertook for the first time the general organisation of secondary schools, the ancient grammar school, local or non-local, was taken as almost the exclusive model for secondary schools."(89)

The Report continues that this policy was supported by the "Regulations For Secondary Schools" issued by the Board of Education in 1904, and that from that date was introduced "an unnecessary and unreal cleavage between secondary and technical education."(90) It concluded that:

> "the existing arrangements...have ceased to correspond with the actual structure of modern society, and with the economic facts of the situation."(91)

The Report maintained that:

> "schools of every type fulfil their proper purpose in so far
> as they foster the free growth of individuality, helping
> every boy and girl to achieve the highest degree of individual
> development of which he or she is capable in and through the
> life of society."(92)

Consequently the Report suggested that secondary education should have three
categories, Grammar, Technical and Modern, each of which would cater for
differing pupil abilities. Although this scheme was a new departure and
aimed at providing a secondary system relevant for twentieth century social
conditions, it is interesting to see the close connection between the proposals
and those of the 1868 Taunton Commission(i). No inference is meant to be
drawn that the Spens ideas reflect a class division, as did the Taunton
categories, but they do reflect a long-standing view of separation. It
should be pointed out, however, that Spens did stress equality of status
(which Hadow also recommended!):

> "For the complete realisation of our recommendations regarding
> curriculum and the inter-relation of schools, parity of
> schools in the secondary stage of education is essential."(93)

This satisfying administrative unity, reflected in official reports
concerned with secondary education was continued by the Norwood Report, pub-
lished in 1943. This supported the idea that children should be separated

---

(i) Taunton Grade I School
To age 18. Taught Maths.,
modern languages, Science,
Classics. Same type as
Public Schools, only the
fees were lower.

Grade II School
To age 16. For boys wishing to
enter the professions & business.

Grade III School
To age 14. General, non vocational
education for farmers & tradesmen.

Spens Grammar School
To age 18. No change in traditional
grammar school curriculum.

Spens Technical/High School
To age 16. Providing an intellec-
tual discipline with a technical
bias, related to certain occupations.

Spens Modern School
To age 14. General education with
a practical approach, but non-
vocational.

into three groups, and described three types of mind to which corresponded three types of curricula. It is significant that the three types of mind fitted, conveniently, the three types of school proposed by Spens. The first type of pupil is one:

> "who is interested in learning for its own sake, who can grasp an argument or follow a piece of connected reasoning, who is interested in causes."(94)

The second type of pupil is one:

> "whose interests and abilities lie markedly in the fields of applied science or applied art...He often has an uncanny insight into the intricacies of mechanism, whereas the subtleties of language construction are too delicate for him."(95)

Finally, there are those pupils who:

> "deal more easily with concrete things than with ideas."(96)

The terms in which the Report describes these groupings are full of ambiguities and it makes one suspect that theoretical arguments were advanced as rationalisations of an already existing state of affairs.

These classifications had little observational basis and almost immediately psychological opinion questioned the assumptions. Cyril Burt argued that individual differences are due not so much to an innate, all-round capacity entering into every form of mental work, as to qualitatively different aptitudes producing qualitatively different types. He maintained that:

> "The one thing which the analysis of mental measurements has demonstrated beyond all doubt is the supreme importance during childhood of the general factor of intelligence."(97)

And again:

> "In the interest of the nation as well as the child, the paramount need is to discover which are the ablest pupils, no matter to what school or social class they may belong, and generally to grade each child according to the relative degree of his ability, and give him the best education which his ability permits...The proposed allocation of all children to different types of school at the early age of eleven cannot provide a sound

"psychological solution."(98)

An important criticism that one makes against Norwood and Spens, particularly Norwood, is the neglect of any adequate discussion of alternative plans. It is true that the multilateral idea was touched on by Spens but the issue was left wide open:

> "On first view it would appear that many benefits might accrue if children above the age of eleven were educated together in multilateral schools, since the transfer of pupils at various ages to courses of teaching appropriate to their abilities and interests would be facilitated...we have, however, with some reluctance, come to the conclusion that we could not advocate the adoption of multilateralism as a general policy in England and Wales."

> "We do not, however, wish to deprecate experiments for establishing multilateral schools, especially in areas of new population...The multilateral idea, though it may not be expressed by means of the multilateral school, should in effect permeate the system of secondary education as we conceive it. Each type of secondary school will have its appropriate place in the national system, with its educational task clearly in view."(99)

This kind of view is an interesting example of the split mind that Dent accused officialdom of possessing, i.e. an attitude which accepts that change is desirable but still clings to established forms. A revealing individual example of this can be seen in the evidence that a past President of the Board of Education gave to the Spens Committee in 1934. Lord Eustace Percy advocated the passage of all primary pupils into four-year, intermediate schools, their stay to be terminated at 15+ and then passing on to a three-year high school. He modified his scheme with the following comment:

> "There is, however, one great objection to this proposal, namely that it would tend to destroy that 'public school spirit' which can only exist in a school with a wide range culminating in a sixth form of mature students on the threshold of the University."(100)

He further argued that:

> "no Englishman would be prepared to sacrifice this spirit."(101)

However, the official government view did not possess this ambivalence and the 1943 White Paper stated:

> "Such then will be the three main types of secondary schools, to be known as grammar, modern and technical schools. It would be wrong to suppose that they will necessarily remain separate and apart. Different types may be combined in one building or on one site as considerations of convenience and efficiency may suggest."(102)

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education went further, and he was reported as saying:

> "I do not know where people get the idea about three types of schools, because I have gone through the Bill with a small-tooth comb and I can find only one school for Senior pupils, and that is a secondary school. What you like to make of it will depend upon the way you serve the precise needs of the individual area in the country."(103)

There is nothing ambiguous about this, but it is confusing when viewed against Paragraph 31 of the White Paper.

However, despite this confusion, the similarities between the official government line and page 376 of Spens are obvious, but they suggest more than this. The fact that no rigid, educational philosophy is enunciated, nor a specific, national plan advocated well illustrates a practical manifestation of the basic philosophical issue which concerned many of the pure theorists - that of balancing a planned order with individual freedom. This secondary education scheme did this, by offering a national framework, but leaving plenty of room for local conditions and experiment.

It is an interesting point to consider whether this open-ended feel for the situation was due to a general pragmatism or whether the legislators were merely leaving possible future options open. Before the 1944 Act was placed on the Statute Book, indeed before the publication of the 1943 White Paper, a great many voices had been raised in favour of the multilateral idea and system. For example, the National Association of Head Teachers, in 1943, urged that:

"Where conditions render it possible we are in favour of multilateral Secondary schools, with absolute fluidity of transfer from one section to another, to develop to the highest degree the varying abilities of each pupil."(104)

The Quaker Education Council also made an unequivocal statement:

"For our secondary schools we strongly favour the multilateral system."(i)

There is a clear commitment in these statements for a multilateral system and they were by no means isolated voices. However, an important factor missing in the demands is evidence that the commitment is more than just an urge for egalitarian structures. There is little evidence that total implications have been worked out, nor is there evidence that efforts have been made to discover concrete results of any multilateral schemes. In fact, there seems to have been a desire to establish these schools for narrow social reasons without considering the educational and cultural implications. For instance, the Co-operative Union argued:

"In our chapter on Primary education we argued about the value of a common school system as a solvent for snobbery and class distinctions in the community, too often fostered especially amongst the middle classes by patronising private schools. The same desire exists to provide a common secondary school for all children over 11 to 16 and over. Such a common school is referred to as the multilateral school."(108)

This is dangerous enough as the basis for an educational scheme but the Union betrays its weak thinking even further, a little later on:

"...the multilateral school...is a single, secondary school providing a variety and multiplicity of grouped courses suiting children of all normal types."(109)

(i) Similar views came from the British Association for Labour Legislation(106) and the Trades Union Congress(107).

One needs to know just what constitutes a normal type and whether types deviating from the norm do so because they do not conform to some intellectual or social stereotype. This kind of vagueness inevitably places any total conception in doubt.

The W.E.A. also demanded, "a common school system in which social distinctions and privileges no longer play a part"(110) though the organisation saw this as only part of a fully worked-out plan.

Finally, a less direct and far more subtle indication of just how deep the urge to social equality in education had struck. This extract can hardly be taken seriously, in its baldness, but the mere fact that an intellectual rationalization was used to justify a prejudice, suggests a certain confidence that the opinion would be accepted at its face value. The instance occurs in a Fabian pamphlet by Grace Leybourne. She quotes a remark of Professor MacMurray's that:

> "the ideal (of knowledge for its own sake)...may express
> the interest of a regime which has the strongest reasons
> for not wishing to see new knowledge used instrumentally
> all along the line, that is, in social and political re-
> construction as well as in the provision of scientific
> techniques."

Miss Leybourne's comment follows (the context is a discussion of the Norwood Report):

> "Is the unenterprising way the Norwood Committee tackled
> its job due to their fear that out of the secondary
> schools may come young people seeking reform?"(111)

The important point about all these plans, apart from their inadequacy as plans, is that they reflect belief that education would somehow change social climates. Other writers in this period demonstrated that education could not do this for it is a function of society and not its creator. But this did not deter these groups urging their particular panacea. A comment in the "Times Educational Supplement" summarises the feeling:

> "There is a rapidly mounting demand...that the public
> educational system shall assume its more creative function,
> and play its full part in determining the nature of the
> society of the future."(112)

The immediately foregoing account will inevitably give the impression

that the urge to multilateralism was an emotional one.   In some cases this

seems to have been true, and in any case, rigorous thought as to assumptions

does not appear to have been an element in determining the theoretical position.

However, one body did consider the issue at great length, and emerged with a

closely-reasoned commitment to multilateralism.   The reason for the depth

of treatment might be accounted for in that the group was responsible for a

vast population area.   However, whatever the reason, the London School Plan(i)

shows how one body went far beyond a mere emotional commitment.

The basic factor was recognised and established immediately in the Preface.

The writer quoted from W.E.A. pamphlet Number 11, in his discussion of

buildings:

> "The buildings are not merely the shell of the school, they
> are an educational factor in themselves - for good or ill;
> and they cannot be left out of account in any assessment of
> the quality of education, either on the practical side or in
> its emotional and social influence."(113)

The whole plan reflected a realistic and direct approach which is refreshing,

amongst much of the writing in the period:

> "We prefer the multilateral system and we recommend that in the
> work of the development plan now in progress the aim should be
> to provide a unified system of secondary education in place of
> the existing system of education given in London in separate
> types of school, and that in striving to achieve this aim the
> general guiding principle should be the establishment of a system
> of comprehensive high schools (Recommendation a(i))."

(i) Although the Plan was issued in 1947 the preparatory discussions begun
     in 1942.

"Where a school stands on a site which is large enough for the purpose...the school should be enlarged to take the additional numbers required. Where extensive reconstruction of devastated areas, or the replacement of condemned houses, is carried out on a large scale, school sites of sufficient size should be secured to accommodate a complete cross-section of the surrounding post-primary population in one comprehensive unit (Recommendation a(iii)).

Opportunities should be seized when they arise to purchase the necessary land for there is a really urgent need for new Secondary school accommodation, and it should have a high degree of priority."(114)(i)

However, although the commitment is clear enough, it was arrived at only after careful consideration of such local factors as school size, siting position, problems of vocational education; problems of transfer, and these were dealt with at some length(115). But the most telling point in favour of the approach, at least as regards the seriousness, was the efforts made to find something relevant from the American multilateral experience(116). The only comment necessary on this discussion is that more emphasis was placed on the social aspects of American education, than on any others. Further, a lot of weight was placed upon the remarks of the Moseley Commission - which reported in 1903! These are blemishes and they lead one to the conclusion that social education only was in the minds of the authors of the Plan. Certainly, no attempt was made to consider the American experience from first principles. At times, an unnecessary defensive tone emerged when they attempted to dismiss unspecified criticisms that American educational quality was not as high as the English standard, even under the pre-war system. The vague comment was made:

"It is, however, easy to be misled on this matter and all such judgments should be accepted with considerable reserve."(117)

(i) See also Appendix II for one area example of the detailed plan.

It is almost as though they did not want to believe arguments which they did
not like.   And later, on the same page, comes an uncharacteristic and spite-
ful outburst:

> "In many ways they (the Americans) have had a wider education
> and it might not unfairly be claimed that they have wider
> interests.   Indeed, our fine reverence for quality in this
> country is confined to a circle.   We tend to love exclusive
> aristocracies, and when the aristocracy of wealth went out
> of fashion we created a new one which we were pleased to think
> was an aristocracy of brains, that is, of those who excel in
> book-learning.   We need to create a much wider aristocracy -
> of those who excel in the art of social living.   This the
> American school consciously sets out to achieve."(118)

It should be said that there was no clear statement in the discussion as
to whether the American school does actually achieve the aim which the last
sentence claims is the intention.

However, despite these weaknesses the plan was created by men of their
times and they must inevitably have been affected both by social experience
in war, and by the volume of educational writings.   The rest of the plan is
sufficiently comprehensive for one to dismiss these few weaknesses as
aberrations.

It is not in the purpose of this thesis to make a critique of the 1944
Act, since many of its recommendations were suggested during the discussions
of the preceding six years.   In this sense, the Act reflected a method of
democracy because it not only incorporated compromise over specific issues
(e.g. the Dual system, in the Religious sector), but it also reflected a
consensus over general principles.   For instance, the abolition of fees in
state schools was widely urged, and this was incorporated in the Act's
provisions(119).   The validity of the consensus can be seen in the following
spread of different basic assumptions in the organisations urging such
reform:

(a) "If parity of schools in the secondary stage...is to be established, payment of fees in one school and not in another becomes incongruous. We hold that the conditions which apply in modern schools should be extended to other types of Secondary school."(120)

(b) "Fees in grant-aided secondary schools should be abolished within a reasonable time limit."(121)

(c) "...education at all Primary and post-Primary schools in receipt of grants from public funds should be free."(122)

There was a similar consensus on the raising of the school leaving age although the Act did not intend changes to occur as quickly as some of the organisations would have liked. Nevertheless, there was widespread agreement on the basic point:

(a) "The adoption of a minimum leaving age of 16 years may not be immediately attainable, but in our judgment must even now (1938) be envisaged as inevitable."(123)

(b) "The society declares categorically, that it wholly concurs...that...the general school age be raised to at least 15 years."(124)

(c) "The school-leaving age should be raised to 16 years without exemptions. Meanwhile, as a step towards this policy, the age should be raised to 15 with the least possible delay."(125)(i)

It must not be thought that this consensus only applied at the secondary school level; this sector has been developed merely to retain continuity. In fact, the consensus covered a wide field covering many points of the 1944 Act(ii).

In summary, then, one can see that the general educational thought in this period divides roughly speaking into three groups; the ideas of the 'basic' theorists; the ideas of the 'practical' theorists, and the ideas of the organisational planners. This distinction is to some extent arbitrary, but it serves to place the educational thought of the period within a framework.

(i) See also N.U.T.(126) and W.E.A.(127).
(ii) See Appendix III.

Considered individually, no group can claim a comprehensive totality in its conceptions. The 'basic' theorists presented the most impressive volume of thought because they considered basic assumptions and took a hard look at the ultimate ends of education. Because their ideas, in a sense, were timeless they failed to take into account strong currents of feeling in contemporary life which profoundly affected educational life (e.g. the idea of equality of opportunity). In fairness, however, it should be acknowledged that educational theorists should not place too much emphasis upon feelings unless such views are first placed in a historical perspective, and subjected to close critical scrutiny. The nature of man and society should be their concern, and not the level of feeling present at any moment of time. But it may be that through their failure to recognise the 'here and now', their views and methods did not receive widespread attention. Certainly, the ideas of the 'practical' theorists, who analysed contemporary structures, do not suggest that basic assumptions were given close scrutiny. The strength of these thinkers lay in the fact that they tried to place existing inadequacies against a theoretical background of values. Their main weakness was that their value system was too loose, being pivoted around vague conceptions (such as democratic living) which they did not work through in any complete manner. Their 'practical' ideas seemed to be relevant but their theory was ill-defined, and therefore unsound as an educational base.

The organisational planners were those who attempted to systematize schemes which would reflect the new ideas. Overall they made general systems, each part of which was fashioned to alter specific problems. In fact, their plans were so general that with the notable exception of the "London School Plan", there was a total absence of any consideration of the economic position of the country. It was clear that, after the devastation which

war had brought about, normal economic life would not be possible immediately after cessation of hostilities. Yet the large schemes poured forth with a naive belief that all would be possible in the immediate post-war world. Further, there is little evidence that this group thought beyond their structures to ultimate aims, though no doubt they could argue that radical measures were necessary in the short term. An indication of this immediacy in their thought can be seen in that not until 1945 was any serious work carried out on curriculum development. Given that the functional relationship between schools and society was often discussed in the period it is a striking omission that not until the Council of Curriculum Reform published their 'Content Of Education' in March 1945, was there a serious study of the principles of curriculum building(i).

However, all three groups did contribute positively to an educational network of ideas, the like of which had not been experienced in this country, and their fertility not only made a general advance possible, but also ensured that it would be a signal one.

It will have been evident that general, if vague, ideas about the extent to which the educational process can fundamentally alter basic attitudes within society, were prevalent during the period. Critics and observers concentrated upon particular areas which seemed to illustrate their general contentions. Consequently, three areas have been chosen which give the general ideas definition. All of them reveal to some extent the urge to equality which was present in England during the war.

(i) The Norwood Report did deal with curricula but not as a subject worked out from first principles.

In the University sector this was revealed, firstly, in the arguments put forward to justify closer links with society, especially at local level. This was a move away from the idea of a University having responsibility only to itself. Secondly, it can be seen in the proposals from various groups which urged a widening of recruitment, the criterion being one of intellectual ability rather than one of the ability to pay.

In the sector centred around religion in education the move to equality can be seen in the willingness of the Anglican and Free Churches to forgo some degree of control in order that their children would be able to enjoy better buildings and equipment, conditions equal to those pertaining in State schools. This situation did not apply to Roman Catholic schools in that this Church was not concerned with buildings but with the spiritual atmosphere in its schools, and with the denomination of its teachers. The Church was therefore quite happy to see the Schools, as physical and administrative units, transferred to the local education authorities.

The Public School issue more obviously than the others illustrates the urge to equality in that most of the arguments revolved around the issue of educational privilege gained by accident, i.e. wealth of parents. The solutions proffered centered around the need for abolition or a total integration in the belief that this would allow a common, state education for all. In this sense it was felt to be democratic and equal.

The basic theoretical tension, already described, between individualist approaches and society-orientated ones, can be seen in these sectors also. With the Universities, it is represented by the opposing ways of regarding Universities as completely antonomous in their work or as having a wider social responsibility. With the Public Schools the tension is evident in the debate as to the Schools' right to independent existence or the necessity

for a common school system geared to the prevailing social philosophy.

With the religion-in-education issue the tension is not so marked because

of the poor financial and physical condition of the Church schools. But

in that the Church recognised the need to come to terms with the State system,

a willingness is evident to lose some school individuality and control.

Each of the three sectors chosen illustrates one of the categories of

thought already outlined: the Universities, for the theoretical position;

the religious debate, for the practical theory; the Public Schools, for

the organisational planners. It is not suggested that these distinctions are

clear-cut, since not all writers can be satisfactorily categorised in this

way, and not all writers of a certain bent dealt with the same subject.

However, the distinction is felt to be a useful one in that it gives some

clarity to the educational thought of this period, and with this in mind,

the following three chapters have been chosen as illustrative of three out-

standing trends in educational thought in England between 1938 and 1948.

The Universities

The debate revolving around the Universities was concerned, almost totally, with ideas as opposed to detailed organisation.   Before considering the ideas it will be useful to indicate the change of outlook that occurred between the period just before the war and the outlook brought about by the war experience itself.

In a study carried out in 1933, E. Deller suggests some tendencies, and one of the marked differences to later attitudes was the emphasis which he placed upon the problem of student recruitment:

> "Our present proportion of students is perhaps as much as we can safely attempt at the present time and that the line of advance for the future is qualitative rather than quantitative."(1)

An identical view was held by the University Grants Committee, which looked forward to a period when:

> "quantitative growth will be less rapid than it has been and it will be more possible for the Universities to concentrate their attention on questions of quality."(2)

This same Committee also gave its view as to why the situation changed after the war experience.   It was:

> "the general sense that the equality of sacrifice which the nation demanded in times of tension and danger ought to be matched by a much greater measure of social and educational equality."(3)

This alleged sense can, in fact, be clearly demonstrated, showing how the emphasis had changed.   For example, the Association of Directors and Secretaries of Education argued that:

> "As an immediate reform it is necessary to ensure that all young men and women who have shown their ability to profit by a University Education should be able to proceed to the University with sufficient funds to make the best of life there."(4)

The N.U.T. expressed similar views(5).

The above change could be termed an organisational one but there were

fundamental differences as well. Deller argued:

> "The University can help, and should help (in serving the
> social system), but it can do so most advantageously by
> being itself, by knowing rather than by doing, by ascertaining
> truth rather than by attempting what is not its concern - the
> business of the statesman, the very necessary business of
> adjustments and compromises."(6)

He further argued that each social situation should be considered on its

merits and that the prime consideration should be its relation to the

Universities' concern for the advancement of knowledge(7). By the end of

the war such an attitude would have been considered ivory-tower thinking,

and Walter Moberley indicates the change of emphasis well:

> "There is a limit to neutrality. There are issues so
> fundamental that ostensible neutrality is impossible...
> some of these basic values are academic; a passion for
> truth, thoroughness in pursuing it to the bitter end, a
> delicate precision in analysis, a judicial temper...but
> they have also wider implications; the University man who
> has assimilated them will have predetermined his stand on
> a number of political and moral questions, far beyond the
> confines of the University."(8)

Moberley's work came at the end of our period, and, in part, his book

is a critical synthesis of current attitudes. However, indications of the

desire for the Universities to make greater creative responses towards the

social fabric had been evident for some years prior to 1946; even in 1937

rumblings were heard. The Proctor of Oxford was quoted as saying:

> "The increasing traffic of senior members with what I may
> call the vulgar aspects of undergraduate life, these are
> new, and in my opinion, disturbing phenomenon."(9)

And by 1943, at the latest, specific suggestions were being made for greater

social relevance. In the 25th Earl Grey Memorial Lecture Bonamy Dobree

claimed:

> "They (ideal, future Universities) would not tolerate, let
> alone seek isolation, nor would societies accept their withdrawal,
> rather would each take a continuous and keen interest in the
> activities of the other, in its workaday functions as in its
> aspirations."(10)

The shift of emphasis then, during the period, was from concentrated unselfish isolation to a wider social relevance and relationship. This shift can be seen in the specific criticisms made against the Universities. The best word to indicate the emphasis of these criticisms is 'synthesis', and certainly many critics concerned themselves with weaknesses which had connections with such a concept even though their interpretations of the term differed. Professor Mansell Jones argued:

> "Modern Universities are, educationally, congeries of departmentalised empiricisms, administered as a system without a plan or any very definite purpose."(11)

Adolph Lowe claimed:

> "The modern Universities have never made any attempt at a comprehensive cultural education."(12)

And Professor Hodges asserted that the Arts Faculty of a modern University:

> "is a close Confederation of distinct departments each dealing with one 'subject', jealous of their independence and too often devoid of any unifying idea and purpose."(13)

L.C. Knights made similar criticisms(14).

This widespread feeling that a synthesis of disciplines was necessary is an interesting one because it reflects to some degree the national preoccupation with community, since it could be argued that to bring disciplines into significant relation not only involves a logical academic impulse but also a human one. To synthesize curricula demands corporate teamwork to the exclusion of the individualist approach of remote scholarship, though this is not inevitably excluded even in corporate work.

The reason why synthesis was emphasised was that overspecialisation was considered to be endangering educational ideals. This view was voiced as early as 1934:

> "The Universities are peopled with men and women deeply
> schooled in their particular subjects, but in too many
> cases lamentably ignorant of the learning of their fellows.
> This excessive departmentalization of knowledge is more
> marked in the newer Universities...teaching is excessively
> specialised and graduates are being turned out of all our
> universities, expert in what they are pleased to call their
> subjects, but ignorant of much of the knowledge vital not
> merely to good citizenship, but to individual capacity for
> life."(i)

Although synthesis was seen as an answer to a narrow education, interpreta-

tions of the term differed considerably.   Broadly, the divergence was between

a practical partial synthesis in terms of subjects and a theoretical comprehen-

sive synthesis in terms of basic attitudes.   H.J. Paton from Oxford(15) argued

that the whole university system was wrong because it was geared to producing

'firsts' and therefore broad, cultural education was rejected. His solution

was that all undergraduates should be required to take a general degree, and

that the intending specialist should move on to research after this.

It was surely an exaggeration to claim that Oxford was only concerned

with examinations.   Experimental research was thriving, and even critics

admitted that Classical Greats gave a broad humanistic education;   in fact,

the only criticism that carried any weight was the refutation of the exag-

gerated claims for transference of learning, in high civil positions(ii).

(i)   A.E. Morgan in 'The Listener' 26.9.34 quoted in B. Truscot's 'Redbrick
      University', Faber 1943, page 124.   This same complaint was made
      regularly throughout our period viz. R. Pedley in 'Journal Of Education'
      Vol. 75, No. 887, June 1943;   H.T. Paton's 'Synthesis In the Univer-
      sities' in 'Synthesis In Education' 1946;   Sir Richard Livingstone's,
      'Some Thoughts On University Education', C.U.P. 1948, pages 13/16.
(ii) Truscot made similar accusations about the teaching in the provincial
      universities, arguing that no research was carried out to any degree.
      However, the only evidence that he produced referred to one unspecified
      case, pages 105/118, 'Redbrick University'.

However, despite this, there is still nothing which would suggest that Paton's pass degree would be infallible. A course can easily be designed to consist of three or four subjects but the emphasis could be an adhesive one rather than cohesive, i.e. subjects would be placed in a course, as units, rather than as interrelated parts of a whole.

H.C. Bartlet, writing on Cambridge, shifted the emphasis onto post-graduate work, where synthesis would be established through co-operative research. This is clearly desirable but it should surely emerge from the nature of the problem to be investigated and this could not always be efficiently carried out through team concentrations(16). In any case, this view rather complacently implies that the bulk of university work (undergraduate tuition) was satisfactory, a view disputed by many writers.

The University Grants Committee thought the situation critical enough to make a pronouncement:

> "...a university would, in our view, fail of its essential purpose if it did not, by some means or other, continue to combine its vocational functions with the provision of a broad, humanistic culture and a suitably tough intellectual discipline."(17)

And the report indicated the possibility of:

> "limiting the disadvantages of specialisation by the institution of courses, leading both to Honours and Pass degrees, covering a much wider range of studies than has hitherto been customary."(18)

Professor Mansell-Jones also complained, and his views can be bracketed with those of the U.G.C. He argued that:

> "too little attention is paid to general, intellectual interests and standards, and that the empirical system (of the Universities) needs overhauling."(19)

By this he meant the connected programmes of study and instruction methods.

The U.G.C. Report in this context, suffers from errors of omission. Clearly a report of this nature is not the place in which to present synopses of university courses, but having made a broad statement of belief, it was naive of the Committee to expect that synthesis would be made by "some means or other". It could be argued that the educator's main problem is that of providing a suitable environment and, at the university level, this is as much intellectual as social. A subject or a group of subjects must be internally consistent and the value of the subject or group can be estimated by the intellectual universe with which it is in relation; the wider the universe, the more valuable the group or subject. In this sense 'some other means' are integral for any synthesis, because they represent the elements of environment.

The second U.G.C. quotation and the Mansell-Jones comment are both too narrow in conception. To alter the administrative, intellectual machinery suggests that university education is only a reflector of social change (i.e. a society, having reached a position where increased specialist function has caused intellectual narrowness, requires broader understanding from its citizens; therefore, Universities should also be agents of cultural formation. In this sense Universities would attempt to influence the creation of culture from without as well as from within(i).

The main objection one has, therefore, to the overspecialisation criticism is that it was oversimplified and did not take a total view of the situation, concentrating rather upon organisational function. A further criticism is that they were unrealistic. Since 1930 there had been a steady

---

(i) Two schemes were produced in the period with this aim, one by Bonamy Dobree, the other by Adolph Lowe. See below.

rise in the demand for University places. During the actual war period the urge to egalitarianism had been reflected in calls for the Universities to be made available to all who could benefit. For example, the National Association of Head Teachers urged that:

> "It should be a recognised fundamental in post-war reorganisation of education that every child has the right to receive the best education at all stages of his or her young life, and having passed a qualifying examination to proceed to the University without any cost to his or her parents."(20)

And the Co-operative Union felt that:

> "Access to the University should be free and open to all students of both sexes, capable of benefiting from such a course, and qualified to do so."(21)

Similar proposals were made by the N.U.T.(22); the Liberal Party(23); and the Communist Party(24).

These theoretical demands were proved by events, as the following statistics indicate:

1930	-	7,408	) Students leaving school with Higher School
1939	-	10,000	) Certificate and University Entrance
1945	-	14,000	) qualification(25).
1947	-	18,800	)

Further, the U.G.C. Report, itself, had argued that:

> "the hard experience of war had demonstrated plainly in many fields the essential value to the community of university-trained men and women."(26)

Such people, clearly, can only be interpreted as specialist products, and when the Nuffield Report further argued that the professions needed a more ample provision for their own requirements(27), it is evident that vague comments about synthesis and general courses are not enough. Finally, the U.G.C. accepted the recommendations of the Barlow Committee (May 1946) which claimed that, in the national interest, the doubling of numbers of Science and Technology graduates was imperative, and that there should be a substantial expansion of Arts graduates concurrent with this. In this sense,

specialisation was almost inevitable.

If it is presumptuous to call such a body as the U.G.C. naive, then perhaps this situation is yet another example of Dent's 'national schizophrenia', where the recognition of the need for change was evident but not the impetus to action.

Not everybody felt that specialisation was wholly bad, however. F.R. Leavis, for example, argued consistently through one of his books that specialisation was inevitable and that the real problem facing British Universities was to bring all subjects into significant relation with one another, (this view, of course, was a 'Scrutiny' one) and then to discover how to train a kind of central intelligence which would more easily transmit the relationship(28).

The Nuffield Report did criticise the Universities not for specialisation as such but for the degree of specialisation which they had permitted(29). Adolph Lowe took a similar view arguing that specialisation corresponded to the process of social differentiation towards which England was heading(30).

All these attacks upon overspecialisation represented the hub of the criticisms centred around the Universities(i). However, only two general

(i) Jacques Maritain made a convincing defence of specialisation. He places the period of university education at the end of a carefully worked out scheme of liberal education which gives due weight to childhood and adolescence. At the University: "Judgment and the intellectual virtues are no longer in the stage of preparation but in the stage of actual acquisition. And it is then, as I pointed out, that specialisation occurs.....The knowledge which has to develop during university years is knowledge in a state of a perfected and rational grasping of a particular subject matter." Even so Maritain still would require students to attend courses in General, Ethical, and Political Philosophy. ('Education at the Crossroads', page 79, O.U.P. 1943).

solutions emerged to the problem of how to achieve effective synthesis; one from Lowe, which was logical and functional; the other from Bonamy Dobree, which was creative and imaginative.

Lowe reflects the interest taken in, and the acknowledgement of Sociology, as an important science, in our period, for his standpoint is strictly sociological. He argued that Universities have a three-fold task, concerned totally with their role as social agent(31), their teaching being planned to centre around general education, vocational education and moral education. Working for his conception of the University as a social agent Lowe described a plan which would short-circuit the 'specialist study' system, by developing cadres of 'enlightened experts', from the centre outwards. These elite groups would form the nuclei of a democratic ruling class(32). He expects that since much social and organisational responsibility will devolve on these groups then they will have a special 'cultural education' provided at the Universities. This will be based upon a theoretical knowledge of facts and a practical experience of a representative section of modern life(33). Therefore, the pivots of his university education will be, firstly, an interpretation of modern culture; secondly, the training of experience (through integrated courses with industry); thirdly, the teaching of criteria. Lowe accepted that in order to achieve all this a new generation of university teachers would have to be produced and to facilitate this he suggests that an experimental college should be built where 'synthetically-minded' specialists would undertake research into cultural synthesis, and also teach post-graduate students(34).

Lowe's ideas were clearly influenced by the contemporary concern for planned orders but though his schemes are neat and satisfying as rational structures, they are open to several objections. At the same time it should

be noted that his plan was a comprehensive attempt to realistically underpin a synthetic curriculum by relating it to its culture, and the plan was also aimed at dissolving the isolated congeries of specialists.

However, Lowe committed at least one error that several writers made in our period - that of confusing the different elements implied in the conception of democracy. Because his scheme is concerned with cultural education then the total life experience of the past as well as the present is involved. Clearly, the cultural traditions of a nation should not be isolated into some formal structure so that their influence is felt fully only by the one group. Invisible cultural forces are at work from birth and they have powerful moulding influences during childhood and adolescence; yet Lowe makes no provision for the school situation. Admittedly, he is concentrating upon the University, but it could be argued that his plan would not achieve the intended cultural synthesis if it was only a grafted addition to the higher reaches of education. In fact, his system could easily become a kind of cultural paternalism, and this may or may not be desirable, but it certainly is not democratic, which is what Lowe intended his system to be. What Lowe has done is merely to interpret democracy as opportunity for a wide experience of intellectual and social life - which happens to fit in with his fundamental view of education as a social agent. In other words, he has offered a highly intelligent and logical rationalisation of his own predispositions.

A minor criticism of Lowe's scheme but one which further indicates the loose democratic argument is that he does not make clear how his elites are to emerge. Many people would regard their very existence as undemocratic, anyway, though it could be argued that, providing the way to the position is open to all, then their existence is compatible with democratic structures. However, Lowe has nothing to say on this point.

It is clear that, in general, educational change follows social change.
It was, therefore, somewhat naive of Lowe to expect that a generation of
university teachers could be trained in a vacuum, almost. It has already
been seen that people were not ready to accept the idea of planning; many
educationists did not fully understand the relationship between education and
society, and the Universities saw the problem in terms of peripheral reform,
at the organisational stage. Lowe failed to sense the emotional uplift
that the idea of democracy gave to people; consequently his treatment of
the subject seemed to be a somewhat arid one.

Bonamy Dobree's scheme offered breadth and a certain warmth, while
tending to ignore a detailed plan. However, like Lowe, he was fully alive
to the wider cultural implications of synthesis(i).

The title of his paper, 'Universities And Regional Life', indicates the
central relationship which he hoped would develop. He made two assumptions
about the post war world and everything else follows from them. Firstly,
he expected English life to be reorientated on a regional basis; secondly,
he emphasised that great changes would occur in social relationships and in
personal values. Dobree's aim is for a mutual pattern of fertilisation
between the University and the area which, on the one hand it serves, and
on the other provides its material existence. This is the new relationship:

(i) Sir Walter Moberley had a similar idea to Dobree's, but was vague
     about it: "The University must find ways, which will fire the
     imagination of explaining to its neighbour (i.e. the local community)
     what it is doing, why it is doing it, and what it essentially is."
     'The Crisis In The University', page 247.

> "Yet if universities are...reflections of the societies in
> which they exist, it is surely to the advantage of those
> societies to see that their universities mirror back what
> is most thoughtful, most fruitful, most ideal, as well as
> what is not materially useful."(35)

And the new values:

> "...they (the newer Universities) cannot repeat the history
> of the old, they must trace out their own way boldly but
> surely, with reference to the wants, real or supposed, of
> emergent society, especially in their region, so that they
> may constantly suffuse it with fresh thought, thought relative,
> not to a departed order of things, but to life as it is lived
> here and now."(36)

In the educational field this implies that the Universities must not only

undertake the instruction and training in specifics, but also undertake the

instruction of values.

> "Must they (the Universities) not take upon themselves,
> deliberately, the task of indicating what the social function
> is of the labours a student is to perform, what the winds of
> doctrine are that animate the communities about them? Briefly,
> what they must do is to turn out men and women eager to develop
> the culture relevant to our emerging society."(37)

The significant point about this passage is that values are equated with

culture and he makes the link more specific when he quoted T. Huxley, with

approval:

> "Culture certainly means something quite different from learning
> a technical skill. It implies the possession of an ideal, and
> the habit of critically estimating the value of things by
> comparison with a theoretic standard. Perfect culture should
> supply a complete theory of life, based upon clear knowledge,
> alike of its possibilities and limitations."(38)(i)

Dobree is more specific when he asserts that:

> "Culture must have its roots in everyday doings, in common
> apprehensions, otherwise it will bear only meagre flowers
> and wizened fruit, since the emotion of significance will be
> absent."(41)

(i) Both Ortega Y. Gasset and Walter Moberley took similar views:
     (Ortega 39)
     (Moberley 40).

And:

> "In sum, I suggest that if we are to revivify our culture
> with the emotion of significance we must reinterpret it in
> the light of the civilisation we live in, an industrial
> civilisation, an age...of shifting value.   The whole con-
> ception needs drastic overhauling if we are to have a coherent
> policy as we surely ought to have;   for without such a policy
> we cannot have a formative effect upon society."(42)

Dobree's conception of synthesis is more convincing than Lowe's although

far less specific and much less organisationally planned.   Dobree's approach

is general, even ideal, but his idealism is founded on a surer grasp of

realities.   What he presents, in a sense, is Fred Clarke's idea of ideal

education (i.e. education for the type, and education beyond the type) for

he accepts the type (existing cultural pattern) and then demands extension

(through the social revitalisation and cross-fertilisation).   Although Dobree

is exhortatory in parts he still leaves one with a strong impression of 'the

possible'.   Lowe, despite meticulous organisational arithmetic, gives one the

impression that he has ignored the living intangible of culture values, treating

cultural education as an intellectual abstraction that only has to be formu-

lated, and then presented, relevantly(i).

The other main distinction which makes Dobree more convincing than Lowe

is in the way each considers the working out of plans at the level of human

contact.   Lowe places his emphasis upon the elite, social functionaries who,

though 'enlightened experts' still work essentially from above.   Dobree's

organic link with regional life presupposes a developed sense of community

and a system of practical compromises, at all levels, between University and

---

(i)   Ortega made a general criticism that could be applied to Lowe, when he
      argued that instead of teaching what ought to be taught, according to
      some Utopian desire, the Universities should teach only what can be
      taught, i.e. subjects taught at the level of the ideas of the time(43).

region(i).   In other words, cultural roots are acknowledged, accepted, and then developed through corporate action.

Overspecialisation and synthesis were the two pole positions around which university criticism grouped at the more practical level.   The writers considered were the more positive and thoughtful of the contributors but other writers did make suggestions which though superficially interesting were not worked out to any degree.

G.D.H. Cole was one such writer who contributed such views to the 'Journal Of Education'.   His most provocative ideas concerned the older Universities, and he suggested that they should become fully post-graduate centres catering for higher degrees and post-graduate refresher courses. He also proposed that a Council for Education should be set up which would develop state control in the educational field.   In such an event all Universities would be incorporated in a comprehensive, national plan worked out by the Council(46).

All that need be said about such views is that though they are vague they do reflect certain contemporary attitudes.   In Cole's case, the urge to planning and institutional function is well exhibited(ii).

(i)   It should be noted that Dobree was not the only writer who emphasised the universities' role of cultural leader, but he did specify a general concept as to how it could be achieved.
M.V.C. Jeffreys argued that universities 'should strive to be active instruments of cultural formation rather than passive reflections of social change."(44)
Sir Walter Moberley quoted Oliver Lodge a few years later: "Keep in close touch with the community, do not seek for independence or isolation, encourage the leading men to take a living and personal interest in college government and give them plenty of real power...Keep in close touch with that life and activity and in any new departure carry the community with you."(45)

(ii) Another piece of evidence suggesting that Cole was more of an attitude reflector than a serious critic can be seen in an idea of his to amalgamate Training Colleges and Technical Colleges into Peoples' Universities(47) And the Co-operative Union held a similar view(48).

One of the ironies of the university situation in our period was that, despite the great emphasis placed upon different kinds of synthesis, critics in their specific proposals tended to perpetuate function. This can be clearly seen in Education where it was urged that Universities should take a greater share in the training of teachers(49) but most writers tended to concentrate upon organisation, which resolved itself into specialist function, again. For example, M.L. Jacks urged that all teachers should have a university education during which they should gain a philosophy of life, sympathy, breadth of mind. But he still categorised the students according to future function i.e. those likely to become VI Form Teachers; those to become teachers other than VI Form, those who would enter the Youth Service(50).

Though overspecialisation and synthesis were the main problems exercising critics, one prominent writer took the whole field of university education and administration and in a caustic and sometimes cavalier fashion exposed weaknesses and deficiencies, Bruce Truscot (or Professor Allison Peers) was a prickly critic who focussed attention on Redbrick University's lack of amenities and general inferiority compared with the older Universities. He made some telling points but he also scored effectively by distorting situations or by failing to verify facts. For example, he proclaimed the virtues of residential halls and complained of the tardiness of the U.G.C. to offer a dynamic lead in obtaining them, and at its unwillingness to make money available for such schemes(51)(i). However, statistics show a very different situation from the one which Truscot complained about. In appendix V of the U.G.C. report, lists

---

(i) It should be noted that the U.G.C. took a different view of its efforts:
     "In previous reports we have laid much emphasis on the value which we
     attach to the residential system as an element of University life."(52)

are given of major building developments between 1936 and 1944(i) and indicates the following residential developments:

Exeter	–	Crossmead Hall of residence for men.
Liverpool	–	Derby Hall of residence for men.
Nottingham	–	Extensions to Hugh Stuart Hall.
Reading	–	Three Halls for women (St. George, St. Andrew, Mansfield).
Sheffield	–	Crewe Hall for men.
Southampton	–	New Refectory.
Bangor	–	New Hall for men.
Cardiff	–	Extension of Aberdare Hall for men.
Aberdeen	–	New Hall for Medical students(53).

These examples might not represent rapid development but they nevertheless place Truscot's views in a different perspective, especially when one considers that the 1935 student population was 51,000 and there was to be no advance on this number until 1945(54).

Further, some of Truscot's criticisms were at variance with the evidence of official reports. For example, he is scathing about the amount of research work conducted in the newer Universities, though he only cites, as evidence, one faculty of one University. He uses this example to show that too much emphasis is placed upon teaching(55). However, the U.G.C. (and it sounds out all university experience) made the completely opposite complaint:

> "Our Report in 1930 dwelt upon the tendency in some quarters
> to lay an undue stress upon quantity of output (in research).
> This tendency is still apparent."(56)

However, despite these blemishes, Truscot did inject some provocation into the university issue and also, by implication, came down on the side of specialisation. In both his main studies he emphasised the pre-eminence of research, placing teaching second:

> "A University is a corporation or society which devotes itself
> to a search after knowledge for the sake of its intrinsic
> value."(57)

(i) Truscot's book was published in 1943 and most of his criticisms refer to
the period after the 1936 U.G.C. Report.

In his later work he again emphasises research and condemns W.G. Adams'
book, 'The Modern Idea Of A University':

> "It will not do to say, as the Warden of All Souls says, that
> the 'central function' of a University is to provide a liberal
> education, and its 'main practical work' to 'train people for
> the various professions', putting the obligation 'to advance
> research and to increase the sum of knowledge' second."(58)

It is this insistence upon the necessity for Universities to search after
knowledge for its own sake that probably introduces the tone of asperity into
Truscot's views, because this emphasis places him in a stream moving against
the contemporary current. Whereas most writers stress some kind of synthesis
and acknowledge social links, Truscot tends to place the institution on a
loftier plane. Because of his rigid insistence upon the intrinsic value of
knowledge, he tends to ignore the social function of the Universities. His
views lack a centre, a conception of function nourished from the actual which
could permeate all his other ideas(i).

Nevertheless, some of his ideas had impressive support. For example,
he indicated Redbrick's general inferiority in relation to Oxbridge and
consequently urged that the whole university topography be changed. Instead
of having two elite, residential Universities and nine smaller, urban, cramped
ones for the rest of the student population Truscot urged eleven of equal size,
all residential(60)(ii). (Although he would not subscribe to this solution
Moberley agreed with the analysis:

> "If Oxford and Cambridge suffer from a surfeit of cream
> 'Redbrick' too often has to put up with skimmed milk."(61))

(i) At the same time it should be noted that his ideas were still superior to
those of some of his critics. For example, L.C. Knights attacked his
views on Research and argued: "Valuable research is only likely to spring
out of an attempt to develop living interests and to find answers to urgent
problems of the present."(59) This is surely a dangerous view for
emphasis upon the present will hide the chain of the past, whose links
represent the cultural consciousness of society.

(ii) 'Redbrick University', pages 37-40.

Truscot wanted substantially increased government grants to finance residential halls, scholarship endowment and new specialist schools. He argued that such expenditure would go a long way to solving Redbrick's problems. Actually, it is over-simplified because it sees the situation in pre-war terms and apparently ignores the new social ideas (of equality of opportunity, for example). Also his view does not consider where the money would come from to finance such schemes. However, he did have at least one distinguished supporter. Grant Robertson replied to a letter in 'The Times':

> "What is a Royal Commission going to do for the civic
> universities except waste three or more years taking evidence
> and finally recommending what the civic universities already
> know they require - all that is required is the money."(62)

Overall, despite his unevenness Truscot must be seen as part of the desire to define clearly the function of the University in the modern world. His imbalance occurred because he tended to regard them as separate institutions rather than as part of a total cultural tradition.

A recurrent criticism of those who examined the ultimate aims of university education was that the Universities as a whole lacked direction. Sir Walter Moberley made the most profound study of this sense of lost purpose but other writers were also convinced of it. Lowe argued that they had failed to take "cognisance of decisive changes in their social environment" leaving them floundering in consequence(63). Murray, Principal of Exeter, felt that "there is no unifying principle of knowledge."(64) And John Baillie asserted:

> "The Universities of the modern west have increasingly
> gravitated towards a condition of complacent disinterested-
> ness."(65)

But Moberley made the most forceful statement on the condition:

> "They (the Universities) have little inner self-confidence,
> because they lack, and are increasingly aware that they lack,
> any clear, agreed sense of direction and purpose. At this
> moment they cannot give an effective lead because they them-
> selves share, and have shown small signs of transcending, the
> spiritual confusion of the age."(66)

This lack of purpose, according to Jacques Maritain, was because:

> "Exhausted and bewildered by dint of false and dehumanised
> philosophy, reason confesses its impotence to justify any
> ethical standards."(i)

Clearly a remedy for such a condition might be found in a fully-worked-

out conception of what a University should do and be. Many writers argued

that what was necessary was a commitment from the Universities to become a

kind of moral conscience of society. D.M. Emmett put this explicitly, arguing

from the position that the central identity of a University was its intellectual

passion:

> "the university has a responsibility...(as) a place for
> focussing the intellectual conscience of the community."(69)

Moberley framed a similar viewpoint as an accusation:

> "Broadly speaking, the University to-day is not asking the
> really fundamental question. In particular there has been
> something like a taboo on the treatment of contentious issues
> of politics or religion...whatever its causes or excuses, such
> a taboo is disastrous and indefensible. It confines university
> education to the use of means as opposed to the choice of ends."(70)

This desire to confront squarely difficult problems is, of course, part of

the general insistence throughout the whole field of education, in this period,

for greater freedom and for the abandonment of fixed stances. This can be

seen, for example, in Religious Education, where there was a move to alter

religious instruction to an historical view of all religions; and also in the

Public Schools' issue where the desire for freedom was manifested in the call

---

(i) 'Education at the Crossroads' by Jacques Maritain, O.U.P. 1943, page 94.
     Baillie(67) and Moberley(68) made similar points.

for open access.

Moberley was particularly insistent upon this sense of freedom, arguing that the University should not only give its students information but also an education which would offer them the best chance of arriving at answers to fundamental questions. He argued that in the past the Universities had adopted a "false neutrality"(71) and he urged therefore the removal of all prohibitions on controversial issues.

Emmett also pointed out the antithesis between freedom and neutrality, arguing that neutrality discouraged discussion from being undertaken at a sufficiently radical level(72). She went on to make a full statement as to what constituted her conception of freedom, arguing that it was not one which merely extended choices but one which demanded that all those concerned with university work should make the exacting effort to understand one another's presuppositions. In other words Emmett's freedom was linked with 'communication' because:

> "the University should be a community and not an aggregate
> of departments pursuing their separate ways."(73)

Emmett goes on to list "common presuppositions" which she feels represent the content of the faith which Universities should aim at. The first of these is a sense of justice and fairness when judging the evidence; secondly, a freedom of mind and spirit, which represents responsible thinking and not merely a rationalization of prejudices; thirdly, moral courage is essential, a quality:

> "not conspicious in university life."(74)

Finally the Universities should possess a sense of social responsibility. Emmett's views are the clearest and most concise statements made by anyone in our period as to final university ends. Admittedly they are generalised but

this is wholly consistent with her prior condition for freedom.   Further

they take into account all the criticisms raised as to the demise of the

Universities.   It is possible to make the criticism that in her eagerness

to maintain identity, which she equates with intellectual passion, she

actually ignores the conditions which have previously given identity i.e.

cultural traditions of society.   But even this objection must be tempered

with the fact that she sees the University as a focus for the community's

intellectual conscience and it would therefore act as a sieve for cultural

forces present at any given moment.

One of the largest groups of writers on this problem was the Christian

group i.e. those who linked their ideas with a specifically Christian commit-

ment.   Sir Richard Livingstone did this though his equation of University

and Church was rather vague:

> "...graduates should go into life not so much expert in the
> battle cries and tactics of the moment, as conscious of the
> deeper issues at stake, and of the values involved in them.
> The Churches and Universities are the natural institutions
> to see to this."(75)

R. Forrester-Paton was even more emphatic as to his commitment but just as

vague in substance:

> "The University is seen truly in perspective when, without
> forgetting the social context, we see it under the saving
> act of the eternal God."(76)

And John Baillie argued that for a stable culture to exist, one which would

give aim and purpose to all education, it would be necessary to have common

convictions in the "effective majority"; for him only the Christian religion

provides both stability and acceptable, common convictions(77).

These comments and solutions tend to be vague because they are not

realised in any detailed conceptual framework.   This could not be argued

against the views of Moberley who made a penetrating analysis of the university

issue.   He argued that only by a return to the Christian tradition would society emerge from chaos.   But before developing the Christian claims he considered two important counter-philosophies or what he calls "spurious remedies";   these are classical humanism and scientific humanism.   On the one hand:

> "classical standards emanate from a small and tidy world...
> But the world and the men with whom we have to deal are far
> more complex and intractable than the classical picture
> allows...(the classical temper) was authoritarian whereas
> ours is democratic;   mechanical, where ours is egalitarian;
> complacent, where ours is iconoclastic."(78)

On the other hand, scientific humanists:

> "offer no adequate ethic for the planner.   They throw much
> new light on the question of how to plan, but little on the
> question to what end to plan."(79)

Although Moberley is generous in his discussion and convincing in his rejection his interpretation of the nature of his opponents is somewhat contrived.   It is far too simple to suggest that the move away from a Christian centre is led by adherents of a pagan literature on the one hand, and a post-Christian science on the other.   These oppositions (which, incidentally, make it relatively easy for him to advocate his own liberal Christianity) are really irrelevant.   The case against Christian values,as such,at least in the educational field, was led by historical and social scientists concerned with the mechanics of the here and now.

However, his own advocacy is not a narrow, traditionalist one:

> "the social embodiment of Christianity in one age is not
> suitable for another."(80)

He even goes so far as to reject the idea of a totally Christian university:

> "any Christian revival, in our universities as in the world,
> must compromise not only recovery but also some element of
> discovery."(81)

His realisation that the old Christian tradition was irrelevant places

Moberley in a different category to many other Christian writers and also
indicates the extent to which he has absorbed the strength of the socio-
cultural case:

> "In existing conditions any 'agreed philosophy' could only
> be an ideology, that is a pattern imposed on the situation,
> and not growing out of it or organically connected with
> it."(82)

However, despite his apparent understanding Moberley's solution is
inadequate.   He accepts that no one group has a monopoly of right-thinking
and virtue so he urges co-operation and the sense of community, within the
University;   serious discussion amongst all members on vital issues;   refusal
to pursue principle to extreme positions, followed by some kind of positive
commitment.   What must be developed is:

> "a sense of responsibility of a new type...By that is
> meant a responsibility for the corporate activities of
> the large-scale society, or societies, of which he is a
> member and for its systems of routines.   These things...
> are not mechanical but result from the interaction of
> myriads of wills."(83)

But, as Ortega pointed out:

> "the school (and University) when it is truly a functional
> organ of the nation depends far more on the atmosphere of
> national culture in which it is immersed than it does on
> the pedagogical atmosphere created artificially within it.
> A condition of equilibrium between this inward and outward
> pressure is essential."(84)

Moberley's solution by emphasising individual assertion tends to ignore
the full importance of cultural forms;   which would not achieve the full re-
discovery which he wants.   However, his analysis was more searching than any
other writers' in the period and his synthesis was a response to the feeling
of democracy prevalant at the time in that it was so free and open.

Far more than in any other issue considered in this thesis the university
problem grappled with fundamentals.   Though organisation and plans were

occasionally emphasised they were generally seen against the need for some prior aim (see Lowe, for example). .It was because of this preoccupation with ends that few writers concerned themselves with issues which certainly occupied the thoughts of other groups in society. For example, no writer considered the implications for the Universities of the concept of equality of opportunity(i).

This disregard of practical points is emphasised in the almost total absence of ideas for new university courses or even new Universities(ii). An indication of the reluctance to contemplate this kind of departure can be gained from the apparent fact that the U.G.C. had deep reservations about the sanctioning of Keele in 1949:

> "In view of the limited nature of the curriculum proposed it has hardly to be wondered that the U.G.C. had grave doubts as to the claims of the college for university status and might very well have withheld its support had not Sir Walter Moberley and R.H. Tawney shared Lindsay's enthusiasm for a new experiment in university education, and carried their colleagues with them."(86)

Such neglect, of course, is an ever-present danger for the theoretician; certainly it was well manifested in the university issue.

(i) Though the Nuffield Report did touch on it briefly when it made tentative population projections.
(ii) Though as early as 1942 Lord Lindsay was conceptualizing his 'Keele Experiment'(85)

Religion in Education

Whatever the general attitudes about religious life or the religious tone of the British people, the problem of religious education in the period was made extremely difficult by the specific of sectarianism. Before dealing with the religious debate, therefore, it will be useful to sketch the main points in the history of the problem.

Until 1870 the state bore no responsibility for the establishment of schools or colleges in this country and the places of education were all of private foundation. Of the elementary schools which had been established by 1870 the majority were either Church of England (run by the National Society) or Free Church (run by the British and Foreign Schools Society) with a tiny minority Roman Catholic. The religious education given in the schools was according to the provisions of the Trust deeds under which they were founded.

The Education Act of 1870 created School Boards and (with later Acts) laid on them the responsibility, in consultation with the Education Department, for building such new schools as were necessary, with the help of Parliamentary grant. In this way there came into existence the Dual System, two types of school working side by side; viz. provided schools, being those provided by a school board or, after 1902, by a local education authority; and non-provided schools established by the Churches or private charities.

In religious teaching the Act introduced the Cowper-Temple clause which laid down that if religious training was given in a provided school, no religious catechism or formulary of any particular denomination should be taught. A conscience clause was also inserted by which a parent could

withdraw his child from religious teaching.

The 1902 Act handed over the responsibilities of the school boards to newly-created L.E.A.'s, whilst still continuing the Dual System, though additional public aid on a substantial scale was given to non-provided schools (aid which included help towards maintenance costs and teachers' salaries). Repairs and enlargement to premises, however, still lay with the managers.

The controversy, which at times was bitter, which surrounded the passing of the Act indicated a real conflict of principle which had echoes in mid-century. The extreme supporters of school boards had endeavoured to drive the voluntary schools out of existence for they assumed that direct control, wielded by a popular elected vote would produce the most wise counsel. On the other hand, there was the principle held by the denominationalists, that Education was too closely linked with private conviction to be brought wholly under the control of public authority. Both points of view were respected in the 1902 Act and in that sense it was a compromise measure.

As a result of the reorganisation of elementary education proposed in the Hadow Report of 1926 and adopted by the Board of Education, the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches planned the building of denominational schools (at senior level) and the 1936 Education Act provided 'inter alia', that if a local education authority was satisfied as to the necessity for the building of a non-provided senior school in their area, then they could make a grant to the promoters of the school for between 50% and 75% of the building cost, and receive back 50% of their expenditure as a grant from the Board of Education. The result of this Act was that 519 proposals for new senior schools were submitted in the three years that were allowed, 289 from Roman Catholics(1).

Before the outbreak of war there was one more development of major importance, the publication of the Spens Report in 1938. This Report indicated that, for pupils over eleven, educational arrangements had ceased to correspond to the actual structure of modern society. The Report's recommendations, especially the proposed parity of esteem over the range of secondary schools, made explicit the principle of equality of status implicit in the Hadow Report. The Spens Report sounded the death knell of the Dual System for the provision of different types of school covering a longer school life would be an impossible financial task for the Churches.

Owing to the outbreak of war the 1936 Act and the provisions of the Spens Report were still-born, but as the urge towards a desire for a new educational set-up grew in the early 1940's, it became clear that agreement on the religious issue was a necessary pre-condition for any large-scale educational reform. Half the schools in the country were Church schools but their organisation and amenities were far behind the State schools in many instances. For example, on the Board of Education's black list, published in 1925, and therefore out-of-date by the outbreak of war, 541 schools were non-provided and 212 were council schools(i). Further, nearly 92% of non-provided schools were housed in buildings erected before 1902(2). Clearly, such anomalies had to be rectified before a "new era in education" could begin.

From 1870 there had been piecemeal movement towards a revision of the

----

(i)   The White Paper, 'Educational Reconstruction' noted that on 31st
      March, 1939, 62% of pupils of senior school age were in schools
      especially designed for that age range. The corresponding figure
      for non-provided schools was only 16%. Para. 47 (b).

National System, with the State taking more responsibility all the time. The new pressures of war made the situation critical, and the choice lay between ending or mending the Dual System.

Foremost among opponents of the system were the teachers and the administrators.   The teachers, as represented by the N.U.T., had very definite views:

> "Experience has shown that the legal safeguards and
> divided responsibilities of the Dual System have given
> rise to endless complications in administration;
> educational progress has therefore been retarded and
> friction engendered...Administrators and teachers are
> convinced that the system is inconsistent with proper
> economy and efficiency."(3)(i)

Ideally, the Union required the abolition of the whole system but in any case they required that the powers of voluntary school managers be severely curtailed.   For example, the organisation required that L.E.A.s be given:

> "1.   Control of secular education in all primary and
>   secondary schools.
> 2.   Power, subject to the consent of the Board of
>   Education, to cease to maintain an unnecessary
>   school.
> 3.   Vest the local authority with the duty of the
>   appointment and dismissal of teachers.
> 4.   Safeguard any member of the teaching profession...
>   from any religious test."(4)

Similarly forthright in their opposition were the directors and secretaries for Education:

> "...the dual system is an impediment to good organisation
> and to the general provision of satisfactory working
> conditions.   Unless it is brought to an end it will prove
> an increasingly serious obstacle to the re-fashioning of
> the educational structure."(5)

(i) The efficiency argument spilled over into professional considerations,
     for the Union strongly objected to Church Ministers inspecting
     religious teaching: 'N.U.T. is strongly opposed to the appointment of
     members of the clerical profession to supervise and inspect the work
     of teachers.   We do not admit their competence' - Editorial in 'The
     Schoolmaster', 24th October, 1940.

Like the teachers they would have preferred abolition but short of this they required extensions of the powers of the L.E.A.(6)

The Free Churches were broadly lined up with the teachers and administrators, but they had no constructive policy to suggest. They objected to denominational instruction at public expense, holding that such teaching should be carried out in the home and Church rather than in the school(7). They hoped for a unified system under public control but realised that this could not be obtained without the voluntary school buildings and these would be too expensive to buy. However, they had no more positive ideas on the issue.

It will have been noticed that no one centre of opposition is apparent in the foregoing quotations nor is there any mention of religion. This insistence from secular bodies on legal, technical or administrative details as foci for opposition to the Dual System was very striking and prevalent at the time (i.e. pre 1944)(i). However, this is not to imply that such bodies ignored the religious aspect of the problem. One of the most authoritative and serious statements came from the Conservative Party. A Party document argued that a basic consideration should be:

> "Emotional awareness by the individual of a purpose at once
> transcending and governing not only his own life but the
> whole contemporary and terrestrial scene - this is an essential
> condition of all social excellence and the general character
> of all active religious belief... It must therefore matter
> greatly to the State that its citizens should possess this
> emotional awareness."(8)

As well as exhibiting this intelligent, sensitive tone this was one of the few documents which understood the historically-determined principles

---

(i) For example: the Liberal Party's 'Education For All' 1942 and the Co-operative Union's 'Plan for an Educated Democracy' by J. Thomas 1942.

on which the Dual System rested viz. secular, popular control and a respect

for individual conscience(9).

There was certainly more specific and intelligent thinking in this

document than in some others, which confined their religious comments to

vague generalisations, such as these from the National Association of Head

Teachers:

> "A sound, Christian education should be the aim of any
> religious teaching in all schools...Christian education
> is not confined to the period specially allotted to
> religious instruction, it is imparted in all lessons and
> at all times."(10)

The most important set of attitudes regarding the Dual System rested

with the Anglican Church for it owned 85% of the non-provided schools(i).

The situation was complicated because there existed a wide range of opinions

within the Church, and this range itself indicated a developed attitude since

the beginning of the century, an attitude developed by the pace of events.

Firstly, the Church of England had virtually ceased to be a school-building

Community and little attempt had been made to keep pace with urban sprawl

in the large cities(ii).   Further, the Church had actually been giving up

many schools since 1902 and the number of children attending had shown a

great drop(iii).   Clearly, there was less enthusiasm for maintaining church

---

(i)   The figures for 1938 were: Church of England - 8979) Board of
                                  Roman Catholics   - 1266) Education
                                  Methodists   - 119) Reports.
(ii) It has already been noted that their response to the 1936 Act was far
      less enthusiastic than the Roman Catholics.
(iii) Schools: 1903   1938
                       11,687   8,979
      Pupils: 2,338,602   1,125,497
      Reports of the Board of Education.

schools than there had been in the past; a leading church writer had

argued that:

> "It would be no less than disastrous to hold children to
> the denominational point of view at the expense of the
> educational efficiency it is their national birthright
> to possess. It is not fair to condemn them to an inferior
> system of education because the church wishes to maintain
> new schools."(11)

The emphasis was shifted into an attempt to ensure sound christian

teaching for all children.   Many people had become appreciative of the

Agreed Syllabus instruction which had been developed in the previous decade(i).

Some opinion within the church believed with Canon Brayley that it was

possible, :

> "for the Church of England to spend her money much more
> profitably - that she ought to go out for something
> bigger and wider than can be obtained by clinging to the
> present, denominational position."(12)

Similar views were held in the country at large; this, for example,

from a powerful secular supporter of the Established Church:

> "Its (Church of England) leaders may well ask themselves
> whether a frank readiness to surrender the Dual System
> at this stage might not best solve the interests of their
> own Church, of religious education, and of Christian
> unity."(13)

On the other hand there was a strong body of opinion which held that

only a church school could achieve a truly Christian atmosphere.   For

example, Spenser Leeson argued that the case for building as well as for

the maintenance of denominational schools, at public expense, was impregnable

---

(i) This had been started in Cambridgeshire in 1924 and according to
     'Hansard' by 1942 over one hundred authorities were using agreed
     syllabuses - Lords Volume 121.   Col. 875.

though he did not believe that national opinion had reached a position where it would accept such an arrangement(14).

Some writers put the denominational case in the language of the educational theorist.   W.R. Niblett argued:

> "For Christian education one needs a Christian society.
> The only way to achieve this is for the individual
> Christian to create cells of Christianity - because a
> Christian society is...an arrangement of things so that
> those who seek intimacy with others may attain it."(15)

And at least one prominent educationist did not even admit the tension within the Dual System.   Basil Yeaxlee argued:

> "We have all been perplexed and inhibited by difficulties
> connected with credal affirmations, tests for teachers,
> emphasis upon doctrine, necessity for state neutrality and
> so forth.   It now seems clear that if we begin at the other
> end, by agreeing upon a few legislative and administrative
> reforms, controversy about these other matters becomes
> unreal, since either the ground for dispute is removed by
> the legislation or adjustment is easy within the new law."(16)

This spread of opinion within the Anglican community could explain the difference in tone of the speeches made by Dr. Temple, the Archbishop of Canterbury.   In June 1942 in his first speech as President of the National Society he made a strong defence of church schools and said:

> "If we wish to avoid totalitarianism there is merit in the
> very duality of the Dual System."(17)

But as the months wore on he stressed the need for realism and compromise. Speaking to his first Diocesan Conference in Canterbury, July 1942, he said:

> "Our main business is surely not to be fighting a rearguard
> **ga**ction in perpetual retreat until we are driven off the field
> by the competition of the resources of the State, but to take
> care that we are interpenetrating with our influence all that
> the State is doing."(18)

Naturally, Dr. Temple's influence was very great in the Church and it was largely through his efforts that the Church Assembly accepted the

October 1942 National Society document, 'The Interim Report On The Dual System'(i). This document is important in two senses. Firstly, it was the 'right of way' which Mr. Butler needed to go ahead with his reforms for the 1944 Act; secondly, it illustrated the compromise which Anglicans had made over the denominational issue. The moderate tone of the document is indicated immediately:

> "In its support of the Dual System the National Society
> has been concerned to secure that religious instruction
> in schools should equip the children for their membership
> of the Christian Church as a worshipping community, and
> in present conditions this must mean membership of one or
> other of the various Christian denominations...In this,
> the Church of England seeks no denominational advantage
> for itself, but desires similar opportunities for all.
> The National Society has long advocated the giving of
> facilities in Church Schools to parents of children not
> belonging to the Church of England for such teaching as
> they may desire."(19)

And, "The National Society would agree to an amendment of Section
> 33 of the Education Act of 1921 which would enable the re-
> organisation of non-provided schools to be carried through
> by the L.E.A.(20)

The Free Churches were fairly happy with the total document because it conceded the hard, denominational atmosphere in schools. In fact, over the previous decade the Anglican and Free Churches had grown closer together in common recognition of the hardship that an insistence on the extreme position involved. The fact that over one hundred L.E.A.s were using Agreed Syllabuses also helped the friendlier atmosphere(ii). A good example of

---

(i) The discussions which preceded this decision are well documented in
Marjorie Cruikshank's book 'Church and State in English Education',
Macmillan 1963.
(ii) A further example of this amity can be seen in a reference by Spenser
Leeson to an unofficial conference of Free Churchmen and Anglicans
which met in 1937 "to consider the present position of religious education
in England and to suggest measures for its fuller recognition and
improvement". 'Christian Education', p. 206. (Longmans 1947).

the concord can be seen in the document which the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Wales issued with the full support of the Free Churches, and presented to the President of the Board of Education in August 1941. This dealt with the training of teachers and with the giving of religious instruction.

It will be necessary to briefly mention the Roman Catholic position here because the attitudes expressed were the least compromising of all the Churches and gives one indication as to why the 1944 Act had to be a total compromise. One reason why the Roman Catholics were not as prepared as, say, the Anglicans to come to a compromise was that they did not have the same buildings difficulties. Many of their schools were newer and the proposals that they had submitted under the 1936 Act would largely cater for their senior pupils (once conditions allowed full implementation of the Act).

The Catholic position is well indicated in the following statement:

> "Catholic children shall not attend schools that are non-Catholic, confessionally neutral or of mixed religious composition - that is to say those that are open to non-Catholic pupils. It is the exclusive province of the diocesan bishop to determine, in accordance with the instructions of the Apostolic See, under what circumstances and with what safeguards attendance at these schools may be permitted, in such manner as to avoid perversion of the children's faith."(21)

In effect, this means that children should have religious education in accordance with the wishes of their parents, and for Catholic parents religious education must include religious instruction in Catholic doctrine given in a Catholic atmosphere by Catholic teachers(i). Throughout the

---

(i) See also F.W. Drinkwater, Year Book Of Education 1933.

discussions prior to publication of the 1943 White Paper and the 1944 Act they maintained this consistent position. Whereas some Anglicans felt that the transferring of Church Schools to L.E.A.s was a betrayal, the Catholics had no concern for their buildings or management as long as the teachers were Catholic and the teaching was given in a Catholic atmosphere.

Even after the 1943 White Paper had been published in the July the Catholics still took a rigid line, despite its being a delicate structure of finely balanced interests. For example, in January 1944 the Hierarchy issued a statement which declared:

> "We have never accepted, do not accept and never shall
> accept the Bill as it now stands."(22)

As it happened Mr. Butler was able to persuade them into a more realistic view, and it was largely his personal intervention which turned the scale.

It will be useful at this point to examine the main provisions in the 1944 Act in order to show just how far the Churches had come to terms with the conception of secular control of schools. It will also indicate that they had sensed the new atmosphere of purposive debate and the desire for a change in the basis for an educational system. The main features were the revival of agreements for those schools which were to have been built under the 1936 Act (Special Agreement schools) and, for all other schools (i.e. Voluntary schools), the choice lay between accepting the alternatives of 'controlled' status or 'aided' status(23). The balance created by these ideas is important for it meant that the Anglicans and Roman Catholics would benefit by the new exchequer grants to those schools choosing 'aided' status and those choosing 'controlled' status would gain because something of their historical continuity would be preserved. On the other hand, great sacrifices were implied in these alternatives. If 'controlled' status was

accepted then the denominational atmosphere would be lost; if 'aided' status was taken, then heavy financial burdens would be imposed through new official requirements regarding new schools(i).   Through the same balance, critics of the Dual System would be glad because of the extension of public control and the reduction of the number of tests for teachers.   But at the same time they had to agree to additional public expenditure on denominational schools.

In general, opinion accepted the 1944 compromise and it may be that people instinctively recognised the Act's triumph of balance whilst at the same time feeling satisfied through the realisation that the position of the voluntary school had become more firmly established; and that religious influence had been given an official place in the state system of education:

> "...the school day in every county school and in every
> voluntary school shall begin with collective worship on
> the part of all pupils in attendance."(24)

Clearly, the religious groups were very much aware of their position and were prepared to actively pursue their attitudes in the educational debate.   But it is also interesting to note that there was a religious tone in the debate carried on at the secular level; a debate concerned with the influence which religion should have on educational policy.   The general feeling can be distilled from Mr. Chuter Ede's remarks to the House of Commons, March 1944:

> "There is, I think, a general recognition that even if parents
> themselves have in the course of life encountered difficulties
> that have led them into doubt and hesitations, they do desire
> that their children shall have a grounding in the principles of
> the Christian faith as it ought to be practised in this country."(25)

(i)   'Aided' schools were made responsible for the capital expenditure on alterations required by the L.E.A. to keep the premises up to standard, and for expenditure on repairs to the exterior of the building. Actually, only half of the cost would be found by managers of such a school.

But one can also see the religious conception behind the Act in two specific provisions. The clause indicating that children should be educated wherever possible,

"in accordance with the wishes of their parents"(26)

was inserted on the basis of the argument that it would ensure the right of a parent to send a child to a denominational school even if it was not the most convenient one(27).   The other provision was the inclusion of the word 'spiritual' in the statement at the beginning of the Bill:

> "And it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental, and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout those stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of their area."(28)

The fact that a distinction was made between 'spiritual' and 'moral' indicates the religious preoccupations of Parliament, in this context.

However, although the religious tone is evident in the Act, and despite clear evidence from Parliamentary debates that many members hoped for education to be pivoted around a religious atmosphere, its basis in a wider reality is not so obvious.   Attitudes expressed in the two Houses appear to have been totally subjective and, at times, even bordering on the histrionic. Obviously emotive arguments can partly be explained by the war situation but they do not give a basis for the apparently genuine religious tone of the Act.   For example, the Earl of Selbourne argued that the main enemy was not Hitlerite Germany but:

> "naked, materialistic paganism which has reared its head in Europe to a height unknown for a thousand years and which threatens Christendom to-day."(29)

If such generalised and unsupported ideas are placed beside Sir Ernest Barker's comment, then a completely different impression is made;   an

impression suggesting that the religious atmosphere in England was one where the mass of the people were dragged along by a convinced, if vague, leadership. Barker felt that people's attitude was one of respect for religion, a mixture of:

> "vague uncertainties, ...real sympathy and good feeling mingled with a large measure of indifference and ignorance."(30)

However, whatever the actual religious tone of the country, in Parliament there was an almost complete expression of religious 'positivism'. Only Aneuran Bevan appeared to present the view that Education should be no concern of the Churches.

Having looked at the religious issue from without, as it were, it now remains to consider the educational aspect of religion, and also the attitudes which people inside the Church had towards the teaching situation.

In the decade before the war one can see a definite change of direction in the policy of the religiously-committed elements in society. There was a movement away from the relatively easy acceptance of a belief in a Christian England, and a therefore complacent view that all was well. Such a view was superficially helped in that church schools were still very much in evidence despite the encroachments of a secular society. However, various factors impelled thinkers to question the narrowly religious approach to Education. These factors produced an active attempt to define a national recognition of the religious factor in life. Broadly, many churchmen became personal and tiny pressure groups operating at the level of ideas and theory, and all the

time widening the scope of the argument(i).   The ideas were generated by a
spontaneous concern for the religious element in national life and there
did not appear to be any centrally organised plan in the way that a conventional
pressure group would operate.   The culmination of all the activity and
arguments can be seen in the 1944 Act where religion received a statutory
place in educational practice as opposed to administration.

Two factors aided the attempts to increase the impact of religion.
Firstly, the Anglican and Free Churches were moving closer together and were
slowly sinking their differences;   secondly, there had been a broadening of
the whole concept of education in the twentieth century and one of the
important modern ideas was that of the education of the whole child.   This
involved the spiritual aspect of education to be fed on religion.

Impetus was given to these basic factors by the reticence of official
documents.   This led the activists to formulate their ideas into logical
structures which would galvanize opinion by their very reasonableness and
shape.   It will be necessary therefore to have some indication of the
frustration that the activists must have felt.

A good example of official thought can be gained from a study of the 1937
edition of 'Handbook of Suggestions'.   This text was a fair summary of the
best in the practice of the period yet in its 600 pages there was only one

---

(i)   There was a considerable number of books and articles written
      offering religious approaches to education and social problems, e.g.
      H.K. Luce: 'Religious Education in Secondary Schools' in 'Religion
      In Education' Vol. 4, No. 3, 1937.
      B. Yeaxlee: 'Religion And The Growing Mind', Nisbett, 1939.
      Reeves and Drewett: 'What Is Christian Education?', S.P.C.K., 1942.
      D. Paton: 'Religion In The University', S.C.M., 1943.

reference to religious teaching:

> "the chapters which follow...cannot deal with the valuable
> training that is given through the social life and daily
> routine of the school and the personal influence of the
> teachers, or with the religious teaching which most people
> will agree has a powerful effect on life and character."(31)

In 1938 the Spens Report was published and although war was imminent no attempt was made to approach a comprehensive philosophy of Education (for the Secondary area anyway). Instead the Report tended to reiterate old ideas such as the one asserting that the activities of a school should be chosen, "with a view to the pupils' physical, intellectual, moral and social development".(32) Though a new note was struck when the Report went on to claim that:

> "The national tradition in its concrete individuality must...
> ...be the basis of an effective education."(33)

However, little attempt was made to define any basic assumptions relating to the place of religion in the national tradition, surely something which could have been expected.

It will be useful, at this point, to consider the views of the activists. One of the interesting aspects of their several positions is that they were aware of criticisms and they did attempt to meet them. As early as 1938 Canon Brayley, an indefatigable writer in the period, produced a book in which he attempted to apply to the teaching of religion the ordinary principles of class teaching, and he argued that each stage of childhood has its own peculiar characteristic which had to be catered for in religious teaching(34).

The 1939 Cambridgeshire Agreed Syllabus had as its aim the attempt to meet the needs of elementary schools not by setting a scheme of actual lessons but suggestions which would be apt for the psychological attitudes of the young at different age levels.

Basil Yeaxlee conceptualised these attempts at marrying Religion and Psychology when he discussed the idea of transference. He interpreted this term as situations which would lead to the transferring of the energies of the pupils to ideals at different stages of development:

> "At every stage of our teaching of the Bible, therefore, we are educating boys and girls into an understanding of a reality which does not conflict with their most vital impulses but fulfils them. We are enabling them to transfer their infantile affections from their parents to a Father who is not the antithesis of normal human parenthood but the author and sustainer of it."(35)

These developmental arguments were answers to the views of people who objected to the rigidity of theological views in general educational situations.

D.E. Evans attempted to summarise and then answer general criticisms in an article entitled 'Religious Education And Some Critics'(36). He isolated three groups: firstly, the secularists, or those who would exclude all Christian education from state schools; against such people he argued that they attach far too much importance to formulated, intellectual beliefs. He argued that it is thought and conduct which matter, which imply a developing situation rather than a static, formulated one. This accords with a life-principle (change), and is also a truly Christian viewpoint. This is satisfactory as far as it goes but he does not offer any evidence which would show the onlooker that his assertions had validity. In fact he merely substitutes terms. His second group of critics he called the anti-positivist school, which holds that positive assertion of Christian beliefs is merely propaganda. Evans dismissed this with the claim that such a view reduces all education to an absurdity, and in any case such an argument is itself positive assertion. The third group is represented by the rationalists, who claim that religious instruction should be concerned with the doctrines and practices of the great Historical Religions. Evans countered this with the view that

such an attitude is totally unacceptable because the approach is different in

kind from a Christian approach.   However, much of his case is lost when he

goes on to develop his view, for he argues that a detached, critically-minded

teacher would be required for the rationalist scheme whereas the Christian

teacher needs the:

> "warmer qualities of conviction and sympathy based upon
> knowledge."(37)

Surely both sets of qualities are necessary for any teacher(i).

Other activists felt that the critics were asking Christians point-blank

questions as to the nature of their responsibilities.   For example, Canon

Cocking felt that the Churches were being asked:

> "What do you really care about?   Is it the training in
> the Christian faith and character of every child who comes
> under the whole, educational system?   Or is it the
> maintenance and extension of sectional privileges?"(38)

Unfortunately Cocking failed to provide answers to the questions, but

he did suggest that what was required generally was co-operation between the

churches and the whole educational and administrative systems.   Given the

number of general educational ideas being developed even in 1941, this was

an unremarkable comment.   It was also a view which did not offer any helpful

---

(i) Evans had formulated his own programme for Christian education some
     two years previously when he offered four basic assumptions from which
     Christian education should operate:
     1. High value to be placed on the individual.
     2. Train individual both to lead and to follow freely.
     3. Worship in school, every day.
     4. Scriptures to be studied because they are the sources for the
        Christian order of society: 'Religion In Education', Vol. 7, No. 1,
        1942.   Article entitled, 'Religious Education'.

specifics.

M.L. Jacks saw the chief opposition as an ambience of ideas, which he grouped under the umbrella of 'child-centred education'. He argued that such a view was a poor preparation for life because it:

> "ignore(s) the law of discipline, which is the Law of God...
> ...They (the theorists) take no steps to ensure that the
> self which they would have express itself is worth expressing;
> self-control must come before self-expression. They confuse
> individuality with individualism and forget that man...needs
> the society of others, with its resulting duties and obligations,
> for his true growth as an individual."(39)

He argued that this kind of basic assumption resulted in sloppy thinking and a relativist approach to problems of value, which would lead to a slackening of the discipline essential for both education and life. His answer to such a situation was that he envisaged as the three-fold obligation of schools, the need to study God, things and man:

> "for only so can we discover our place in the scheme of things
> entire, know the truth and do it."(40)

M.V.C. Jeffreys also saw the main critic as an assumption of ideas though he was able to specify their source. He quotes a passage from Hogben's 'The Creed of a Scientific Humanist' (in 'Dangerous Thoughts') to indicate the basis of a view which he regards as a weak-minded retreat from the spiritual and religious problem:

> "The social contract of scientific humanism is the recognition
> that the sufficient basis for rational co-operation between
> citizens is scientific investigation of the common needs of
> mankind, a scientific inventory of resources available for
> satisfying them and a realistic survey of how modern, social
> institutions contribute to or militate against the use of such
> resources for the satisfaction of fundamental human needs."(41)

Jeffreys argues that this quotation is typical of the educational thought of the period, arguing that it was escapist and therefore irrelevant because it did not face up to the basic problems of the relationship of individuals to

society and of both to God.   For Jeffreys the answer is essentially a
religious one because the only way to make sense of moral relationships is to
assume the existence of a God.   Such an attitude, though, is surely too
exclusive.   Pagan humanists made much of moral relationships from a basis
of Justice, for example.

Spenser Leeson was also very much aware of the rational and scientific
criticisms.   His comments on this attitude can be used as a starting point
for consideration of views within the Anglican Church as to the purposes and
content of religious education.   His argument was that immediately before and
during the war England was living off spiritual capital and that the vision of
a central, spiritual purpose in life was rapidly fading away.   His corrective
to this was to forge a closer link between Christian ethics and the Christian
faith(42) and his justification for adopting such a position is explained in
the following passage:

> "By a strange twist that same spirit of secular humanism,
> that sought so passionately in the early days to exalt the
> dignity of man, has now joined with tyranny to degrade it.
> His dignity means his freedom as made in the image of God to
> fulfil the divine will for him.   Secular humanism denies
> that there is an image of God or a divine will.   So tyranny
> finds in it a congenial ally, for where God is faithfully
> worshipped, tyranny can never have a clear and open field.
> Secular humanism teaches men to look to the state for every-
> thing, their religion included, and so if a nation that thinks
> itself free shall play with secularism, its freedom will fade
> out of sight and be lost."(43)

This is hardly a fair statement for it proceeds from one unexamined
assumption to the next.   History provides many examples (e.g. the Inquisition)
of faithful worshippers exerting a tyrannical influence.   It is a distortion
to dismiss secular humanism as state-centred, for individual rights and the
responsibility of the individual intelligence to order his experience meaning-
fully in a total social context are also emphasised by humanists.   Further,

it is obvious that an agnostic or atheistic social worker can still help or save those in need and this, presumably, motivated by love and compassion; and such a person is an example of one who has effectively divorced Christian faith and Christian ethics. It could even be argued that such a person is extending the possibilities for freedom in the recipients of the help, through their emancipation from difficulties.

There are other sections in the book where Leeson makes large statements which are either contradicted or, at least, placed in a very different perspective by his later, qualifying comments. For example:

> "We shall never, as teachers, lose sight of the sanctity of scholarship and of technical proficiency; but they will be all the more sacred to us because we shall pursue them no longer as separate, or as ends in themselves, and because we shall recognise in the pursuit of each subject an opportunity of practising ourselves in a divine virtue - integrity in the search for truth, self-discipline, industry, wide-mindedness, balance of judgment, perseverance."(44)

The first part of this statement suggests that Leeson is subscribing to the idea of the autonomy of the subject, but this should be an end in itself, rather than a means to the practice of divine virtue. In any case the list of qualities at the end of the quotation has no suggestion of divinity about it but rather of scholarship.

The absence of a tight control in these passages is not altogether typical of Spenser Leeson for in other writings it is he who demonstrates the weaknesses in similarly generalised propositions. For example, in a criticism of the Spens Report he complained that the Report contained too many clichés and that it failed to ask relevant questions(i). Other churchmen agreed with Leeson's

---

(i) For example, he criticized the Report's loose advocacy of a conception such as fostering free growth of individuality, without asking just in what direction the growth would take - 'Religion In Education', Vol. 6, No. 2, 1939, 'The Spens Report'.

intellectual aims, and Alan Richardson argued that a Christian education would foster them, but he took his aims much further. He considered that complementary to the intellectual aim of education there would also be a social one:

> "...(to) build up a character which exhibits...the social virtues of discipline, loyalty, community sense and obedience."(45)

He asserted that the only education which is likely to produce this end is a religious one because it enables:

> "the individual to perceive the nature of the conflict within his soul and which points the way in which the tension may be resolved."(46)

Clearly, to concentrate upon ends is very important but the ends which the educator is supposed to produce are secular ones (according to Richardson) and the religious content is only a means by which an unspecified tension may be relieved. His argument is therefore unacceptable as theory because too generalised; there is no reason, for example, why a good secularist-based school could not produce his ends. It is also unacceptable as religious education, because based upon secular aims.

M.V.C. Jeffreys did not make this mistake, but offered consistent religious aims:

> "The unifying purpose should be a Christian purpose – meaning that education be understood and experienced at its full depth, in which God's purpose for man sets the standards of judgment and endeavour."(47)

One can justifiably ask how is one to know God's purposes and who are the people able to interpret them anyway. Such interpreters would be most important for they would have to decide whether the purposes were valid in a time of rapid social change (such as war); indeed, whether war was part of His purpose anyway. Further, there would be the problem of reconciling Christian aims in a social situation where children were continually confronted with non-Christian ideals, such as status and acquisitiveness. However,

whatever the internal problems produced by such comments, the basic position is at least consistent with a religious viewpoint, which is more than can be said for Richardson's position, and also that held by other critics.

For example, W.R. Forrester argued that the whole educational process required a religious atmosphere and he felt that if religious education was anything it was a "quality of education, and not R.I. added on to the three R.s"(48). But his conclusion was that the character of the teacher is all-important and "his basic qualification must be sincerity". This is a strange position to adopt because if the teacher's character is all-important then his example is going to be the educative factor and his sincerity may, or may not, be religiously motivated even though this will give the essential quality of education. The point about the view is that it does not obviously admit to the intervention of a supernatural agency; the position is nearer to a humanist viewpoint.

M.L. Jacks also thought that a religious ambience was the basic necessary quality for religious education, and he felt that a sacramental aspect was missing from the country's teaching(49). He suggested that the truths of scripture should be taught in and through every school subject. This spirit, which informs the whole, is what constitutes religious education for Jacks. In other words judgments would be made from the viewpoint of the Christian.

Most of the sources quoted have been similar in one respect; they have tended to highlight one part of the problem and then generalised in discussion of it. However, Jeffreys was an exception in that he took a much more comprehensive view. He attempted to develop not only a critique of educational ideas and practices, but also of the social and cultural sources from which they derive. Central to the issue is the conception of sin, sin not as total depravity, but as rebellion, the disposition of man to make himself his own

God. He argues, therefore, that being God-centred Christianity is ultimately incompatible with man-centred ideas, and, secondly, that the Christian revelation is alone commensurate with the full dimensions of life(50). Using these two principles as criteria he argued that the current conception of education was ethical rather than religious. Jeffreys always uses this religious criterion and he is more concerned with the ground on which values rest than with their specific content. The outstanding merit of this book is, indeed, this consistency, though it does produce a weakness, namely, a failure to develop the themes so as to suggest practical significances. This would have been excusable, given his concern over premises, but he does occasionally suggest functional roles but leaves them undeveloped. For example, it is something of an anti-climax after reading the school projected as a kind of 'ecclesia', to find Jeffreys content with undenominational teaching(51). Even more striking is his failure to bring out the importance of Church reform. He is clearly aware of the Church's weaknesses but tends to ignore them; yet surely there is a sense in which a secular culture makes a Church more rather than less important. However, despite the weaknesses Jeffreys did attempt to consider basic ideas against the background of the general turmoil of opinion.

So far we have seen in this brief survey that the religiously-committed thinkers, though obviously trying to gain central educational positions for their spiritual-educative systems, nevertheless were aware of opposition and even made attempts to modify rigid standpoints in order to compromise and move nearer to the 'educational efficiency' which so many secularists were assumed to want. Perhaps this apparent urge to modification resulted in a basic confusion in their thinking, a confusion containing two emphases. Firstly, there was a confusion between religious education and

religious instruction.   The statement on Christian Education issued by the

Archbishops in 1941 dealt almost exclusively with religious instruction(i), as

did the Agreed Syllabuses.

An individual who illustrates this 'instruction principle' is M.L. Jacks:

> "The study of the Bible must always be the basis for
> religious instruction...an examination of the content of
> the Christian faith, and of its meaning as an interpretation
> of life, and the application of Christianity to personal and
> public problems, are essential parts of religious instruction;
> but the first essential is to find out what Christianity is
> and the evidence for that is in the Bible."(52)

However, other writers took religious instruction to be a much more subtle

matter for they argued that spiritual nourishment could be found not only in

the scripture lesson but in all lessons, and in the whole business of living

a common life.   Canon Hodgson made this interpretation very forcibly:

> "If what we need is to let our faith unify the heterogeneous
> activities of men and nations, we shall not achieve this end
> by concentrating upon a departmentalised instruction in
> Christian faith and practice...Christian education is not an
> education in a particular subject but a particular kind of
> education in all subjects."(53)

The basic objection to this is that it is too vague.   One would like to

know, for example, just in what sense would specific disciplines be inter-

preted in a Christian way;   and whether or not this would not gradually erode

the conception of the autonomy of the subject, or discipline.   The vagueness

_____

(i)   The February 1941 proposals by The Archbishops of Canterbury, York and
      Wales.   The famous five points dealt with were:
      1. Religious teaching to be given in all schools.
      2. R.I. to be an optional subject in the Teachers' Certificate.
      3. Only trained Christian teachers to give the instruction.
      4. The Teaching to be inspected.
      5. An Act of Worship to be compulsory in all schools.

is brought about because there is no clear resolution of the religious issue

as a matter of scriptural instruction or as a generalmethod determined by faith.

The second emphasis within the basic confusion was that of confusing

religious instruction with ethical teaching.   Canon Brayley, for example,

argued that:

> "The main thing is to shape the child's character and to give
> him sound principles of conduct and worthy ideals of life."(54)

R. Dunkerley argued in similar vein:

> "...the personal element is of vital importance in the growth
> of moral and spiritual ideals",

where he pivots his case around Whitehead's view that moral education is

impossible without the habitual vision of greatness(55).   One has to consider

these confusions against the background of the war.   Many people saw the

vital issue of the times as being a moral one and the Parliamentary debates

clearly showed that many people made a close equation between moral virtue

and religion.   The religious thinkers, therefore, must be seen as not merely

attempting to gain sectional advantage, but also as attempting to relate

their convictions to a social purpose, however indirectly.

A.V. Murray saw religious education against the background of what he

thought was the essential basis of Education:

> "Education is rooted and grounded in social structure and
> planning in education must have reference to social
> structure."(56)

These comments clearly show an awareness that religious education should

be something more than a mere reinterpretation of symbol and ritual;   that it

should have some relevance for the age(i).   Certainly the concern felt in
our period for a more democratic and just society (however vague these ideas
might have been) was well indicated in the religious sector.   The number of
organisations and individuals who urged the concept of efficiency on the
church schools shows this though, significantly, most of them were secular
groups.

The two most interesting things about the religious issue in the period
are, firstly, the way the debate reflected the general feeling in society for
change;   secondly, the unrealistic nature of some of the essentially religious
ideas.   The first point is clearly manifested in the 1944 Act, which was a
consensus Act in so many ways.   But more subtly it was reflected in the tone
of the arguments.   Nearly all the writers considered show a willingness to
consider different attitudes.   Sometimes the views are rejected (as in Evans'
rejection of the rationalist position);   at other times, ideas are incorporated
into a modified religious attitude (as in Murray's ideas which have clear
links with F. Clarke's conception of the relationship between education and
society).   Clearly, the willingness to consider seriously other points of
view is indicative of a possible willingness to accept new structures.   The
second point can be seen in the view of the religious thinkers.   They

---

(i)   It should be stated that not all writers agreed with such a view.
      Basil Yeaxlee argued: "Education, and above all religious education,
      is now conceived as a process of fostering the native powers of
      children and young people in such a way that they may perceive what
      is true for themselves and love it for their own sake."   'Religion
      And The Growing Mind' (op. cit), pages 5-6.
      Interestingly, the views of Murray and Yeaxlee, as indicated in these
      quotations, reflect the more general educational tension between an
      individual-orientated education and a social-orientated one.

considered the function of religion and, in doing so, variously interpreted it as either religious instruction, religious education (in a wide sense) or ethical teaching. However, this attempt to consider assumptions led them to neglect concrete possibilities. Only two instances have been found where the ability of the teacher to <u>do</u> all the things projected was considered. As it happens neither of them were very sanguine as to the teachers' intellectual command(57). This emphasis upon assumptions was a parallel movement to that going on in the general educational debate; where, for example, the economic capability of the nation to carry out ideas was not considered by many groups.

Overall, the religious debate well illustrates the recognition of the need for change, but a change not revolutionary in nature but rather based on traditional forms. In the larger framework of ideas the religious thinkers and planners would hold their place amongst the 'practical theorists'.

The Public Schools

It is possible to see two main strands in the Public Schools issue, during our period, strands which reflect the polarity of attitudes which normally arose when this issue was under discussion.   The two strands were composed: of the pro-School group which emphasised the various elements in the Public Schools tradition;   and the anti-School group which emphasised the social basis of the Schools.   Ironically, at times, a social reason was given for abolishing the Schools though such writers would claim to have a general and altruistic social sense rather than a confined and sectional one. For example, Fred Clarke wrote:

> "It seems clear that the essence of the matter (the Public
> Schools question) is the closing of a division in the nation
> which, tolerable as it may have been in other conditions,
> can only prove disastrous in the years that lie ahead.
> There seems general readiness to accept the necessity but
> not much evidence of an understanding of all that is implied
> in the way of sacrifice.   We must recognise that a nation
> divided in the old way is no longer possible.   There is
> need for a thorough-going realization of the idea of community
> issuing in a genuinely common education."(1)

He went on to argue that the only solution to the problem was social and that cultural privilege would need to be abolished throughout society.   Apart from such minor irony it will have been noticed that the quotation does not place any emphasis upon educational criteria, an omission evident in the rest of the article.

This is a feature of much of the debate in our period, when the critics of the schools rarely bothered to find out what actually went on in the establishments, preferring to accept hearsay.   Alternatively, they might concentrate only upon the social aspect of the problem, sometimes producing a pseudo-political rant rather than a piece of analysis.   For example, Arthur Calder-Marshall claimed without any evidence that:

> "The interests of the Public Schools coincide with the
> vested interests of all those institutions sheltering
> under the capitalist system...The huge, vested interests
> of the Church are voluntarily supported by property-
> holders, so long as they preach a capitalist morality and
> give the divine sanction to inequality."(2)

On one occasion he descended to abuse and characterised all Public Schoolboys

as "muted individuals whose mean is mediocrity,"(3) a comment whose contrivance

is suggested by the studied alliteration(i).

The aim of this chapter, then, will be to consider the quality of the

debate in an attempt to see how the pressures of war reacted upon people's

views about the Public Schools.

The attitudes of the anti-School group were succinctly stated by a group

of scholars who issued a 'Manifesto' in the 'Times Educational Supplement'.

This view is an accurate indication of the general position of the 'anti-group'

throughout the period:

> "....that the system of Public School education is undemo-
> cratic. It segregates those children who, by inheritance,
> proceed to leading positions in industry, politics, the
> civil services, the armed forces, and by its training
> strengthens their social privileges. It is socially
> injurious since it divorces this section of our people
> from the rest, from the life of the main part of the
> community, especially from all those engaged in the pro-
> ductive processes, and manual and technical labour."(5)

It should be stated that though this view has the tone of an assertion,

in fact there was some evidence for the claims.   For example, it was

calculated for 1939, that out of 830 holders in high office in Church,

---

(i)   It should be pointed out that the pro-school faction also had writers
      who made generalised and emotive comments which were, at best, rather
      silly, and at worst, totally unhelpful.   For example, the Headmaster
      of Dover College wrote, "if tests of upbringing and character can be
      devised for elementary schoolboys, then the fears of governing bodies
      will disappear."(4)

State and Industry 636 had been to Public Schools. The same report noticed

close links which existed between the Public Schools and the older Universities,

arguing that this completed the circle of disproportionate privilege(i).

This argument against the privileged position which the Schools held was

a common one in the period. The London County Council even went so far as to

publicly dissociate itself from any co-operation with the Schools arguing that

the independent boarding schools were educationally undesirable, under the

principles on which they were operated(ii).

H.J. Laski also made a strong attack on the social implications of a

nation possessing a Public School section, in the English sense. He argued

that an essential condition for social unity is that there shall be no mis-

understanding between classes. However, in England, he thought such mis-

understanding was almost inevitable because the classes were separated from

the earliest years of childhood. Laski further argued that State Education

was bound to be inferior to that of the private sector because the education

of the most powerful and monied elements was unrelated to, and independent of,

the education of the masses. Finally, that since the ruling ideas of a society

are generally those of its ruling class, then the English educational structure

dangerously narrowed the experience from which any ideas would come. The

---

(i)   Scholarship List at Oxford and Cambridge, December 1942:
      Public School Awards:

	Nat. Sci.	Classics	History
Oxford	19 of 21	All 62	37 of 38
Cambridge	39 of 41	34 of 36	40 of 43

      Quoted in W.E.A. pamphlet 'The Public Schools and the Educational
      System' 1943, page 20.
(ii) For a rather one-sided discussion of this see 'Journal of Education',
      Volume 75, Number 884, March 1943: "The L.C.C. and the Public Schools".

main weakness in his general argument is that he seems to consider the narrowing of experience only in strictly social terms; he neglects the intellectual and stimulative experiences of school life. Many Schools, as will be shown later, were making rich and wide cultural efforts for their pupils, facts which Laski conveniently ignored.

A more generalised left-wing view was given by Aneurin Bevan who argued that in the past the Public Schools had been vital and necessary elements in English history but all the good in them had been emptied into "the broad streams of education", and that all our general educational system was doing was prolonging a physical structure void of any contemporary sanction. He concluded with the point:

> "If you want to democratize the children of the public schools
> as distinct from the quasi-democratisation of an institution,
> the best way to do it is for the whole school population to
> pass through the state system."(6)

The argument, of course, is very close to Laski's in that the emphasis is placed on the narrowing of experience. But there is nothing in the wide generality of his solution which indicates anything positive. His whole case rests upon the interpretation that one places upon 'democratize'; but whatever this is there is nothing inevitable in the possibilities for social cohesion and social closeness merely because different types of children are placed together. Organisationally an institution could function smoothly but permanent sympathy would not be an inevitable result.

This vagueness or the tendency to narrow the problem into an abstraction such as 'social equality' or 'democracy' was typical of the attitudes of the Left. The Communists were extremely direct in their approach, totally committed, but generally unhelpful since they made an uncritical acceptance of State control the plank for their views:

"The Communist Party urges that all Public and Private
Schools should be fully incorporated into a unified
State system. This implies that these schools should
cease to function in their present form, and be brought
under the control of local education authorities and
conform with other State Schools in charging no fees
and in inspection, staffing, and equipment."(7)

R.H. Tawney, in a study he undertook for the W.E.A. made a statement

compounded of good sense and exceptional looseness, suggesting perhaps that

prejudice was gaining the upper-hand in his thinking:

"The fundamental issue is simple. It is whether the
existence of a group of schools reserved for the children
of the comparatively prosperous and in a large measure
isolated from the public system of education is or is
not, as the world is today, in the best interests of the
nation. It cannot be decided by the venerable device of
describing privileges as liberties. Educational freedom,
like other kinds of freedom, does not consist in the right
of every individual to use such economic advantages as he
may happen to possess in order to secure special opportunities
for himself or his children, or in the unfettered discretion
of those who control educational resources to employ them if
they think fit, to gratify that national anti-social egotism."(8)

The second sentence probably puts the whole issue succinctly, but the third

and fourth sentences introduce an emotive note, on the one hand, and several

major confusions, on the other. Firstly, it cannot be considered reprehen-

sible to gain for one's children a better education than one's own, even if

this is gained by spending money; especially if this is chosen rather than out-

lay on luxury consumer goods. Secondly, though it is possible to consider as

reprehensible the attitude by which one accepts an inadequate state system

because one is able to opt out, it is not reprehensible to accept the fact of

the existence of independent schools as such nor the willingness of parents

to send their children to them. Finally, it can hardly be considered as

anti-social that one is prepared to provide a better education for one's

children than is locally available(i).

However, not all the attitudes of the Left were divorced from actuality.
The T.U.C. for example, saw two sides to the problem:

> "The great majority of these (Public) schools are based
> on class distinction, and insofar as that is their only
> claim to existence they should be abolished. On the
> other hand there are a number of private schools with
> very high educational claims. Such schools may well be
> brought within the State system and it is to be hoped
> that they will be free to preserve and develop any special
> characteristics which they may possess."(10)

Vagueness and superficiality were not confined to the Left, however.
The Fleming Report made some statements suggestive of a refusal to think
issues through to their conclusions. One of the Report's discussions(11)
deals with the criticism that the high places in Church and State normally
went to Public School products and to no one else. The defence which the
Report offers is that since universal Secondary education did not come into
being until 1902, and that since high position does not arrive until middle-age,
then it would only have been in the decade 1930-40 that much impact could
possibly have been made. This is a reasonable argument but then the Report
exhibits a certain superficiality. It reinforces the defence by arguing that:

> "...the process would still be retarded by the natural
> tendency of the dispensers of patronage to select persons
> of the same type and outlook as themselves,"(12)

but makes no comment upon a system which results in this kind of in-breeding;
to speak of "natural tendency" is surely to avoid the issue.

(i) Forced logic was also in evidence in the writings of some of the
     critics. For example W.B. Curry argued that the degree of social
     privilege in England was incompatible with "genuine democracy".
     Since the main bulwark of privilege was the Public School then they
     must be abolished. Such a statement is satisfying in its neatness
     but totally unhelpful in its untested generalisations. It superficially
     carries its point because of the introduction into the argument of an
     emotive and vague abstraction ("genuine democracy")(9)

In the same Report the comment is made that:

> "the trend of social development is leaving the Public
> Schools out of alignment with the world in which they
> exist."(13)

But the only concession made to social development in the Report's

recommendations was to widen the basis of recruitment. This may or may

not have been a practical and realistic view, but it was certainly an

inadequate one having already argued that social development, and all that

implies, was moving away from the Schools.

It will have been noticed that the criticisms so far considered con-

veniently and comprehensively advocate blanket abolition of the Public Schools.

The situation, however, was not quite so simple because of the existence of

two strata - the Independent Schools and the Direct Grant Schools(i). The

W.E.A. study of the issue, published in 1943, did consider the problem from

all aspects and it makes the most intelligent and balanced appraisal of any

of those produced by critics. Its weakness was the common fault of much

educational thought in the period - that of uncritically accepting emotive

conceptions which they unconsciously filled out with social and human implica-

tions. Throughout the pamphlet the Association urged that a democratic

school system should be set up(14) and quoted with approval a statement made

by Sir Stafford Cripps:

> "If there is to be equality of opportunity for youth, then
> our children must share a common system of education with
> those of all others."(15)

They failed to critically examine the conception of 'equality of

opportunity', nor did they offer the educational principles for the 'common

---

(i) This distinction was made in the Fleming Report: paragraph 92.

system'.   Nevertheless, they felt it necessary to examine the Independent

sectors separately by considering the Direct Grant Schools and the boarding

schools individually.   The Association argued that the Direct Grant Schools

should be completely assimilated into the State system(16), arguing that

there was no educational advantage in the existing situation and that, in

any case, such Schools fostered a special social prestige completely out of

harmony with the spirit of the times.

On the Boarding School issue the Association made their most telling

point in their anticipation of the argument that such Schools provide a

training in community life which would prove of highest value in the post-

war world.   The Association argued that if that was so then it was the duty

of the State to provide boarding education for all children above a certain

age.   On the other hand if it were impossible to provide such facilities

then they became a scarce commodity and should be "distributed on sound

rationing principles"(17).   Unfortunately no indication of the democratic

principles on which such rationing would be determined was indicated in the

pamphlet.

The Association's proposals were certainly open and far-reaching.   They

argued that all the Schools should become public for the first time though

they did not offer a uniform plan.   The suggestions considered turning the

Schools into L.E.A. day schools, and even adult education centres(18).   In

keeping with the open aspects of their proposals the Association did not

reject boarding education outright as they felt that children in need of such

a regime should be given the opportunity:

"Children whose health, or residence in a rural area
far from a day school, or other circumstances make it
desirable they should have a Boarding School education."(19)

The first part of the sentence is clear enough as to general criteria
for selection but the second part begs every question. Clearly if 'democratic
principles' are to be the basis of a system then one must know on which
principles 'other circumstances' will be judged. The failure to define
these principles throughout the pamphlet produced a soft centre of ideas,
not wholly masked by the apparent reasonableness of specific proposals.

Overall, the critics allowed their attachment to ill-defined and larger
social ideals to obscure the educational issue. There is some excuse for
this since life was being lived at high pressure during the war and therefore
future ideals would naturally exert a strong pressure on the intellect at any
given moment. However, such conditions do not excuse the refusal to consider
the educational merits of the Schools and such neglect resulted in a distorted
view of the problem. Instead of considering the Schools as part of the social
and cultural history of the nation and then evaluating their educational role
in a carefully-analysed social context, the critics tended to see the Schools
not as functions of a society but as anachronistic functions in a future (and
abstract) democracy. And this resulted in the nugatory nature of their
basic pivots.

Weakness in the arguments centering around the Public Schools was not
confined to the critics; the pro-School group had their far share as well.
For example, J.L. Papillon argued that the Schools developed:

> "a manly, straightforward character; a scorn of lying
> and meanness; habits of obedience and command, and
> fearless courage. Thus equipped he goes out into the
> world, and bears a man's part in subduing the earth,
> ruling its wild folk, and building up the Empire."(i)

This kind of emotive and dramatic comment is worthless as a serious statement, with its exaggerations and unsupported generalisation.

E.H. Partridge made similar claims, claims having more in common with some mystique rather than education.   In discussing the suitability of Agriculture as a school subject he argued that no boy:

> "need turn aside from farming as offering no opportunities
> for 100 per cent. twentieth-century Englishmen."(20)

However such comments do not represent the total picture which the apologists offered.   The Conservative and Liberal parties made important defences of the schools.   What was impressive about the Conservative case was its sound, practical logic and its refusal to seduce by high-sounding abstractions.   One suspects that their arguments were so forthright and well worked out that they were uncomfortable.   Certainly no sustained attack was mounted against them, and in fact, one important writer gave high praise to the Party's general educational ideas(ii).   Their basic standpoint can be seen in the following quotation:

> "We will only say that, in our judgment, the special contri-
> bution made by the public and preparatory schools to the end
> we are discussing (the education of talent and the development
> of leadership) is too valuable to be jeopardised if they were
> to lose their independence and become a mere part of the State
> System.   The aim should be, on the contrary, to increase the
> value of their special contribution."(21)

(i)   Quoted with approval by B. Darwin in his book 'The English Public School', page 21, Longmanns 1938.

(ii) See H.C. Dent's 'Education in Transition', page 188.

The Liberal Party, however, tended to exemplify the woolly thinking which was so often associated with this topic during the period:

> "The Public Schools should be preserved, but maintained
> as an integral and essential part of the national system
> of education. Their advantages and amenities should
> become available to all children likely to benefit by the
> training they afford, irrespective of the financial and
> social position of their parents. But if they are to
> become part of the national system of education they should
> have more roots in the localities in which they are situated."(22)

The main weakness of this comment is that assumptions are unexamined. The assumption that it was feasible to make the Schools local, by the stroke of a pen, seems extremely naïve. Obviously, Schools which, by definition, placed their children in a specially created environment would not be able to immediately reflect the social traditions of another stratum of society. Secondly, there is no evidence in the Liberal view which indicates that local schools are always and inevitably desirable.

The emphasis placed upon leadership and training in these two documents was paralleled by C.E.M. Joad. Although he claimed that the Schools turned out "philistines and civilised dullards" he still felt that methods were very valuable. He contended, firstly, that they did not make concessions to difficulties and therefore maintained the intellectual effort which any pupil needs to make. Secondly, the Schools emphasized the Classics which Joad feels has the virtue of postponing intellectual maturity until the last possible moment, though it is not clear what he means by this(23). Joad thus took a very narrow view of the Public Schools; however he enlarged this view in 1945 when he gave a social rather than intellectual emphasis to his arguments. He contended that it would be socially just to open them up for all those who could benefit by them, which would entail a State take-over and a reorganisation as boarding schools for Secondary children(24). Whether

this would be socially just is itself a debatable point but in any case a State take-over would not be the only method whereby his first aim could be achieved. The main weakness in Joad's thinking in these two instances is that he does not examine the Schools' tradition within a modern society. Consequently he tends to abstract both his emphases, thereby dissipating his arguments.

Donald Hughes set out to place the Schools in the intellectual context of the age, as he saw it. He sees scepticism as the main contemporary danger and he called such an attitude:

> "a thoroughly disreputable educational ideal. It is,
> after all, only a rather pretentious name for ignorance."(25)

Education needs to be re-orientated, so his argument runs, with Christianity as the pivot for all knowledge:

> "To divorce learning from religion is a heresy, for all
> knowledge is only an approach to Truth, and what is
> Truth if it is not religion?"(26)

To achieve this aim Hughes wanted to see an aggressive propagandising of Christianity where all subjects would be linked to the unity of Christian truth:

> "The heart of our problem is our national distrust of
> authority, and the right and natural pride which we take
> in our tradition of freedom in our education. But we
> are in danger through our failure to understand the true
> nature of freedom; in teaching people to think but not
> what to think we shall produce the 'clever devils' against
> whom we have been warned."(27)

This authoritarian tone is a constant factor in Hughes' thinking and he claims that the Public School is the institution which aggressively inculcates a rigorous moral tone:

> "In most (Public) Schools there is an agreed standard of
> moral conduct which their members are called upon to
> observe.....we do not regard these standards as being of
> doubtful value.   We think it would be difficult for any
> community to exist without them."(28)

This view, arguing for the production of a type as an educational ideal

is superficially appealing especially in a time of great social change.

Especially so since it could be argued that an individual is only liberated

for creative development when he has a stable base from which to move.   And

this, he claimed, is what the Schools do:

> "I am convinced that our wisest choice will be the Public
> Schools which have met the lesser demands of the past and
> which will not quail from the titanic tasks of the future.
> Not moulds producing a type to order, not refuges of
> privilege creating a gulf in our social life which nothing
> can bridge but democratic strongholds of the Truth, educating
> a balanced individual in a community which will respect his
> personality while claiming his service."(29)

It is interesting and significant that Hughes, a supporter of the schools,

equates them with democratic practice.   The reason, clearly, is that he sees

democracy not as a system of technical equality but as an atmosphere of freedom

through which balanced and free individuals are produced.   This is an important

difference of approach from that of the critics of the schools, who concentrated

upon an uncritical acceptance of the technical equalities.

This concern for what might be called a 'spiritual' atmosphere in

preference to a greater amount of technical freedom in, say, recruitment is

well shown in his practical schemes.   He argued that the State should aid the

schools in such a way that 40% of their pupils' fees could be remitted;   but

he does not want to place the figure higher than 40% because:

> "I think it is desirable to maintain, as far as possible, the
> traditional character of the schools and, therefore, during
> the transitional period, it would be better to have a large
> number of boys there of the type which has made and preserved
> the school traditions."(30)

Thus, despite opening up the Schools to bursary-holders he is still mainly concerned with the spiritual status quo(31).

Hughes' attempt at an analysis of the whole system was a serious attempt to place the whole problem on a rational basis, and also on a basis which took cognizance of general social factors and attitudes.   Certainly his advocacy of the Schools as strongholds of Christian morality and educational freedom was consistent with his general framework of ideas.   His main weakness was a certain irascibility with critics, where he tended to dismiss the attacks with urbane generalisation:

> e.g. "Most of the criticisms have been violent, some passionate, and some cynically detached; a few of them have been reasonable and almost all of them have been immature."(32)

He was not alone in this kind of denunciatory method(i).   However, Hughes brought a note of serious intelligence to a debate which at times tended to be submerged in abstractions.

The interpretation of democracy, as a general spiritual freedom regulated for the individual through deliberate channelling of attitude, within the School community, and thereby leading to balanced, individual freedom was also promulgated by John Wolfenden.   He also cleared away some confusions by making the point that the people who objected to the Schools actually objected to the method of recruitment rather than to the education provided(33).   The point was well worth making because most critics did not even bother to find out what went on in the Schools' classrooms.   He further made the important historical point that:

(i) See B. Darwin's 'The English Public School', page 33; Longmanns 1938.

> "They (the Schools) exist to satisfy a demand....
> they must be regarded as one among countless other
> reflections of the structure of the country, as one
> mirroring in microcosm the whole system of which they
> are a part."(34)

After this introduction Wolfenden went on to make specific defences of

the Schools, defences which have two main pivots. Firstly, he argued that

the Schools provide stability at an important stage of life; secondly, that

they offer relevant experience for life. The physical and organisational

nature of the Schools ensures this stability because of the sense or order

inherent in them, and in their well-defined educational goals. This community

atmosphere is crucial and peculiar to the Schools, particularly in their

boarding tradition. The day-boy in a State school would have to contend with

different people and conflicting opinions in his home life, and Wolfenden

argues that this is harmful and unsettling(35). On the other hand, for the

Public School boy:

> "....the selection of human minds and characters among
> whom he is to grow up is made for him. He is given a
> small, concentrated, limited field of action, with all
> the irrelevant strangers excluded."(36)

These ideas represent the basis of Wolfenden's view, a view which implies

that the best preparation for society is to be cut off from it in the early

years in order to develop individual strengths within a small, ideal community.

All that can be said about his argument is that it is a theoretical one

(despite the existence of the Schools), because he does not offer any evidence

which would show that a child educated in terms of both the local community

(i.e. town or village) traditions, and also national, cultural traditions

would be less well-prepared for entry into the adult world.

Wolfenden has an articulate ally in F.C. Happold who made exactly the

same point regarding the necessity for a selective environment:

> "This conception of the homogeneous, self-educative school
> community is of vital importance.   It conceives of education
> as coming not primarily through words but through situations;
> not primarily through courses of study but through an
> intangible spiritual atmosphere created by the community.
> All available evidence tends to show that such a community
> cannot come into being except by segregation, not of varieties
> of ability, indeed the more variety within certain limits,
> the better, but of type, characterised by what I can only
> call natural sensitiveness."(37)

It is worth noting that the Fleming Report questioned the largeness of such

claims(38).

Again, it is necessary to note the insistence upon an ethos as opposed to

organisation, the emphasis which many critics placed upon the problem.   This

consistent position which the Schools held, of defenders of an attitude, is

well illustrated by their willingness to make concessions at the organisational

level.   For example, the Headmasters' Conference offered to consider ways of

coming to terms with the State(i).   The ideas were put forward by Spenser

Leeson in a letter to 'The Times':

> "We shall be ready to enter into discussion with any
> person or body of persons interested, in order that mis-
> understandings may be removed."(39)

This, of course, was very vague but some months later a more specific

announcement was made.   The Conference desired:

> "First, an extension of boarding-school accommodation so that
> any parent who wishes to have a boarding-school education for
> his boy...shall be able to have it...Next, that the parents of
> these boys shall pay what they can afford...Thirdly, that schools
> should make a contribution where they are able to do so, while
> the remainder of the cost should be met out of public funds...
> We believe that this is the wisest method of advance; it is not
> revolutionary; it builds on existing foundations and it pro-
> vides for the extension and growth of a principle widely admitted."(40)

(i)   It should be pointed out that one writer, viewing the situation retrospec-
      tively, claimed that one of the reasons for such reasonableness was that
      the schools were going through a period of financial crisis.   See
      'British Journal of Educational Studies', Volume 111, Number 1, 1954,
      'The Public Schools and the Welfare State' by D. Chrichton-Miller.

Clearly this is an attempt to meet some of the demands of the critics but the statement suggests that the Conference had not really perceived the mood behind the criticisms, a mood which reflected a demand not merely that the Schools be thrown open to the less-privileged but that they should be fully incorporated in a national system. There was a further demand implicit in the critics' views, which was that the Schools should be of maximum utility to the whole, social body, though admittedly there was an unexamined assumption, within the demand, that such utility would be best achieved by preventing the development of any sort of elite.

One other main defence of the Schools remains to be considered and it has links with the spiritual ambience which so many writers thought was worth preserving. This was religious atmosphere.

Most of the texts mentioned have something to say about Christian education and the suitability of the Schools to disseminate this(i). No writer went quite as far as Hughes but all felt that the Christian teachings and atmosphere were essential particularly in an age of materialism. The best summary of all the attitudes can be found in the Fleming Report:

> "The School Chapel focusses the growing religious sense
> of the boys and girls in ways to which their ages and their
> school loyalties readily respond, and the common acts of
> prayer and worship, the preparation for Confirmation and
> Church membership, and those possibilities of religious
> education which lie outside the classroom, can become an
> integral part of the school-life and organisation."(41)

And concludes the discussion with the comment that:

(i) For example, D. Hughes' 'The Public Schools and the Future', Chapter 1, page 9; F.C. Happold's 'Towards a New Aristocracy', page 105 following; A.B. Badger's 'The Public Schools and the Nation', Chapter IV, page 49.

> "On the whole, however, it must be recognised that the
> opportunities of healthy religious development which a
> good Boarding School gives are one of the greatest
> advantages of such a school."(42)

However, not all writers felt that this was the case and Badger quotes

several 'Public-School' novels which give a very different picture. Alaric

Jacob's 'Seventeen' offers the view that Chapel was considered, by hard-

swearing youths, to be a place where one had to sit on hard, wooden seats,

dozing through the prayers and sermon. Similarly, in Alec Waugh's 'Loom

of Youth' the boys despise religion, regard God as a prig and are bored by

the services(43).

Unfortunately, Badger does not make clear whether the attitudes are part

of the exigencies of the novel technique or whether they really are dramatising

experience.

Bruce Truscot also denied that the Schools taught Religion and even

claimed that the Public School staffs were not Christian, anyway(44).

However, his arguments can be dismissed because he admits that his only

evidence is from a few personal acquaintances(i).

Probably, the view put forward by 'Six Public School Headmasters'

represented the genuine ethos:

> "The whole basis of Public School Education is Christian,
> which means not a particular type of divinity syllabus but
> a Head and Staff who look upon their profession as a
> Christian vocation."(45)

(i) It is obviously very difficult to gain any reliable evidence on such a
     subject, but if the care with which Chapel developments were fostered
     (in some schools) is anything to go by then the attitudes were more
     than a mere posturing. See Prospectus for Oundle School, 1950, and
     the Quartercentenary magazine of Abingdon (1963) where such developments
     are traced.

The Fleming Committee, which took as its terms of reference:

> "To consider means whereby the association between
> the Public Schools...and the general educational system
> of the country could be developed and extended,"(46)

reflected both the attitudes of the critics and the apologists in the compromise report which they produced.   It recommended that the opportunities in Public Schools should be made available to all pupils and the only criterion for admission should be:

> "the capacity of the pupil to profit by education in the
> school, and that no pupil should be precluded from entering
> any of these schools by reason of the inability of the
> parent to pay fees."(47)

It suggested that two lists of Schools should be drawn up, referred to as Scheme A and Scheme B.   Scheme A referred to Direct Grant Schools and the Committee recommended that they should be accepted as "associated schools", whence they would be required either to abolish tuition fees or, if they were retained, to grade them according to an approved income scale which should provide for total remission if a parent's income required it.   Further, the L.E.A. would have the right to reserve places at such Schools and would pay the tuition fees of their pupils;   and part or all of the boarding fees according to a parent's means(48).

Scheme B applied to:

> "Such Boarding Schools or Schools taking a substantial
> number of boarders as the Board may accept, being schools
> recognised by the Board as efficient and not being run
> for private profit."(49)

These Schools would offer a minimum of 25% of annual admission to pupils who had previously been educated for at least two years in a grant-aided primary school.   They would be given bursaries.

Clearly, the Report was a compromise where the committee felt that the

general educational value of the Schools both as integrated communities and institutions of humane studies(50) had to be balanced against their being out of step with the times (in a broad, social sense)(51).

This second complementary part of the compromise was made explicit early in the Report:

> "it will be most unfortunate for education generally if any school or group of schools, by standing out, creates among the schools of the country a fresh social distinction which can scarcely fail to be more serious than the old."(52)

The Fleming Report was a much more sensitive document than, say, the Independent Schools Section of the 1944 Act, where the only issues considered were the registration and inspection of Schools(53). More fundamental, though, was the fact that the Report reflected in a sense the unsatisfactoriness of the Public School debate in that the strengths of the cases presented by critics and apologists found their way into the final recommendations. It is suggested that the debate was unsatisfactory because each side seemed blind to the value of the other's case. Whereas the critics showed no knowledge of the educational practices of the Schools(i), the apologists failed to recognize the emotional attachment widely felt for 'democratic' (i.e. more open) social arrangements. It may be that this attachment did not always bear scrutiny but the fact remains that the apologists did not take the feeling into much account.

(i) See Appendix IV for some idea of what went on.
Four London Heads actually wrote the following nonsense: "Were the Public Boarding Schools to throw open 100% of their places for scholarships the offer should be rejected. The result would be a system of schools for leaders and a system of schools for the led - more a fascist conception than a democratic one. Leadership must arise from the people and not be confined to a caste of conditioned 'gauleiters'."(54)
'Journal of Education', Volume 75, Number 885, April 1943.

Overall, the Public School debate reflects two general attitudes in our period. Firstly, the tendency to use highly emotional ideas and abstractions without considering basic assumptions. Secondly, the apparent willingness of 'planners' to build or destroy structures without taking cognizance of all the facts. This is well illustrated by both sides in the debate for the apologists, who, broadly, wanted the Schools to develop as in the recent past; the critics wanted everything about the Schools to disappear within a larger plan.

In a broad framework, the discussions would be placed under the umbrella of 'organisational planners' but it is stretching critical licence to call many of the writers 'thinkers'.

Retrospect

"If we accept democracy as the best form of government, then
the greater the understanding and participation of the citizen
the better.   If the increasingly complex society in which we
live is to retain a democratic dynamic, we cannot be too well
educated and we cannot merely judge education quantitatively.
Moreover, democracy demands not only knowledgeable self-inquiring
citizens but, if it is to function harmoniously and effectively,
it needs a genuine sense or feeling of equality...unless there
is a broad and widely accepted feeling of equality, a democracy
will be subject to constant tension, strain and frustration."[1]

So Mr. Willey writing in 1964.   This quotation is a useful one for it suggests

the main ideas which have underlined the changes in educational thought which

have occurred since the end of the second world war in the areas covered by

this thesis.   Whilst it would be an exaggeration to state that English demo-

cracy and English education have been under, "constant tension, strain and

frustration", nevertheless practical pressures have been applied on a basis

of larger theory, resulting in change.   There is nothing new in this but a

new factor has developed, namely the emphasis placed upon research and

organised objective enquiry.   For example, there was nothing comparable in

the war years, to Mr. Kalton's factual survey of the Public Schools[2], nor to

the monumental statistical work carried out by Professor Moser for the Robbins

Committee[3].   This emphasis upon objective studies has been partly a response

to the disquiet felt over certain educational sectors, partly the influence

which sociologists have had on educational thought since Clarke and Mannheim.

Underlying all this has been an ever-present impetus for evolutionary change,

and a constant insistence upon the injustice of the status quo.   In this

connection there is a direct link between the war years and the post-war period,

different only in the sophistication of the arguments.   For both periods were

concerned with the implications involved in the acceptance of a democratic

social framework, the most insistent being 'equality', or in the post-war period,

'equality of opportunity'. A tension has developed out of this second concept which was only implicit in the thought of the war years; the tension created in the attempt at reconciling a general cultural pattern with the need for an élite of excellence.

Willey's emphasis upon the need for a more widely and deeply educated community because of the complexity of society is a reflection of the narrowing down of educational enquiry on the one hand, and the comprehensiveness of underlying aims on the other. Since the war almost every sector of the education service has been specifically investigated e.g. the Plowden Report (primary schools)(4); the Newsom Report (secondary modern schools)(5); the Crowther Report (secondary grammar schools)(6); the Albermarle Report (youth service)(7); the Robbins Report (higher education)(8). All these documents were important in that they examined all the issues related to their particular educational sector and made forward projections of need. This latter activity implies, at worst, an attempt to create a pattern; and at best, the search for principles for action. In any case formal educational enquiry, since the war, has expanded in scope. It is true that in the number of enquiries set in motion, the war period would equal post-war activity but the areas of concern were much narrower in the former period. Apart from the Norwood Report, the Spens Report and the Fleming Report the main enquiries were concerned with higher education at the vocational level e.g. MacNair (teacher training)(9); Goodenough (medicine)(10); Loveday (agriculture)(11). Further, nothing approaching the objective thoroughness of the Public Schools investigation carried out by Mr. Kalton, nor their sociological analysis by Mr. Royston Lambert, occurred during the war years. And these two investigations in particular show the emphasis that has come to be placed upon sociological and statistical method, in educational analysis.

The repetition of the idea of a "sense" or "feeling" of equality in the Willey quotation is interesting because it indicates a new turn in assertions made about democracy and the concept of equality. During the war the concept of equality was seen almost as something concrete which a changed educational practice would ensure for every child. Willey's statement refers to "a sense" of equality which is a very different thing. Indeed, implicit in the use of such a term is the importance of individual awareness, and under such conditions the sense of equality may be different for different groups. Certainly, post-war educational controversy would suggest that it is the sense of equality which preoccupies people, even though they may refer to the concept of (an assumed) absolute equality. For example, the arguments over selection at eleven years old and the Public Schools issue would suggest that the sense of equality is all-important. If, say, both the selection process and the Schools were totally abolished then presumably the sense of being equal would be felt by all. But the real situation of educational equality would not be altered in any way. The researches of Mr. Bernstein(12), Dr. Bowlby(13) and Dr. Douglas(14) clearly show that various kinds of personal and social deprivation are the causes of unequal educational opportunities. Therefore, to alter the educational pattern for adolescents would not affect the issue. Logically the emphasis ought to be placed on lowering the school starting age and equalising social factors, such as housing conditions and book provision. And even then an absolute equality would not necessarily pertain because of genetic differences amongst individuals.

This would seem to suggest that controversy in the post-war period centred around similar issues to those concerning the war-time theorists. This is true in so far as the concept of equality of opportunity is concerned, but the focus of the argument changed so that education came to be considered

not so much as a moulder of society but rather as a social activity with specific functional rôles. This can be seen in the number of projects which have been started since the war concerned with syllabuses and method. For example, the National Foundation for Educational Research granted £58,000 for five years for research into the effects of streaming; £1,300 over three years was granted to Sheffield University for research into the logical programming of mathematics syllabuses; and the Nuffield Foundation made a grant of £100,000 for research into modern languages teaching.

This is not to say that larger social aims have not figured in educational discussion, only that in comparison with the war years they have not loomed so large. When such aims have been pressed, however, the tone has sometimes been alarmist to the extent of warning against inevitable national chaos. Diogenes in the 'Times Educational Supplement' had this comment to make about Mr. Crosland's proposals for the reorganisation of secondary education:

> "Can we afford in this small, overcrowded island the kind of educational chaos that plagued the newly-founded Soviet state in the twenties when a not dissimilar mania for equality and an excessive hatred for intellect descended on the schools... the gulf between private and state education will become a chasm; and the two nations a reality in the sphere of schooling. The lumping together of the intellectually inclined minority with the less able majority, whether teachers or taught, will further exacerbate social tensions as well as inhibiting the able."(15)

Such a view is not very helpful because it is clouded by emotive terms like, "small, overcrowded island"; "two nations"; "obsessive hatred of intellect". The passage is nothing more than an opinion without evidence. And there is no indication elsewhere in the statement that the relationship between a society and its schools has been understood. One must assume from the passage that Diogenes believes that the school system creates the society when in fact, as many writers have pointed out, schools are functions of the existing social

organisation.

Professor Elvin was much more sober in his view of education although the idealistic nature of his world picture tended to avoid discussion of a basic educational function. He argued:

> "We must really come to terms with the problems of individual
> and social life in the new technological context; and we must
> quite seriously now educate for membership of humanity. All
> these things imply an attitude to ourselves and to humanity
> that is not new but is new in the degree of emphasis. That
> is that man has increasingly to take charge of his own destiny
> on this planet. This is the concept, the world-view that we
> have to present to the young through education in the years
> ahead."(16)

This kind of large ideal view has to be carefully tempered by practice. Otherwise the schools would find themselves being the sole agents for what amounts to a moral attitude. To place such a burden upon them would be to risk destroying their power to fulfil their own primary functions, namely the teaching of skills and the developing of individual abilities in order that the pupils can take their place in an existing society.

The Comprehensive school has figured in much educational discussion since the war and its position in 1967, whilst far from being an accepted one is nevertheless much more secure than it was in 1945. Although the number of such schools has vastly increased since the end of the war some of the arguments used in their support are just as vague despite a shift of emphasis. Whereas in the war years it was their value as a social solvent which was canvassed, some supporters since that time have argued on a narrower, educational front. Professor Peter Townshend asserted:

> "The minimum arguments for comprehensive schools are therefore
> that the majority of children can profit from an academic type
> of education until at least 16; that since children's performance
> varies so uncertainly from year to year, decisions about those
> qualifying for VI form work and higher education should be post-
> poned to as late a stage as possible, and that the educational
> standards of the brightest children can be maintained but those
> of the academically weaker children significantly improved."(17)

This statement is vague in that there is no indication as to the meaning of "minimum" in this context. Also it leaves one with the impression that it is nothing more than a reasonable-sounding statement of faith, for there is no clear evidence to prove any of his assertions.

The Labour Party, using similar terms, made the same error. A Party document made the point:

> "The assessment of a child's abilities and aptitudes in the comprehensive school is made over a long period and every opportunity is given to the child who has not been able to develop his or her capabilities to the full in early life. As aptitudes change a wide range of courses is available from which to make a choice and every child can be encouraged to make the maximum use of his potentialities."(18)

Once again this is more a statement of an ideal than of existing practice or fact. Ironically such a statement could be used equally well to describe some Public Schools, with more chance of it approximating to fact.

Not all advocates of the comprehensive school shifted the emphasis onto educational advantages. John Daniels used exactly the same argument that some writers used in the war e.g. Grace Leybourne(19):

> "They (the British ruling class) are on the horns of a dilemma: if we educate working class children to the highest levels, they will endanger the stability of our bourgeois rule: if we do not educate many children to high standards of proficiency especially in science and technology, the growth rate of British capitalist industry will fall behind the rest of the capitalist world."(20)

Arguing from statistics such a view might seem plausible. Mrs. Floud argued that:

> "while the proportion of the relevant age-cohorts of working-class boys passing into the grammar schools has increased by 50% since the war, the figure is still very low - rather less than one in six as compared with nearly one in two of children from non-manual homes."(21)(i)

(i) The Crowther Report also produced evidence to show the social class inequalities of educational opportunity. Crowther Report, Vol. II, page 120, 1960.

The Robbins Report produced similar evidence in relation to university entrance:

> "...the proportion of young people who enter full-time higher education is 45% for those whose fathers were in the 'higher professional' group, compared with only 4% for those whose fathers are in skilled manual occupations."(22)

But such figures are too stark for they need to be judged against environmental factors; levels of expectation and encouragement within the family; and the fact that intelligent people tend to have better jobs and/more intelligent children, even if neither condition is an absolute.   Inequality in proportions may well be apparent in the quotations but the conscious stifling of opportunities for a particular group, is not.   Mrs. Floud's quotation clearly shows a furthering of opportunities and she qualified the above quotation in the same article:

> "There is conclusive evidence to show that awards of places in grammar schools and universities are made today (1961) (as they were not before 1945) to children of all classes on equal intellectual terms; that is to say that the social distribution of available places closely reflects the social distribution of measured intelligence."(23)

However, there is some evidence for another tendency in the period, implicit in the Daniels quotation.   The tendency for education to be discussed in business and commercial metaphor.   For example, Sir Geoffrey Crowther was reported as suggesting the necessity to achieve, "a sharp increase in the productivity of the universities."(24).   John Vaizey asked:

> "How far is it possible to do a more effective job in education, using existing resources, by re-allocating them and using them in new ways, with new aids?"(25)

Finally, Mr. Willey argued:

> "If we compete for world markets, we have to be as skilful, as efficient, indeed as well educated, as our competitors.   Our national survival depends wholly on the manner in which we use our human resources."(26)(i)

(i)   Chapter XIV of the Robbins Report deals at length with higher education in its aspect of national investment.

The commercial flavour to these statements was a recognition of the close links in the total social chain but it also reflects some of the vagueness in, supposedly, theoretical statements. For example, Mr. Willey does not define what he means by "well-educated". The implication is that it means skilful and efficient which may result in education being a very narrow activity. Further, if national survival "depends wholly on the manner in which we use our human resources", then other educational ideals may have to be ignored. It could be that in the search for the most efficient way of using human resources then equality of opportunity would be unrealistic, and would have to be abandoned even as a theoretical position. One suspects that Mr. Willey would not intend such an influence. And if we are to be as "well-educated" as our competitors then direct State intervention could easily result. If we were short of architects, say, relative to West Germany, then presumably the government would ensure an increased supply by the re-direction of resources. And such a situation immediately poses the problem as to the nature of the well-educated community. The point about the Willey quotation, and other similar ones, is that they do not explore this issue nor do they offer a base from which to begin. It would seem reasonable to begin from the position that a term like "well-educated" can only be defined in terms of a particular environment, and not against a necessarily shifting basis such as national comparisons.

The tendency, already noted, to look for more objective evidence before taking up set positions can be illustrated by the Public Schools issue. This has produced a body of information against which many of the war-time arguments can not be sustained. There has also been an important administrative change in that a Royal Commission has been appointed whose terms of reference mark a great change from the Fleming Report terms. Whereas Fleming was

concerned to seek ways of association, the Newsom Commission is to seek ways of integrating the private sector with the maintained system; this is clearly a much sharper term of reference. Finally, the post-war discussion has reflected a more informed level of opinion, and a more fundamental one than existed during the war.

At the same time, opinions bearing great resemblance to war time arguments have been put forward. For example, Walter James in his, 'Independence And The Church School' asserted:

> "I believe that the public aim would be set lower if the private
> system did not exist. For this reason, those who govern
> independent schools have the duty beyond all else of maintaining
> in its full integrity that independence which has been entrusted
> to them."(27)

This statement of faith does not help to clarify the position, a criticism which could be levelled at a paragraph in a Labour Party pamphlet, published for the 1965 General Election:

> "The school is surrounded by its own playing fields of 70
> acres...Nearby are the...laboratories, workshops, swimming
> bath and gymnasium, as well as changing room block with baths
> and lavatories...In 1959 another large block adjoining the
> last was built; it contains a new library, an extra laboratory,
> four classrooms, two common-rooms, and studies for three masters
> and forty boys. In 1960 thirteen more rooms for music were
> added, making twenty-one in all...In 1965 a new indoor 25 metre
> heated swimming bath and a gymnasium fitted for a full-size
> basketball court, or four badminton courts, or an indoor tennis
> court was built."(28)

This passage was quoted in a context to show the way in which privilege is manifested within Public Schools. This may well be the case but it is still not an educational nor a theoretical argument against schools having such excellent facilities and equipment.

However, in general, in the post-war period debate has been reasonable, and much more sober than the war-time one. John Vaizey commented:

> "the discussion has not been about ends but about means."(29)

And the 'Times Educational Supplement' expressed a similar view:

> "The schools themselves have not escaped the diffused
> egalitarianism in the air, and would feel much happier if
> they could claim to be socially comprehensive."(30)(i)

Certainly the Schools themselves have made overtures to the State in an attempt

to come to terms with the public sector. In 1958 the Governing Bodies

Association drew up a statement:

> "the main proposal of which is the establishment by the
> Ministry of Education of a system of bursarships or assisted
> places at Public Schools, the Ministry sharing with the
> parents on an approved scale of fees due to the school and
> drawing its bursars mainly, if not entirely, from those
> previously educated at State primary or secondary schools."(31)

And, in a speech to the House of Commons, Mr. Prior revealed:

> "Eton, Rugby and Winchester...receive two boys each year from
> Hertford County Council. There are many other examples as
> well. Surrey does the same thing, London and Surrey County
> Councils run their own boys' schools at Ottershaw and Woolver-
> stone."(32)

Other speakers in the same debate suggest the extent to which attitudes

on the Left and the Right had come much nearer together. Mr. Crosland argued:

> "I want the Public Schools to be filled by a mixture and not
> by just the richest or just the cleverest children."(33)

And later:

> "I would never dream of suggesting that a government should
> deny any parent the right to pay for education if that parent
> so wished...On the other hand I would like to see the Public
> School system as such wither away."(34)

It should be noted, however, that Mr. Crosland's statements, when taken to-

gether, come very near to the position that, 'parents can pay for education

---

(i) See also motion in the House of Commons, June 16th, 1961:
> "That this House, recognising the valuable contribution that the
> Independent schools have long been making to education, expresses
> the hope that Her Majesty's Government will encourage a closer
> association between the (independent) schools and the public
> educational system."(31)

so long as it is education in the conditions which I prescribe'.

The then Minister of Education, Sir David Eccles, in his reply to Mr. Prior's motion gave his answer to the Governing Bodies Association's scheme and indicated the relative closeness of views of both sides of the House, something clearly demonstrated in other speeches in the same debate:

> "The government see no reason to use public money to subsidise the transfer of boys from one system to the other on a basis of selection in which nobody knows what would be just or why. Still less do we see any reason for destroying the Public Schools altogether. We want the two systems to live alongside and to learn from each other."(35)

There are, perhaps, two reasons for the moderation in the Public School discussions. One is that since the Fleming Report the Schools have adapted themselves well to the conditions of post-war society. They, "are positively booming" noted one commentator(36). Consequently, they have not been placed in the difficult financial positions that they were in during the war.

The second reason is that emotive assertions have been found impossible to sustain because of the evidence of objective, factual research. A number of examples will place this point in perspective. No one can deny that the Public Schools are successful, according to current criteria. Academically, for example, they are superiod to the maintained grammar schools. Mr. Kalton wrote:

> "Fewer than 1 in 8 Public Schoolboys leave school with less than 4 'O' levels compared with 1 boy in 3 in grammar schools; at the other end of the scale 2 in 5 Public School leavers have 8 or more 'O' level passes compared with 1 in 5 leavers from grammar schools."(37)

There is a similar picture for 'A' levels:

> "Most universities have an entry criterion of at least 2 'A' level passes, a standard which is achieved by as many as 54% of leavers from Public Schools compared with 33% from grammar schools."(38)

Mr. Calder-Marshall could not make his strictures about mediocrity on this evidence(i).

Similarly, one can challenge Lord Fisher's claim that:

> "the schools accept it as part of a good education to liberate pupils from attitudes of exclusiveness into a spirit of constructive fellowship."(39).

Mr. Roy Lambert, however, argued:

> "As an organisation, the public school tends to deal mainly with schools of similar kind, status and social composition: in games fixtures, for example, or in social meetings between pupils (some schools prohibit their boys from meeting girls from secondary modern schools or council estates for example). The school thus maintains rather than enlarges the pupil's already limited experience of other social groups."(40)

This also places a candid statement of Mr. Dancy's in a clearer perspective:

> "They (the Public Schools) are in fact (though not in intention) exclusive, not merely academically like the grammar schools or the older universities but also in ways that are apparently unrelated to education."(41)

Factual evidence, then, has produced in the post-war period a situation where most people would accept that the Public Schools have a place in our educational system, though the nature of their place has not been defined. Even the Workers' Educational Association, a most persuasive advocate for radical measures in the war, argued in 1966:

> "We do not advocate that fee-paying should by law be abolished, or that the right to open and to run a private or independent school should be taken away. Such steps, even if they were just and conducive to the national interest, are at present outside the range of practicality, and out of harmony with the mood of the British people."(42)

John Vaizey's view that the Public Schools issue has come to be one about means is substantiated by the number of suggestions which have been put

---

(i) See page 108 of this thesis.

forward by various groups and individuals, none of whom recommend abolition.

J.C. Dancy argued for two basic functions for the Schools:

> "1. They could help to meet the increasing demand for boarding
>   secondary education, especially in the I.Q. range (say)
>   107-115 for which there is virtually no boarding provision
>   in maintained schools.
> 2. They could help to meet the increasing demand for sixth
>   form education...especially to supplement the work of small
>   grammar schools in rural areas."(43)

There is a similarity in these proposals to W.E.A. ideas although the

groups at which the proposals are aimed would differ in academic quality.

The W.E.A. had two main suggestions:

> "We strongly press the claims of two particular forms of
> boarding education: first, a short spell of it for all
> maintained-school children at some stage, as a means of
> pursuing special educational projects and of strengthening
> community among children from different home backgrounds...
> Our second suggestion, the residential sixth form (academic
> studies, age-range 16-18) or junior college (all types of
> studies, academic and technical, age-range 16-18) could
> readily emerge from some of the present independent schools
> which have a fine tradition in sixth form studies."(44)

These two proposals are sensible although the desire to develop the idea of

community seems odd when, elsewhere in the report, the Association rejects

the Newsom Report suggestion of giving residential courses to underprivileged

children(45).   The reason for this is that:

> "it is quite unlikely that these children would be suited
> to the atmosphere and customs of these independent schools."(46)

This argument does not stand up to scrutiny because if children were

to be permanently educated at the schools then they would bring their own

forces of change with them and there would be a gradual reorientation of

attitudes within the school.   It might be argued that such a view ignores the

fact that the Public Schools have adapted to the infiltration of the managerial

and technological class since the war and yet have still retained their

identity.   This may be so but it has been achieved because parents agreed

with school aims.   With the 'Newsom child's' parents there would be no

common bond of interest and the tension which this would create within the

school would inevitably lead to change.   During the short courses the W.E.A.

objection would not apply because the emphasis would be educational in the

narrow sense i.e. emphasising the work to be carried out.

Two other schemes have been suggested which are of interest, although

they are too general to provide clear guides for solution.   John Vaizey

argued that:

> "the Public Schools Commission should draw up plans for each
> school, keeping its individual character, and that a large
> number of working-class children should be encouraged to apply
> for admission."(47)

A similar suggestion came from the Comprehensive Schools Committee although

it did not necessarily imply retention of specific individual character.

The question to be asked was:

> "What are the specific ways in which the maintained system
> of secondary education can be helped by integration with
> individual Public Schools?"(48)

The point to note about these suggestions is that they concentrate upon

function i.e. defining the rôle which the Schools could play in the national

educational system.   They therefore indicate the large shift in attitudes

since the war period, when offensive or defensive positions were adopted

without much recourse to educational ends.   The post-war argument over

function has not moved very near a solution but it has achieved a general

agreement over the definition of the critical area of concern.   A comment

from Mr. Lambert sums up the situation well:

> "In all respects...the problem of the school, home and
> outside society is one of the most pressing ones facing
> the public schools now, both in terms of the school's
> effectiveness in achieving its present ends and in terms
> of the school's potential role in our educational system."(49)

In the sphere of religion in education there have been great administrative changes consequent upon the 1944 Education Act but much of post-war
activity has been a continuation of war-time/attitudes rather than developments of them, and it has only been in the recent past that significantly new thinking has emerged.

Nevertheless, changes have occurred and the Schools Council noted several important ones:

> "In the past ten years (1944-54), along with the process of reorganisation and rebuilding and the study of curricula, there has been a significant change in the emphasis and outlook in the field of religious education in the county schools... The Agreed Syllabuses for County Schools, in the preparation of which the Church has taken a prominent part, have a new emphasis on the presentation of the Bible as a whole, and on the necessity for teaching the Christian faith. Even more important is the increasing concern of teachers and of Advisory Council on Religious Education that the whole great effort of religious education will have little permanent effect unless means can be found by which boys and girls are helped to become active members of a Christian Church."(50)

And,

> "Perhaps the outstanding characteristic of the past ten years has been the steady growth of friendships and co-operation between all engaged in the educational enterprise...since the (1944) Act was passed the relationships between the Churches have been increasingly cordial."(51)

That the two changes described in the first quotation have actually occurred is confirmed from other sources. Basil Yeaxlee, in a survey of Agreed Syllabuses since 1944 wrote:

> "The courses are planned to help children gain during the period of their school life, taken as a whole, an understanding of the whole Bible in outline with, of course, a more detailed knowledge of the Gospels and of the life and teaching of Jesus... Above all, the syllabuses provide help not only in the conduct of the daily act of worship required in all schools, but in the teaching of children at every stage in their development what worship means and how they may practice it, personally and corporately."(52)

And E.C.D. Stanford commented:

> "The keynote in all the subsequent interpretation of the
> (1944) Act and of amending legislation has been partnership -
> a genuine effort to work together on the part of the
> Authorities, the Churches and the teachers."(53)

These changes were inevitable because of the terms of the 1944 Education

Act. But the most important change affecting religion in education has been

outside the school situation, the change in the relationship between Church

and State. This has been a gradual historical movement, but has culminated

in specific administrative measures. In the late nineteenth century and in

the early twentieth century the Church was senior partner and her educational

efforts were directed towards Church membership. After 1944, however, the

Church became subservient to the State, her educational aims changing in con-

sequence to those of meeting the spiritual needs of children within the

educational situation. The emphasis placed upon consensus in the 1944 Act

resulted in the 'religious' clauses being generally accepted despite the

confusion over religious education, religious instruction, and ethical teaching.

This confusion has not been resolved in the post-war period, however, and the

desire of the Church to meet the religious needs of children in the educational

situation has only made the confusion greater - because no agreed principles

have emerged.

A reflection of this uncertainty at the centre can be seen in the way

that Agreed Syllabuses have been subjected to much scrutiny and criticism.

The journal, 'Learning For Living' made the following comment:

> "The fatal flaw in the Agreed Syllabuses...is that they work
> from the abstract to the concrete instead of from the concrete
> to the abstract...this is not the way Christian belief is
> discovered; nor is it the way children learn."(54)

The Newsom Report pointed out that if teachers were left to themselves they

would not choose a literary and historical approach and argued:

> "They (less able children) need to know what answer the
> Christian faith gives. This ought to be given in the most
> direct and plainest way possible. If such changes in
> method involve a fairly general revision of Agreed Syllabuses
> we shall not be surprised."(55)(i)

This disquiet over Agreed Syllabuses has been echoed about the teachers who

use them. W.R. Niblett claimed:

> "there is evidence that much tame and tepid teaching of
> religion in schools still goes on. The supply of teachers
> who vitally relate their teaching of the Bible to life is not
> big enough. And the Churches, by and large, are not helping
> them enough."(58)

F.W. Garforth made similar points, only more bluntly:

> "In far too many (schools) the teaching is desultory,
> uninformed and unrelated to anything beyond itself."(59)

Despite all this, positive and constructive suggestions have emerged for

the reform of the Syllabuses. 'Learning For Living' suggested:

> "...two tasks before those teachers who are willing to re-
> make the Agreed Syllabuses. One is to find a new way of
> telling the story that is past, so that when it is told it
> remains as a 'view' even if its details fade. The other is
> to find a way of joining in the story that is present in
> grappling with the human situation in which boys and girls
> are living now."(60)

That people are willing to re-make the Syllabuses has been evidenced by the

number of schemes put forward since 1960. The Surrey Syllabus of 1963 includes

ten pages of suggestion headed, 'Some Of The Problems Of Religion And Life'(61);

and Doctor Goldman has begun new work in Bible teaching, from the point of view

of a psychologist(62).

The foregoing has been a consideration of religious education from within,

as it were, but there have also been many views directed at the Christian

---

(i) See also, (a) 'Religious Education: 1944-1984', page 195(56).
       (b) Ibid. page 30(57).

education from without, specifically from Humanists.   This non-Christian
pressure for changes in religious education has only gathered momentum in the
latter part of the post-war period but it suggests a radical departure from
the committed criticisms of the war period.

The Humanist view has been confusing in that two separate schools of
thought have arisen.   One is the sympathetic school which, whilst desiring
to alter the aims of religious education, nevertheless accepts that there is
valuable common ground between Christian and Humanist.   H.J. Blackham typifies
this view.   He argued:

> "These foundations which prepare the person for responsible
> living and thinking can be a common concern for those who
> hope to see this preparation consummated in a Christian life,
> and for those whose own convictions make them look for a
> different outcome."(63)

And he went on:

> "...the school as a community can and should have not only
> its common moral foundation but also its solemn occasions
> together, its commemorations, its dedications, its festivals.
> This distinction between what belongs to humanity and what
> belongs to a specific faith need not compromise the universal
> claims of the Christian faith.   It is simply a recognition
> that they are neither to be assumed nor enforced."(64)

Blackham's position is taken by a group of Christians and Humanists who, in
a pamphlet, set out what they considered to be a common aim for the schools:

> "The aim would be rather to encourage responsible moral and
> religious attitudes and choices; and to encourage an apprecia-
> tion of the value and importance of human relationships."(65)

The other Humanist viewpoint is that of anti-religion, and is typified
by Brigid Brophy in a Fabian pamphlet.   She argued that the religious
education issue was in a tangle and that:

> "nothing will release us short of scrapping all the religious
> provisions of the 1944 Act.   If the State is to honour its
> moral obligation not impose on children opinions for which it
> has no warrant, state schools can only be, in matters of
> religion, tolerant and neutral...offering worship and instruction

> "in none, pursuing simply the proper business of schools,
> education, which includes giving a neutral report to the
> children of the facts of the various religious beliefs and
> disbeliefs held in the world."(66)

This anti-religion view is extreme and uncompromising and educationally rather unhelpful. Miss Brophy's argument for neutrality is not likely to confront the pupil with the tensions necessary for personal, moral and social development. Ronald Goldman put this well:

> "Religion is important here (the teaching of morals) because
> it asks all the right questions about men, their relationships
> with each other and their relationship with Creation - and
> these questions of values and their implications for living
> are very relevant to moral growth."(67)

However, her views do indicate how the general picture is becoming more confused and unsettled.

The intervention of the Humanists in the religious issue appears to be producing a significant change in thinking, although it is still too early for this to be clearly seen. However, it does look as though they have turned the argument away from function and towards aims. But the total situation is very unsettled and in this sense the post-war position does not mark an advance on the war period.

The university debate in the post-war period has been concerned with two main issues; the relationship between the Universities and general culture, and the problem of meeting increasing demands for places.

The culture argument was prevalent during the war period when questions as to the rôle a University should play in society were continually being posed. However, the terms of the argument have changed greatly. The problem of specialisation has not been so much in evidence, nor has the tension between teaching and research although this problem has been considered(i). The

(i) See 'The Modern University' by G.L. Brook, page 11(68).
     And below, page 149 of this thesis.

post-war university arguments have been set against a much wider background, that of the culture in which the Universities exist. Within this setting the function of the University has been examined.

Although this situation has pertained during the nineteen sixties Aldsdaire MacIntyre claimed that the wider perspective was not apparent in 1956, a surprising situation given the war-time writings of people like Dobree, Lowe and Moberley. MacIntyre saw the dilemma of the provincial universities as a reflection of the breakdown in the general provincial tradition:

> "These problems are usually considered in isolation as though the difficulties of university life could be surmounted without reference to the problems of social life in general. It is this artificial isolating of the university discussion that leads to the prevalent rash of Oxbridge solutions to Redbrick problems. To turn the provincial universities into residential institutions, to deplore specialist training and pine over something called general education, to long for a tutorial system; ...It would be absurd to ignore the very real problems for which such solutions are offered. But the only hope of solving them is to put them into relation to a wider context."(69)

This kind of plea did not need to be made later in the period. A.H. Halsey, reporting the 1961 Gulbenkian Education Discussion, suggested that university functions:

> "are derived from the massive fact that we live in a culture which, by its nature, generates rapid change. In such a culture the university is conceived of as the central instrument of a triple purpose: it must maintain the impulse to cultural change through research, it must disseminate the basic intellectual elements of the culture and it must prepare the young to live in tomorrow's world as specialised practitioners of the scientific culture in both old and new professions."(70)

And Professor Elvin argued that the two great cultural problems of the time are:

> "to fashion a society that is not only democratic but of a high cultural level, and to fashion a culture that is at once strong in its native roots and broad enough to feel its community with the human culture that transcends national boundaries. The universities are far from being the only agents that may reasonably be called upon to promote these great ends. They do already

> "make great contributions towards them. But a thorough,
> yet at the same time reasonable, canvassing of the needs of
> our time in the universities and among university men and
> women might encourage them to see that these bring a challenge
> to which, in the interests both of our Culture and of our
> culture, we must now rise."(71)

Wider aims are clearly in evidence in this passage but they also tend to
dissolve away through their vagueness. Indeed, the uplifting tone of the
last sentence is very suggestive of some of the war-time euphoric writing.
One has to ask the exact nature of the challenge to which the Universities must
rise. And despite the distinction made between culture, Culture and the
"human culture which transcends national boundaries", a distinction which is
only verbal and is not elucidated, Elvin does not indicate the means whereby
his aims could be achieved. The most serious omission, however, is the
thinking behind his implied view that education, and especially university
education, can somehow fashion culture. The work of Sir Fred Clarke and
T.S. Eliot would suggest that such a belief is mistaken.

Elsewhere in the same paper Elvin makes a statement which modifies the
above view slightly:

> "...the cultural influence of universities may be most happily
> felt when it is implicit in their life rather than explicit in
> their curriculum. It should be a by-product of the life that
> is lived in a university rather than a direct outcome of the
> teaching that is provided there."(72)

The new Universities of York and Essex illustrate in practical terms
this second view of Elvin's whilst at the same time placing strong emphasis
upon the formal, academic relations:

> "Both York and Essex are not allocating any money in their
> building programmes for a conventional student union building.
> This attitude to student organisation cuts them off from the
> nineteenth century provincial universities and from some of the
> new universities such as Strathclyde. Both York and Essex are
> built to comprehend student organisation within the university as
> a whole, rather than as an emanation of something external to it -
> part of a national corporation of student interests."(73)

Such a view also marks a reversion to the Oxford and Cambridge pattern.

York and Essex, however, approach academic teaching from different
viewpoints.   Dr. Sloman of Essex takes the view that education is a by-
product of the Universities' larger commitment to excellence and the advance-
ment of knowledge.   Consequently, he argued:

> "A primary function of a university must be engage in
> research...And research is the guarantee of its academic
> standards."(74)

At York, however, Lord James sees the Universities as places of general
education through teaching:

> "Nothing could be further from my intention than to denigrate
> the importance of genuinely important research.   I would
> recognise, too, the importance in some fields of research at
> a very humble level as a valuable means of teaching.   It is
> rather the attitude that believes research, however trivial,
> to be a more important activity than teaching, however stimu-
> lating, that I fear and deplore."(75)(i)

These institutions also illustrate what N.C. Phillips has called, "the
Platonic inspiration", through which:

> "English Universities have been engaged more or less explicitly
> in producing a quite small class of philosopher-kings or guardians...
> The Platonic inspiration is patent in the notion of an aristocracy,
> in the withdrawal into semi-monastic groups, in the pre-destined
> rôle of leadership and in the preference for education over train-
> ing.   When a country feels an urgent need for more philosopher-
> kings and guardians - more administrators, more doctors, more
> scientists, more teachers - the validity of the Platonic scheme
> is apt to be questioned.   And it comes to be questioned funda-
> mentally, because philosopher-kings who are two-a-penny are no
> longer philosopher-kings - the élite is no longer élite.   So the
> demand for the rapid production of more graduates, though not
> necessarily a symptom of ideological discontent, in fact often
> is so."(77)

This is a significant quotation for it reveals what has developed into a
national schizophrenia over the Universities.   For whilst many writers have

---

(i)   This is a position which Lord James has consistently held.   For example,
      in 1958 at the London School of Economics Oration Speech he made the point:
      "our Universities must adopt a more positive responsibility than
      many of them do now for the general education of their students."(76)

argued for a vastly increased output of graduates there has not been agreement over the number required, nor has there been a willingness to work through the implications of such demands.

Over the issue of the scale of the increase the Robbins Report suggested a figure of 558,000 in higher education by 1980(78); John Vaizey recommended 800,000(79). Students at the Universities only, the Robbins Report recommended in the short term an increase in the estimates for 1967/68 of 12.5%(80); Professor Glass argued for an increase of about 20%(81)(i).

However, although there was general agreement on the necessity for rapid expansion there was reluctance to will the means for achieving it ruthlessly enough. Hence, although new Universities were built and Colleges of Advanced Technology upgraded to Technological Universities, the "platonic inspiration" still manifested itself in the refusal to apply the logic of the premises. For example, if the demand is for more graduates quickly then it is not enough to produce a few more select institutions. One could also demand that new equipment and staff be provided by reducing residential accommodation and residential grants. Allied to this one could make degrees dependent upon examination rather than attendance at seminars and tutorials. In other words, there is evidence of the split mind, for it cannot be argued that this reluctance to act ruthlessly is because of a clear conception of university function; the different ways in which the Universities see themselves shows this.

However, it should be pointed out that not enough research has been directed at the Universities and they represent a sector where the post-war emphasis upon function has not been so well manifested. For instance, what

---

(i) Other writers also argued for more graduates e.g. Mr. Willey(82) and Robert Peers(83).

one would like to know is whether a university's function is not constantly

changing in relation to the kinds of students it possesses; and whether one

University might not have aspects of its character which ought to determine

function, and another University possess different aspects determining a

different function.

The emphasis on cultural function which pre-occupied the Universities

in the post-war period was not an isolated sector but part of a general debate

about culture and equality. This debate is best considered by examining the

views of the Left and the Right since they place their emphasis on opposite

points.

The 'New Left' argued consistently during the late fifties and early

sixties for a common culture, and Stuart Hall, in an editorial, made explicit

the place that formal education would have in such a condition of society:

> "The goal of an educated community must be taken together
> with the concept of a common curriculum, for the one is
> the means to the other."(84)

This view was extended at the end of this period although only in a theoretical

statement. Education in this second view was seen as:

> "a preparation for personal life, for democratic practice
> and participation in a common and equal culture."(85)

It will be noted that there is a shift of emphasis between the two statements.

The first one is concerned for a common culture, the second wants a preparation

for personal life within a common culture, ends which would seem to be opposed.

A common culture can only be attained by denying or preventing certain

practices working against comprehensiveness. In other words change would be

ruled out, which is the dynamic for personal development(i).

T.S. Eliot has argued cogently in opposition to this kind of view, taking

---

(i) See also Raymond Williams', 'Culture And Society'(86)

the position that a stratified society is the only possible agent for cultural transmission. He makes the point that culture can only be transmitted in the course of living, by example rather than by precept. The basic channel for cultural inheritance is therefore the family within which culture is handed down from generation to generation(87), and he contends that formal education is not a cultural agent(88). This latter point is, of course, directly contrary to what egalitarians would claim. Eliot further argues that high cultural standards actually go with inequality of opportunity and he brushes aside as myth the view that a great deal of ability is wasted for the lack of education(89). According to him if all had equal opportunities, without the framework of family groups, or classes, then society would be overwhelmed by a general vulgarity(90).

A common criticism can be made against both Eliot and the Left in that their viewpoints are too narrow, for they do not make clear what ought to be the central pivot of any education - that of its possessing a personal character. For education to have dynamic consequences and to be self-perpetuating through life then it must induce in the pupil a sense of enquiry and criticism. Eliot's intention is to maintain stability and a kind of formal or static tension within all the groups or classes, in a balanced harmony. The views of the New Left leave everything too vague and ill-defined. For example, the logic of the view for a common culture should lead to a view of the school as community, as a substitute for the prototype community in the family. From there the individual would develop outwards. But the New Left places the emphasis upon a common curriculum, which could cause stagnation and a dulling of the spirit of enquiry and criticism.

The arguments revolving around general culture and the educational community bring into focus the problem of élites within society. Professor

Elvin took the view that:

> "The kind of social élite which owes its position in the
> first place to wealth and has this confirmed by the incul-
> cation of pride in a style of life distinctive of its own
> social club, is and must be distasteful to those who have
> a feeling for a genuine community. But hostility to an
> intellectual élite is Philistine. An intellectual élite,
> conscious that it is one, but feeling part of the community
> and not socially marked off from the generality of men,
> can be a great source of strength to a society."(91)

In other words, providing that the excellence is intellectual, then it is

to be commended; but if prestige is to be accorded to a generalised social

phenomenon then it is to be deplored.

Elvin's views come very close to Adolph Lowe's(92) in the war years:

certainly he presents a case for functional élites in Lowe's terms. This is

very interesting because Elvin seems to be on the point of developing a logical

exploration into the implications of the concept of equality, something which

neither the war-time writers nor the post-war theorists have attempted.

Elvin states the position very clearly:

> "...a desire for a genuine sense of community must not be
> confused with a desire to blur the distinction between what
> is excellent and what is not excellent at all. But how,
> in an educational system, can you discriminate between what
> is excellent and what is not and not begin to establish
> élites?"(93)

This kind of theoretical analysis, which Elvin has not developed fully

as yet, is refreshing and important for much of war-time and subsequent theory

has not possessed this stringent discipline and acuteness. The thought of

both periods suffers because of this and although post-war educational discus-

sion has drawn upon objective research much more than in the earlier period

there is little evidence to suggest that it is being moulded into a basic

educational philosophy. It could be argued, perhaps, that there is some

evidence for an accepted underlying philosophy in the vague and intuitive

attachment to the concept of equality of opportunity, a concept much in evidence in both periods. However, in neither period was the concept defined and it is this vagueness which at the level of basic theory suggests little differentiation between the periods.

The use of the concept is confused because of the different meanings attached to the word 'opportunity', for it means different things to different people. In the areas covered by this thesis, for example, the meanings assigned to the term by a supporter of Comprehensive schools would be different from those developed by a Public School headmaster. Specific group or social pressures have determined, perhaps unconsciously, these differences. In other words, the concept of equality of opportunity is meaningless unless it is prefaced with the question, 'opportunity for what?'. This question has not been satisfactorily answered in either period. In fact the issue has been avoided by the vague assumption that inequality means only the injustice of overprivileged and underprivileged groups. Such a simplified view ignores the logical implications of a system of complete equality of opportunity in education which is that a uniform system of grading intelligence must be devised so that each individual pupil will receive the exact amount of education which his ability warrants. Further, a thoroughgoing application of the concept will tend inevitably towards increased control by the State, which will then be forced into the position of having to extend opportunity only to those vocations which serve the ends of the State. This would not necessarily be motivated out of sinister aims but simply by the logic of the situation.

Since the beginning of the second world war the use of this concept in English educational thought has been confused because it has been viewed as a specific rather than as an aspect of a much wider and more complicated 'values' framework. If one is to assert the desirability of equality of opportunity

then one must also know what comprises the ideal or just or good life. Such an aim is a social one, and consequently should not be determined according to prejudice or emotional bias, but according to the nature of man, which itself implies that due weight be given to his cultural inheritance.

Educational ideas in the generation covered by this thesis have not developed very far in basic theoretical terms but educational enquiry in the post-war world has narrowed down, become more objective, and therefore more exact. This new preoccupation with function or the attempt to determine what institutions actually do perform in educational terms is healthy, but is surely a secondary process. The important thing would seem to be to produce a body of theory based on the cultural history of one's nation and on the nature of man. The secondary problem of determining the possibility for achieving the theory within specific institutional models can then be carried out.

<u>Appendix I</u>

A Selection Of Titles Of Articles In 'Journal Of Education'

1938,
Volume 70.

"Air Raid Precautions And The Schools"
"Using The Library"
"Athletics And Physical Fitness"
"The Careers Master"
"What Shall We Read?"
"Christmas Books"
"Aids To The Teaching Of Music"
"Evacuation Of Schools In Danger Areas"
"Results In The Teaching Of French"
"The Problems Of Play-Reading"
"Stamp Collecting And The Teaching Of Geography"
"The Pronunciation Of Latin In And Out Of School"
"Some Timetable Problems Of The School Certificate Examination"
(2 parts)
"Enquiries Into Homework And Out Of School Activities"
"School Buildings"
"Choosing A Career"
"Educational Administration"
"Alternative Handwork Or Elementary Engineering Courses In A
Secondary School"

1939,
Volume 71.

A long series over several volumes on "Education And Citizenship"
(including English, History, Science, Mathematics, Languages
and Religion)
"Can England Afford Her Public Schools?"
"The Case Against Democracy"
"Education And Democracy"
"Progressive Education"
"Justice And Privilege"
"Hadow Fact And Hadow Fiction"
"The Place Of The Senior School In Education"
"The New Outlook In Geography"
"The War And Education"
"New Possibilities In Language Lessons"
"Blueprint For An Age Of Plenty"
"Education And Religion"
"Freedom In Education"
"How Will Education Fare?"
"Congress On Education For Democracy"
"The Speeding Of Communications"

Appendix II

Part of West London Division.   Secondary Schools (age range 11+ to 16+ and over) within the Comprehensive High School System

Ministry of Education Number	School	Electoral Area	Sex	Proposed Type Of School	Future Size	Form Entry	Proposed Alterations to Premises	Estimated Capital Cost	Financial Years
14786	Cook's Ground	Chelsea	G	C					
28132	Chelsea Central	Fulham East	B	C					
–	Sloane	Chelsea	B	C					
–	Carlyle	Chelsea	G	C					
To be transferred to a new building for boys and girls on Carlyle and Sloane school sites (enlarged).					2,000	13	E A	£360,000	
20104	Addison Gardens	Hammersmith S.	M	C					
24406	Portobello Road	Kensington N.	M	C					
28124 end	West Kensington Central	Fulham E.	M	C					
To be transferred to a new building for boys and girls on a site in the Holland Park neighbourhood.					2,000	13	H A	£360,000	a.
26766	Avondale Park	Kensington N.	M	C					
26278	Colville	Kensington N.	M	C					
28184	Lancaster Road	Kensington N.	M	C					
To be transferred to a new building for boys and girls on a site in the Avondale Park neighbourhood.					2,000	13	H A	£360,000	

E = enlargement of existing site
H = new site
A = new building
a = first period

Page 37, 'London School Plan'.

Appendix III

This appendix gives a brief idea of how the 1944 Act, in areas other than secondary education, reflected the recommendations of various organisations whose views were canvassed in our period.

1. **Nursery Schools**	The Act requires that local education authorities should have regard: "to the need for securing that provision is made for pupils who have not attained the age of five years by the provision of nursery schools or, where the authority consider the provision of such schools to be inexpedient, by the provision of nursery classes in other schools." Education Act 1944, Part II, Sec. 8, Clause 26.
Liberal Party, "Education For All", page 13.	"...a unified system of Infant and Child Welfare, Day Nursuries and Nursery Schools should be brought within the reach of all."
Association of Directors and Secretaries, op. cit, page 11, "Education: A Plan For The Future".	"It should therefore be the duty of the L.E.A. to provide nursery schools or classes for all children whose parents desire (or may have to be persuaded) to take advantage of this provision."
National Association of Head Teachers, op. cit, page 2, "Education After The War".	"Nursery-infant education for children under 7 years should be in separate departments, and should come under the administration of the Board of Education."
Nursery School Association, "The First Stage In Education", 1943, page 6.	"We make the following (five) recommendations: It be made obligatory on L.E.A.s to provide nursery school education for all children from the age of two whose parents desire it..."
2. **School Meals**	"Regulations made by the Minister shall impose upon local education authorities the duty of providing milk, meals and other refreshment for pupils in attendance at schools and county colleges maintained by them." Education Act 1944, Part II, Sec. 49.
National Union Of Teachers, "Educational Reconstruction", op. cit, page 28.	"The Executive recommend: (1) That it should be a duty and not merely a power of the L.E.A. to provide meals for children attending any grant aided schools. (2) That such meals should be provided free."
Association of Directors and Secretaries, op. cit, page 26, "Education: A Plan For The Future".	"...it should now become the duty of the L.E.A. to provide them (midday meals) free of charge in all schools."

Trades Union Congress, "Education After The War", op. cit, page 19.	"School Meals must become an integral part of full-time education. The educational value of the common meal must be recognised...If this educational view of school meals is taken, then such meals will be provided free, as is the rest of the educational curriculum."

3. Inspection of Private Schools

"The Minister shall appoint one of his officers to be Registrar of Independent Schools; and it shall be the duty of the Registrar of Independent Schools to keep a register of all independent schools, which shall be open to public inspection at all reasonable times."
Education Act 1944, Part III, Sec. 70.

Spens Report, op. cit, page 332.	"At present only a small proportion of private schools is inspected, although the proportion is relatively high among schools giving a grammar school education. We think it important that compulsory inspection of private schools should be introduced."
Association of Directors and Secretaries, op. cit, page 14, "Education: A Plan For The Future".	"It is important that there should be some immediate supervision of schools, not in receipt of public money or inspected by the Board of Education. It is therefore recommended that all such schools should be inspected either by the Board of Education Authority or by the L.E.A., and licensed by the Board of Education after consultation with the L.E.A. with a view to their complying with certain minimum requirements to be prescribed."
Trades Union Congress, "Education After The War", op. cit, page 6.	"All schools outside the State System should, of course, be subject to official inspection and it is appropriate that tests relating to educational standards and teachers' qualifications should be applied by representatives of the Board of Education."
National Union of Teachers, "Educational Reconstruction", op. cit, page 8.	"That a Scheme of supervision of all private schools should be part of the educational arrangements of the country."

4. Part-time, post-secondary education

The Act requires local education authorities to provide:
"(a) full-time and part-time education for persons over compulsory school-age; and
(b) leisure-time occupation, in such organised cultural training and recreative activities as are suited to their requirements, for any persons over compulsory school age who are able and willing to profit by the facilities provided for that purpose."
Education Act 1944, Part II, Sec. 41.

National Union of Teachers, "Educational Reconstruction", op. cit, page 10.	"Day continuation schools should be established. Attendance should be compulsory for all young persons from the time when they cease full-time education until after they attain the age of 18."
120 Industrialists, "A National Policy For Industry", op. cit, page 10.	"We are in favour of part-time compulsory education up to the age of 18. If arrangements are made for a reform of this character, we consider that industry should make its contribution by suitably regulating the hours of work of juvenile employees."
British Association For Labour Legislation, "Education For Democracy", op. cit, page 33.	"The proposed new Act for a raising of the school leaving age should contain a clause which would, as from the end of the war, require young people under 18, not receiving full-time education to attend day continuation courses in working hours, for a period not less than 320 hours a year."
National Association of Head Teachers, "Education After The War", op. cit, page 2.	"A system of part-time day continuation schools up to the age of 18 should be established, attendance at them being made compulsory for a minimum of 8 hours per week."

Appendix IV

A.   Indications of the Public Schools' educational achievement can be seen
in that at Oundle between 1922 and 1939 the following additional buildings
were made to the school:

        Gymnasium   Five Courts
        Swimming Bath   Block of Classrooms
        Tuck Shop   New Workshop
        Power Station   Three new Boarding Houses.

In addition, the following 'progressive' educational projects were
taught:

(1)   Engineering and Applied Science including a metal shop, a wood
shop, a foundry, a drawing office and an engine room.

(2)   The conversaziones - "The boys, working in small groups, are
engaged in preparing demonstrations in Physics,
Chemistry, Engineering, Mathematics, Metallurgy,
Biology, Farmwork and workshop practice of all
kinds.   In addition, the Senior Classical and
History forms are at work simultaneously on
exhibits of a non-scientific nature, dealing
perhaps with local history or archaeology."(a)

B.   A similar diversity, though not as great, can be seen in the prospectuses
of Abingdon School.

C.   The work carried out in Direct Grant establishment can be well seen in
C.P. Hill's 'History Of Bristol Grammar School', Chapter VIII (Isaac Pitman
Limited 1950).

Examples: Greatly increased Library)
Science Lecture Theatre   )   New buildings
Biology Laboratory   )

Many fascinating visits and trips and the expansion of school societies,
e.g. lumber camps and harvest camps, an aeronautical club.

Academically, Biological Science was developed and an 'Economics' Sixth
formed;   as well as the school possessing one of the best classical sixths in
the country, winning 53 open scholarships and 34 exhibitions to Oxford and
Cambridge from 1914-1946.

---

a.   From prospectuses of Oundle School - courtesy of Headmaster.

Bibliography   Educational Ideas In The Second World War

1.   "Education: Its Data And First Principles" by Sir Percy Nunn, 1st Edition,
     9th Impression (1925).   Preface.
2.   Ibid, page 9.
3.   Ibid, page 24.
4.   Ibid, page 27.
5.   Ibid, page 25.
6.   Ibid, page 138.
7.   Ibid, page 44.
8.   Ibid, page 199.
9.   "Society And Solitude" by E.T. Campagnac, page 114.   E.U.P. 1922.
10. Ibid, page 118.
11. "Education: Its Data And First Principles" by Sir Percy Nunn, 3rd Edition,
     Arnold 1945, page 12.
12. Ibid, page 13.
13. Ibid, page 14.
14. "Education For Citizenship In Secondary Schools"for The Association For
     Education And Citizenship.   O.U.P. 1935, page 5.
15. Ibid, page 5.
16. Ibid, pages 9-10.
17. Quoted in "Groundwork Of Educational Theory" by J.S. Ross.   Harrap 1942,
     page 43.
18. From his review of, "Essays In Commemoration Of The Visit To England Of
     Comenius", "Journal Of Education" Volume 75, Number 885, April 1943.
19. "Modern Education: Its Aims And Methods" by T. Raymont, Longmanns Green
     1942, page 34.
20. "Towards A New Aristocracy" by F.C. Happold, Faber and Faber 1943, page 29.
21. Ibid, page 30.
22. Ibid, page 85.
23. Ibid, pages 82-3.
24. Ibid, pages 85-6.
25. "Essential Education" by W.R. Niblett.   U.L.P. 1947, page 30.
26. "Education For Sanity" by W. Curry.   Heinemann 1947.
27. "The Public Schools Question" by Spenser Leeson.   Longmanns 1948, pages
     32-5.
28. "Looking Ahead" issued by Conservative and Unionist Party 1942, page 15.
29. Ibid, page 25.
30. "Education At The Crossroads" by Jacques Maritain.   O.U.P. 1943, pages 2-3.
31. Ibid, pages 10-11.
32. Ibid, page 115.
33. Ibid, pages 12-13.
34. "The Project Method Of Teaching" by J.A. Stephenson.   H.M.S.O. 1937.
35. "Spens Report", H.M.S.O. 1938, page 78.
36. "The Philosophic Bases Of Education" by R.R. Rusk.   U.L.P. 1928, page 84.
37. "Education At The Crossroads" op. cit, page 89.
38. "Diagnosis Of Our Time" by Karl Mannheim.   Routledge Kegan Paul 1943,
     page 57.
39. "Man And Society" by Karl Mannheim.   Routledge Kegan Paul 1940, pages
     74-5.
40. "Diagnosis Of Our Time" op. cit, page 34.
41. "Education And Social Change" by Sir Fred Clarke.   Sheldon Press 1940,
     page 30.

42. Ibid, pages 40-5.
43. Ibid, page 49.
44. Ibid, pages 49-50.
45. "Institutio Oratorio" by Quintillan, Book I.
46. "The Study Of Education In England" by F. Clarke.   C.U.P. 1943, Preface.
47. Ibid, page 27.
48. "Freedom In The Educative Society" by F. Clarke.   O.U.P. 1947, page 9.
49. Ibid, page 13.
50. Ibid, page 45.
51. Ibid, page 36.
52. "Journal Of Education", Volume 75, Number 889, August 1943.
53. "Journal Of Education", Volume 70, Index, 1938.
54. "A New Order In English Education" by H.C. Dent.   U.L.P. 1942, page 5.
55. Ibid, pages 5-6.
56. Ibid, page 13.
57. "A New Order In English Education" op. cit, page 42.
58. Ibid, page 43.
59. "Christian Newsletter", January 31st, 1940.
60. Ibid.
61. "Times Educational Supplement", July 12th, 1941.
62. "Christian Newsletter", April 5th, 1940.
63. "Times Educational Supplement", June 29th, 1941.
64. "Times Educational Supplement", July 5th, 1941.   See also further articles
    in the series printed on July 12th and July 19th, 1941.
65. "Times Educational Supplement", July 22nd, 1942.
66. "A National Policy For Industry" - signed by 120 industrialists, November
    1942, page 10.
67. "Journal Of Education", Notes and Comments, Volume 71, Number 835,
    February 1939.
68. Ibid.
69. "Spens Report", H.M.S.O. 1938, page 147.
70. "Times Educational Supplement", September 10th, 1939.
71. "Education In Transition" by H.C. Dent.   Routledge Kegan Paul 1944,
    page 11.
72. Ibid, page 14.
73. "To Whom Do Schools Belong?" by W.O. Lester Smith.   Blackwell 1942,
    page 179.
74. "A Plan For Education", W.E.A. 1942, page 5.
75. Ibid, page 5.
76. "Times Educational Supplement", May 31st, 1941.
77. "London School Plan", L.C.C. 1947, page 7.
78. "Plans For An Educated Democracy" by J. Thomas.   Co-operative Union 1942,
    page 26.
79. "Education For All", Liberal Party 1942, page 15.
80. "Education: A Plan For The Future", The Association of Directors and
    Secretaries for Education, 1942, pages 9-10.
81. "Democracy And Education" by J. Dewey.   Heinemann 1916, page 115.
82. "The Future In Education" by Sir R. Livingstone.   C.U.P. 1941, page 20.
83. Ibid, page 38.
84. "Education For Citizenship In Secondary Schools" op. cit, pages 126-8.
85. "Education For A World Adrift" by Sir R. Livingstone.   C.U.P. 1943,
    page 38.
86. Ibid, page 150.

87. "Some Tasks For Education" by Sir R. Livingstone.   O.U.P. 1947, page 53.
88. Ibid, page 92.
89. "Spens Report", H.M.S.O., page 351.
90. Ibid, page 351.
91. Ibid, page 351.
92. Ibid, page 362.
93. Ibid, page 376.
94. "Norwood Report", H.M.S.O. 1941, page 2.
95. Ibid, page 3.
96. Ibid, page 3.
97. "British Journal Of Educational Psychology", November 1943, page 131.
98. Ibid, page 140.
99. "Spens Report", op. cit, pages 375-6.
100. "King's College Education Papers", Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, Volume V, Number 3, 1938.
101. Ibid.
102. "Educational Reconstruction", H.M.S.O., page 10, paragraph 31.
103. "The Times", April 14th, 1943.
104. "Education After The War", National Association of Head Teachers, 1942, page 2.
105. "Quaker Education And The Future", Friends' Education Council, 1942, page 7.
106. "Education For Democracy" by B. Drake, British Association for Labour Legislation 1942, page 19.
107. "Education After The War", T.U.C. 1942, page 4.
108. "Plans For An Educated Democracy" by J. Thomas.   Co-operative Union, 1942, page 13.
109. Ibid, page 14.
110. "A Plan For Education", op. cit, page 5.
111. "A New Charter For Education" by Grace Leybourne.   Fabian Society 1943, page 28.
112. "Times Educational Supplement", July 12th, 1941.
113. "London School Plan", op. cit, page 10.
114. Ibid, page 227.
115. Ibid, pages 219-230.
116. Ibid, pages 214-9.
117. Ibid, page 216.
118. Ibid, page 216.
119. "The Education Act", H.M.S.O. 1944, Part II, Section 61.
120. "Spens Report", op. cit, page 309.
121. "Education For Democracy", op. cit, page 19.
122. "Education: A Plan For The Future", op. cit, page 13.
123. "Spens Report", op. cit, page 311.
124. "Interim Report On The Dual System", National Society, 1942, page 4.
125. "Education After The War", op. cit, page 1.
126. "Educational Reconstruction", National Union of Teachers, 1942, page 4.
127. "A Plan For Education", op. cit, page 10.

Bibliography   The Universities

1.   'Tendencies In University Education' by E. Deller, page 9, O.U.P. 1933.
2.   Quoted and referred to in 'University Development 1935-1947', page 26,
     U.G.C. Report, H.M.S.O. 1948.
3.   'University Development' op. cit., page 26.
4.   'Education: A Plan For The Future', The Association of Directors and
     Secretaries of Education, 1942, page 28.
5.   'Educational Reconstruction', National Union of Teachers 1942, page 18.
6.   'Tendencies In University Education' by E. Deller, page 16.
7.   'Tendencies In University Education' by E. Deller, pages 14-16.
8.   'The Crisis in the University' by Walter Moberley, pages 298-9, S.C.M.
     Press 1949.
9.   'The Times', March 18th 1937.
10. 'The Universities And Regional Life' by Bonamy Dobree, page 4.   The 25th
     Earl Grey Memorial Lecture delivered at King's College, Newcastle,
     April 29th, 1943.
11. 'Journal of Education', Volume 74, Number 879, October 1942; article
     entitled 'The Modern Universities'.
12. 'The Universities in Transformation' by Adolph Lowe, page 15; Sheldon
     Press 1940.
13. 'Synthesis In Education: Addresses given at the summer conference of the
     Institute of Sociology, August 1944'.   Published by the Le Play House
     Press, Malvern 1946.   Professor Hodges' article is entitled, 'The Meaning
     of Synthesis'.
14. 'Scrutiny', Volume VI, March 1938, pages 361-71.
15. 'Synthesis in Education', 1946 (op. cit).   Paton's article entitled
     'Synthesis in the Universities'.
16. 'Synthesis in Education', 1946 (op. cit).   Article entitled, 'On
     Cambridge' by H.C. Bartlet.
17. 'University Development', op. cit., 1948, page 60.
18. 'University Development', op. cit., page 61.
19. 'Journal of Education', Volume 74, Number 879, October 1942.   Article
     entitled, 'The Modern Universities'.
20. 'Education After The War', National Association of Head Teachers 1942,
     page 2.
21. 'Plans For An Educated Democracy' by J. Thomas 1942, page 26.
22. 'Educational Reconstruction' 1942, pages 18-20.
23. 'Education For All', 1942, page 16.
24. 'Britain's Schools', 1942, page 30.
25. Nuffield College: 'The Problem Facing British Universities', page 85.
26. 'University Development', (op. cit), page 28.
27. Nuffield College Report (op. cit), page 86.
28. 'Education And The University' by F.R. Leavis, Chatto and Windus 1948.
29. Nuffield College Report (op. cit), page 98.
30. 'Universities in Transformation' (op. cit), page 26.
31. Ibid, pages 4-6.
32. Ibid, pages 23-4.
33. Ibid, pages 25-35.
34. Ibid, Chapter V.
35. 'The Universities And Regional Life' (op. cit), page 5.

36. Ibid, page 7.
37. Ibid, page 12.
38. Ibid, pages 12-13.
39. 'Mission Of The University' by Ortega y Gasset, page 64, Routledge 1946.
40. 'The Crisis In The University' (op. cit), page 172.
41. 'The Universities and Regional Life' (op. cit), page 13.
42. Ibid, pages 14-15.
43. 'The Mission Of The University' (op. cit), pages 44-50.
44. 'Journal of Education', Volume 76, Number 894, January 1944. Article entitled, 'The Function of the Universities'.
45. 'Universities, Ancient and Modern' by Walter Moberley, Manchester University Press 1950, page 14.
46. 'Journal of Education', Volume 75, Number 887, June 1943. Article entitled, 'The Future of the Older Universities'.
47. 'Journal of Education', Volume 75, Number 885, April 1943. Article entitled, 'The Post-School Structure of Education after the War'.
48. 'Plans for an Educated Democracy', by J. Thomas, for the Co-operative Union, 1942, page 26.
49. For example, 'The McNair Report', H.M.S.O. 1943, page 50.
50. 'Journal of Education', Volume 75, Number 888, July 1943 and Volume 75, Number 889, August 1943; two-part article entitled, 'The Universities and the Training of Teachers'.
51. 'Redbrick University' by Bruce Truscot, Faber 1943, pages 38-44.
52. 'University Development' (op. cit), page 54.
53. Ibid, pages 92-3.
54. Ibid, page 27.
55. 'Redbrick University' (op. cit), page 118.
56. 'University Development' (op. cit), page 60.
57. 'Redbrick University' (op. cit), page 45.
58. 'Redbrick And These Vital Days' by Bruce Truscot, Faber 1945, page 86.
59. 'Scrutiny', Volume 12, page 59.
60. 'Redbrick University' (op. cit), pages 37-40.
61. 'The Crisis in the University' (op. cit), page 207.
62. 'The Times', October 29th, 1943.
63. 'Universities in Transformation' (op. cit), page 15.
64. 'Synthesis in Education' (op. cit). Article entitled, 'Synthesis in the Newer Universities'.
65. 'The Mind of the Modern Universities' by J. Baillie, S.C.M. Press 1946, page 19.
66. 'The Crisis in the University' (op. cit), page 21.
67. 'The Mind of the Modern Universities' (op. cit), page 20.
68. 'The Crisis in the University' (op. cit), page 70.
69. 'Foundations of a Free University' by D.M. Emmett, S.C.M. Press 1946, page 20.
70. 'The Crisis in the University (op. cit), pages 50-1. See also, 'Universities under Fire' by R. Forrester-Paton, page 21, (S.C.M. Press 1946).
71. 'The Crisis in the University' (op. cit), page 53.
72. 'Foundations of a Free University' (op. cit), page 12.

73. Ibid, page 13.
74. Ibid, page 18.
75. 'Some Thoughts on University Education' by Sir Richard Livingstone, C.U.P. 1948, page 12.
76. 'Universities Under Fire' (op. cit), page 31.
77. 'The Mind of the Modern Universities' (op. cit), page 34.
78. 'The Crisis in the University' (op. cit), page 297.
79. Ibid, page 296.
80. Ibid, page 294.
81. Ibid, page 297.
82. Ibid, page 116.
83. Ibid, page 309.
84. 'Mission of the University' (op. cit), page 38.
85. 'Journal of Education', Volume 74, Number 879, October 1942. Article entitled, 'The Universities'.
86. 'Keele After Ten Years', The Keele Union, University of Keele 1961, page 10.

<u>Bibliography</u>   <u>Religion in Education</u>

1.   'Educational Reconstruction', Government White Paper, H.M.S.O. 1943,
     para. 49.
2.   Ibid. para. 46.
3.   'Educational Reconstruction', National Union of Teachers, 1942, page 44.
4.   Ibid. page 45.
5.   'Education: A Plan for the Future', Association of Directors and
     Secretaries of Education, 1942, page 15.
6.   Ibid. page 17.
7.   'Baptist Times', 5.8.43.
8.   'Looking Ahead', Conservative and Unionist Party, 1942, page 25.
9.   Ibid, page 27.
10. 'Education after the War', National Association of Head Teachers, 1942,
     page 4.
11. 'A Policy For Religious Education' by Canon F. Brayley, O.U.P. 1941,
     page 74.
12. Ibid. page 35.
13. 'The Times', October 10th, 1942.
14. 'Christian Education' by F. Spenser Leeson, Longmans 1947, page 151.
     The extract quoted was taken from a speech delivered in 1944.
15. 'Religion In Education', Volume 8, Number 2, 1941.   Article entitled
     'On Christian Education'.
16. 'Religion In Education', Volume 8, Number 2, 1941.   Article entitled
     'Reconstruction and Religious Education'.
17. Quoted by F. Iremonger in his book 'William Temple', O.U.P. 1948, page
     571.
18. Ibid. page 571.
19. 'Interim Report On The Dual System', National Society, 1942, page 5.
20. Ibid. page 6.   See also pages 7-8.
21. Article 1374:   quoted 'Ecumenical Press Service' No. 14/27th year,
     8.4.60.
22. Quoted in 'Church And State In English Education' by M. Cruikshank,
     Macmillan 1963, page 165.
23. Education Act 1944, H.M.S.O. Section 15.
24. Ibid. Section 25 Part II.
25. Quoted in H.C. Dent's 'The Education Act, 1944', U.L.P. 1944, page 26.
26. 'Education Act 1944' (op. cit) Part IV, Clause 76.
27. Hansard (Lords Volume) Volume 132, Column 864, 1944.
28. 'Education Act 1944' (op. cit) Part II, Clause 7.
29. Hansard (Lords Volume) Volume 132, Column 970, 1944.
30. 'The Character Of England' by Sir Ernest Barker, C.U.P. 1948, page 83.
31. 'Handbook Of Suggestions For Teachers' 1937, H.M.S.O.
32. Spens Report, 1938, H.M.S.O., page 152.
33. Ibid. page 153.
34. 'The Teaching Of Religion' by Canon Brayley, Longmanns 1938.
35. 'Religion And The Growing Mind' by Basil Yeaxlee, Nisbett 1939, page 212.
36. 'Religion In Education', Volume XI, Number 2, 1944.
37. Ibid.
38. 'Religion In Education', Volume 8, Number 4, 1941.   Article entitled
     'Why Christian Education Notices'.

39.   'God In Education' by M.L. Jacks, Rich and Cowan 1939, pages 64/65.
40.   Ibid. page 117.
41.   'Education: Christian or Pagan' by M.V. Jeffreys, U.L.P. 1946, pages 35-36.
42.   'Christian Education' by F. Spenser Leeson, Longmanns 1947, page 108.
43.   Ibid, page 182.
44.   Ibid, page 135.
45.   'The Nature And Task of Religious Education To-day' in King's College Education Papers, Newcastle, Volume 5, Number 2, 1938.
46.   Ibid.
47.   'Education: Christian or Pagan' (op. cit), page 50.
48.   'Religious Education - A Problem In Three Dimensions', King's College Education Papers, Newcastle, Volume 5, Number 3, 1938.
49.   'God In Education' (op. cit), page 103.
50.   'Education: Christian or Pagan' (op. cit), Chapter V.
51.   Ibid, page 41 and page 64.
52.   'God In Education' (op. cit), page 162.
53.   'Religion In Education', Volume 8, Number 3, 1941.   Article entitled 'What Is Meant By Christian Education?'
54.   'The School Without The Parson' by Canon Brayley, Religious Education Press 1945, page 50.
55.   'Teachers Of To-day', Volume 19, Number 202, 1940.   Article entitled 'The Crucial Factor In Religious Education'.
56.   'Religion In Education', Volume 8, Number 2, 1941.   Article entitled 'Education And A New Order'.
57.   'A Policy In Religious Education' (op. cit), page 145, and 'Religion In Education', Volume 5, Number 3, 1938.   Condensation of a speech by Sir Walter Moberley delivered to the Institute of Christian Education.

<u>Bibliography</u>   <u>The Public Schools</u>

1.   'Journal of Education', Volume 73, Number 861, April 1944.   Article by
      Fred Clarke entitled 'The Public Schools And The Nation'.
2.   Arthur Calder-Marshall, 'Challenge To Schools', Hogarth Press 1937,
      page 40.
3.   Ibid, page 12.
4.   'Journal of Education', Volume 73, Number 858, January 1941.   Article
      entitled 'The Public Schools', by the Headmaster of Dover College.
5.   'Times Educational Supplement', September 19th, 1942.
6.   'Journal of Education', Volume 73, Number 859, February 1941.   Article
      by Aneurin Bevan entitled, 'Class Bias In Education'.
7.   'Britain's Schools', Communist Party of Great Britain 1942, page 25.
8.   R.H. Tawney, 'The Problem Of The Public Schools' for the W.E.A. 1944,
      page 32.
9.   'Journal of Education', Volume 73, Number 859, February 1941.   Article
      by W.B. Curry entitled, 'What Will Happen To the Public Schools?'
10.   T.U.C. Memorandum on 'Education After The War' 1942, page 6.
11.   Fleming Report, H.M.S.O. 1944, paragraph 145.
12.   Ibid, paragraph 145.
13.   Ibid, paragraph 71.
14.   'The Public Schools And The Educational System', W.E.A. 1943, pages 9 and
      17.
15.   Ibid, page 9.   Quoting the Journal, 'Education' of October 2nd, 1942.
16.   W.E.A. Ibid, page 10.
17.   Ibid, page 13.
18.   Ibid, page 14.
19.   Ibid, page 18.
20.   E.H. Partridge, 'Freedom in Education', Faber 1943, page 23.
21.   'Looking Ahead', Conservative and Unionist Party 1942, pages 35-6.
22.   'Education For All', Liberal Party 1942, page 15.
23.   'Journal of Education', Volume 73, Number 859, February 1941.   Article
      by C.E.M. Joad entitled, 'The Shame of Culture'.
24.   C.E.M. Joad, 'About Education', Faber 1945, page 115.
25.   Donald Hughes, 'The Public Schools And The Future', C.U.P. 1942, page 27.
26.   Ibid, page 32.
27.   Ibid, page 38.
28.   Ibid, page 29.
29.   Ibid, page 53.
30.   Ibid, page 59.
31.   Ibid, page 49.
32.   Ibid, page 43.
33.   J. Wolfenden, 'The Public Schools To-day', U.L.P. 1948, page 15.
34.   Ibid, page 16.   The Fleming Report made a similar point. (op. cit,
      paragraph 54).
35.   Ibid, Wolfenden, pages 52-54.
36.   Ibid, page 55.
37.   F.C. Happold, 'Towards A New Aristocracy', Faber 1943, pages 85-6.
38.   Fleming Report, op. cit, paragraph 112.
39.   'The Times', January 30th, 1943.

40.   'The Times', September 14th, 1943.
41.   Fleming Report, op. cit, paragraph 131.
42.   Ibid, paragraph 132.
43.   A.B. Badger, 'The Public Schools And The Nation', Hale 1944, pages 56-7.
44.   B. Truscot, 'Redbrick And These Vital Days', Faber 1943, pages 160-1.
45.   'The Times', September 16th, 1943.
46.   Fleming Report, op. cit, preface.
47.   Ibid, paragraph 177(ii).
48.   Ibid, paragraph 177.
49.   Ibid, page 101 - 'Summary of Recommendations'.
50.   Ibid, paragraph 113.
51.   Ibid, paragraph 71.
52.   Ibid, paragraph 12.
53.   'Education Act' 1944, H.M.S.O., Part III, Sections 70-75.
54.   'Journal of Education', Volume 75, Number 885, April 1943.   Comment by
      'Four London Heads'.

Bibliography   Retrospect

1.   'Education To-day And Tomorrow' by F.T. Willey, Michael Joseph, 1964, page 12.
2.   'The Public Schools: A Factual Survey' by G. Kalton, Longmanns, 1966.
3.   Report, 'Higher Education' presented by the Committee On Higher Education, 1963, H.M.S.O.
4.   Central Advisory Council For Education, 'Children And Their Primary Schools', 1967, H.M.S.O.
5.   Central Advisory Council For Education, 'Half Our Future', H.M.S.O. 1963.
6.   Central Advisory Council For Education, '15 to 18', H.M.S.O. 1959.
7.   'The Youth Service In England And Wales' H.M.S.O. 1960.
8.   Report, 'Higher Education', op. cit.
9.   'Teachers And Youth Leaders', H.M.S.O. 1944.
10.   'Medical Schools', H.M.S.O. 1944.
11.   'Higher Agricultural Education In England And Wales', H.M.S.O. 1946.
12.   See Penguin 'Social Science Survey', 1965, pages 144-168; 'British Journal Of Sociology' IX, 1958, pages 159-174.
13.   'Child Care And The Growth Of Love' by John Bowlby, Pelican Books, 2nd edition, 1965.
14.   'The Home And The School' by J.W.B. Douglas, Macgibbon & Kee, 1964.
15.   'Your Children, Your Schools, Your Government', 'Times Educational Supplement' pamphlet, 1966, pages 6-7.
16.   'Changing Education In A Changing Society', H.L. Elvin. Lecture delivered to the Association of Technical Institutes, published by them, February, 1960, page 7.
17.   'The Argument For Comprehensive Schools', by Peter Townshend in 'Essays In Local Government Enterprise', edited by E. Hillman, Merlin Press 1966, page 49.
18.   'Education', The Labour Party, Transport House, London, 1965, page 16.
19.   'A New Charter For Education' by Grace Leybourne, op. cit.
20.   'Beyond The Comprehensive School' by John Daniels in 'Essays In Local Government Enterprise', op. cit, page 57.
21.   'Social Class Factors In Educational Achievement' by Jean Floud in 'Ability And Educational Opportunity', edited by A.H. Halsey, O.E.C.D. 1961, page 99.
22.   Report, 'Higher Education', op. cit, page 51, paragraph 139.
23.   'Social Class Factors In Educational Achievement' by J. Floud, op. cit, page 99.
24.   Reported in 'Daily Telegraph', 10th December, 1960.
25.   'Education For Tomorrow' by John Vaizey, Pelican Books 1966, page 36.
26.   'Education To-day And Tomorrow' by F.T. Willey, op. cit, page 15.
27.   'Independence And The Church School' by Walter James, S.P.C.K. 1966, pages 9-10.
28.   'Education', Labour Party, op. cit, page 29.
29.   'Education For Tomorrow' by John Vaizey, op. cit, page 47.
30.   'Your Children, Your Schools, Your Government', op. cit, page 21.
31.   An Article by Lord Fisher in 'The Times', 14th December, 1960.
32.   Hansard, House of Commons Debates, 16th June, 1961, Column 812, H.M.S.O.
33.   Hansard, House of Commons Debates, 16th June, 1961, Column 834, H.M.S.O.
34.   Ibid, Column 867.
35.   Ibid, Column 898, Sir David Eccles.
36.   'Public Schools And Private Practice' by John Wilson, Allen & Unwin, 1963, page 116.
37.   'The Public School: A Factual Survey' by Graham Kalton, Longmanns, 1966, page 87.

38. Ibid, page 88.
39. Lord Fisher in 'The Times', 14th December, 1960.
40. 'The Public Schools: A Factual Survey', op. cit, page XXIV.
41. 'The Public Schools And The Future' by J.C. Dancy, Faber, 1963, pages 106-107.
42. W.E.A. evidence to the Public Schools Commission, December, 1966, page 4 - Temple House, 27 Portman Square, W.1.
43. 'Education For Tomorrow', op. cit, page 144.
44. W.E.A. evidence to the Public Schools Commission, op. cit, page 12.
45. Newsom Report, op. cit, page 50, paragraph 156.
46. W.E.A. evidence, op. cit, page 12.
47. 'Education For Tomorrow', op. cit, page 48.
48. 'Public And Comprehensive Schools' issued by The Comprehensive Schools Committee, 1965, page 3.
49. 'The Public Schools: A Factual Survey', op. cit, page XXV.
50. 'Religious Education In Schools Since 1945' - A report of the Schools Council, 1954, pages 6-7.
51. Ibid, page 12.
52. In 'Year Book Of Education' 1951, Evens Bros., pages 287-288.
53. 'Education In Focus', by E.C.D. Stanford, Religious Education Press, 1965, page 44.
54. 'Learning For Living' Volume I, Number 3, January, 1962.
55. Newsom Report, op. cit, paragraph 173.
56. 'Religious Education 1944-84', edited by A.G. Wedderspoon, Allen & Unwin, 1966.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid, page 28.
59. 'Education And Social Purpose' by F.W. Garforth, Oldbourne, 1962, page 112.
60. 'Learning For Living', Volume I, Number 3, January, 1962.
61. Referred to in 'Religious Education 1944-1984', op. cit, page 27.
62. See 'Religious Thinking From Childhood To Adolescence' by R. Goldman, Routledge, 1964, especially Chapter 4.
63. 'Learning For Living', Volume IV, Number 2, November, 1964, page 19.
64. Ibid, page 20.
65. 'Religious And Moral Education', Borough Road College, Isleworth, 1965, page 7.
66. 'Religious Education In State Schools' by Brigid Brophy, Fabian Tract 374, 1966, page 19.
67. 'Learning For Living', Volume 5, Number 5, May, 1966, page 25.
68. 'The Modern University' by G.L. Brook, Andre Deutsh, 1965, page 11.
69. In 'The Twentieth Century', February, 1956, page 128.
70. 'Universities Quarterly', Volume 16, Number 2, page 169.
71. 'The Cultural Function Of The University' in 'The University To-day', U.N.E.S.C.O., 1960, page 102.
72. Ibid, page 86.
73. 'Whither Britain's New Universities?' by S. Maclure, 'Listener', 2nd February, 1967, page 158.
74. The Second Reith Lecture, 'Listener', 21st November, 1963, pages 8-23.
75. Quoted by S. Maclure in 'Listener', 26th January, 1967, page 122.
76. Quoted by A. Carr-Saunders, 'English Universities To-day', London School of Economics, 1960, page 9.
77. 'Universities And Society' by N.C. Phillips in 'Listener', 26th September, 1963, page 452.
78. Report, 'Higher Education', op. cit, page 69, Table 30.

79.   'Education For Tomorrow', op. cit, page 70.
80.   Report, 'Higher Education', op. cit, page 260, Table 61.
81.   'The Home And The School', op. cit, page XXII.
82.   'Education To-day And Tomorrow', op. cit, page 134.
83.   'Fact And Possibility In English Education' by Robert Peers, Routledge,
      Kegan Paul, 1963, page 93.
84.   'New Left Review', Number XI, 1961, page 43.
85.   'New Left May-day Manifesto' 1967, page 15.
86.   'Culture And Society' by Raymond Williams, Penguin Books, 1961, pages
      318-324.
87.   'Notes Towards The Definition Of Culture' by T.S. Eliot, Faber Paperbacks,
      1962, page 43.
88.   Ibid, page 106.
89.   Ibid, page 102.
90.   Ibid, page 101.
91.   'Education And Contemporary Society' by H.L. Elvin, C.A. Watts, 1965,
      page 144.
92.   'Universities In Transformation', Adolph Löwe, Sheldon Press, 1940.
93.   'Education And Contemporary Society', op. cit, page 163.