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INTRODUCTION

During the past twenty years\textsuperscript{1} a revolution has occurred in the nature of historical enquiry. Increasingly historians are tending to conceive history less as a discrete monotechnic academic discipline and more as a process of investigation informed by the rapidly developing disciplines of sociology and social psychology.\textsuperscript{2} The study of the history of education, like other kinds of historical study, has been transformed by its integration into an enlarged pattern of social enquiry. This movement has considerably affected the planning and development of the present study. In particular, this thesis maintains that a proper understanding of the relationships existing between society and methods of teacher training cannot be reached without an awareness of the growth of two phenomena, secularization and bureaucratization, both sociological in their derivation. The main purpose of this introduction, therefore, is to survey the present relationship between sociology and the study of the history of education. Within this overall survey the meanings and uses of the terms secularization and bureaucratization are more closely examined to indicate their relevance to the historical development of the study. Finally, this introduction will attempt to place the present study in the existing framework of research concerned with teacher training.

The relationship of sociology and the history of education has rapidly generated its own literature. C.K. Turner in an early paper described the difficulty historians have in formulating theoretical models capable of sustaining historical explanations:

It is particularly difficult in studying aspects of the history of education to use any kind of theoretical framework. The concepts and tools of
the historian cannot be easily used to discuss a particular aspect of the past which has been arbitrarily extracted out of context for the convenience of study.3

In responding to this difficulty, historians of education have adopted as one type of solution some of the models of the sociologist and social psychologist. While the use of these kinds of models has greatly increased the amount of historical investigation that is comparative-normative in its approach,4 problems and misunderstandings have arisen, sometimes serious in nature. G. Bernbaum has pointed out:

There remain formidable obstacles to the attainment of the real unification of the subjects ... the historians' criticisms of sociology are frequently based on misconceptions of the sociological perspective, whilst the sociologist's attacks on historians frequently ignore the most recent changes which have occurred in historical scholarship.5

In this thesis, which has as its central theme the development of teacher training, an attempt has been made to pursue a path between the extremes of 'pure' sociological and historical interpretation. The concepts of secularization and bureaucratization are therefore used as continuing themes and points of reference within the overall development of the study. Nowhere in the study is it suggested that the twin concepts make a steady linear progression within a fixed chronological framework. Nor is it claimed that they provide a total explanation of the developmental pattern of teacher training. Rather, to borrow a term from the American sociologist, R.K. Merton, the concepts are used as "theories of the middle range", those describing and explaining events but not claiming "a conclusive and final interpretation".6 In other words, this study suggests that interacting processes of secularization and bureaucratization provide a useful framework. Within this format a thematic approach has been adopted because, as
Merton has persuasively argued:

One consequence of such formalization is that it serves as a control over the introduction of unrelated, indisciplined and diffuse interpretations. It does not impose on the reader the task of ferreting out the relations between the interpretations embodied in the text. Above all, it prepares the way for consecutive and cumulative research rather than a buckshot array of dispersed investigations.

In order to counter the tendency towards dispersed investigation, some adaptation of the sociological concepts of secularization and bureaucratization has been undertaken to increase their thematic strength. Such adaptation is easier with bureaucratization than with secularization which made an unpromising start within the field of sociology, as indicated by the very title of D. Martin's seminal discussion of the topic, "Towards eliminating the concept of secularization". Martin adopted his academic stance because he mistrusted cluster factors being conjoined, and subsequently explained away, under an umbrella definition such as secularization. In confronting the dilemma posited by Martin, B.R. Wilson and A. MacIntyre in their respective books cautiously attempted to sharpen their definitions of the concept. A resolution to the problem came from two sources. First, Martin himself offered a sociological explanation in his most recent book, A General Theory of Secularization, rapidly becoming recognized as definitive. Secondly, O. Chadwick has provided an applied sociological explanation in The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century which both defines and gives a working interpretation of the concept. In shaping his applied definition, Chadwick begins by confronting the doctrinaire abuse of the concept. This arises, according to him, when the concept is reduced to the level of simplistic dogma, "God is dead. Therefore secularization must be occurring. Therefore secularization
is a coherent notion". While noting the dangers of reductionism, Chadwick also comments on the alternative evil of stretching the concept beyond its proper limits. If these difficulties are recognized, he believes that the concept of secularization is a valuable means of theoretical interpretation:

From these difficulties of definition it does not follow that the umbrella word secularization is misused. It is often easier to be sure that a process is happening than to define precisely what the process contains and how it happens.... In this respect secularization, as a large idea used by historians, is no different from other such large ideas.

From this position Chadwick proceeds to limit the meaning of the term in order to provide it with authenticity and power. He asserts that secularization is not a change in fashion or custom, nor is it a change in fundamental Christian doctrine. While acknowledging that a reduction in Christianity is a probable side effect of secularization, Chadwick concludes that secularization might imply "a growing tendency in mankind to do without religion". The present study pursues this tendency to do without religion as one of the factors explaining the direction denominational colleges have followed in the twentieth century.

The other factor that this study is specially concerned with is the process of bureaucratization. This may be described (at the risk of over simplification) as the growing tendency of mankind to demand, collectively, improved standards of living, thereby creating a demand for more government and more services which, in turn, inevitably increases the number of centralized 'bureaucratic' organizations formed to administer them. In this kind of chain reaction, the original, non-valuative concept of bureaucratization put forward by Max Weber, soon becomes enmeshed in an associated consideration of the styles and
types of bureaucratic organizations. This can be confusing, especially so in the light of the numerous re-definitions\(^ {18}\) and re-applications of Weber's theory within the field of educational research.\(^ {19}\) In the interests of clarity it may be helpful at this point to state that this study is primarily concerned with the application of bureaucratic theory at an organizational level. Consequently, Weber's original propositions concerning the nature of bureaucratic organizations are used as the starting points for analysis. Weber defined bureaucratic organizations as being, "organizations whose social structures are arranged for the rational distribution of time, space and resources".\(^ {20}\) In extending this basic definition Weber went on to state that bureaucratic organizations are governed by "rules, regulations and hierarchies" and that such organizations are staffed by "full time officials" who are employed on the basis of "fixed contracts and salaries".\(^ {21}\) Collectively, these various comments are customarily referred to as Weber's theory of an 'ideal-type' of bureaucracy.

A number of writers have challenged facets of this theory. Allowing for weakness attributed to it by R.H. Hall\(^ {22}\) and D.S. Pugh,\(^ {23}\) the present study contends that the concept of an 'ideal-type' of bureaucracy as posited by Weber continues to be useful. Indeed, during the course of the study a persistent attempt is made to argue that the teacher training activities of the religious denominations become bureaucratized partly as a response to the constantly increasing centralization of national government.

The nature, style and purpose of English government during the late Victorian period has been the subject of extensive academic reappraisal during the last decade. N. Morris,\(^ {24}\) O. MacDonagh\(^ {25}\) and K.M. Hughes\(^ {26}\) in their respective articles have all contended that from the late 1860s Victorian governments covertly began to abandon laissez-
faire principles in order to pursue more centralist policies. The trend towards centralism is examined in what is perhaps the most substantial piece of original research devoted to the development of teacher training during this period. F.W.T. Fuller in his doctoral thesis, "The Churches Train Teachers" argues that well before 1890 the denominational colleges had been reduced to being "agents of the state". He maintains that their subservience had been brought about by the progressive implementation of state authority. This authority, Fuller suggests, was imposed upon the colleges by an inspectorate whose task it was to monitor the teacher training process in the light of ever increasing amounts of government legislation. In a thinly researched area, Fuller's main hypothesis is indirectly supported by G. McGregor. In tracing the history of Bishop Otter College, McGregor takes as a major theme "the denominational colleges' search for autonomy". In pursuing this line of enquiry, he produces a final hypothesis that strikingly complements the earlier work. Thus, while Fuller argues that by 1890 the church colleges had lost their autonomy, McGregor suggests that from the opening of the twentieth century these colleges were persistently seeking to re-establish their freedom.

The present study, a development of the work of Fuller and McGregor, attempts to show how the subordinate status of the church colleges was confirmed and their search for autonomy denied, through the progressive secularization and bureaucratization of the state. An analysis of the progress and interaction of these two phenomena, as related to the development of teacher training in England during the twentieth century, forms the central theme of this thesis. Incidentally, attention will be paid to the problems inherent in the proper integration of sociology and history.
Although secularization is a difficult concept to define, it is much easier to explain how it has affected teacher training than to analyze the effect of bureaucratization. Difficulties in this latter area arise partly because any use of the word bureaucracy, or its derivatives, is bedevilled by an English predilection to use them indiscriminately as terms of abuse. During the period covered by this study, the word bureaucratic was freely and pejoratively equated in England with 'Prussianism' and later 'Hitlerism'. In the light of this common usage of the word, it is important to note that in sociological terms bureaucratization is a neutral, non-valuative concept. Therefore throughout the study, attention will be directed towards maintaining the proper distinction between the sociological and pejorative use of the word and concept.

The foregoing represents the theoretical framework of the study. Within this context, the first chapter of this thesis provides a contextual review of those forces actively promoting the secularization of English society during the nineteenth century. From this contextual opening, the study moves towards a consideration of how the processes of secularization and bureaucratization were dramatically impelled forward during the course of the First World War. Against the background of the continuing economic crises of the inter-war period, the central part of the study is largely given over to a consideration of the seeming paradox of the religious denominations becoming the agents of their own secularization. It is argued that in striving for greater instrumental efficiency the denominations bureaucratized their colleges and in so doing, hastened their secularization.

In the final part of this study, an attempt is made to demonstrate how anti-Nazi feelings, generated during the Second World War, played a
major part in suspending the process of secularization during the 1940s. It is argued, following C. Cannon,\textsuperscript{33} that the resulting climate of opinion enabled the denominational colleges to achieve favourable terms within the overall 1944 settlement. Finally, the study considers whether the denominational colleges have any viable future in a society in which the rise of the corporate state threatens to be both absolute and final.\textsuperscript{34}


6 Merton, R.K. (1957), Social Theory and Social Structure; p. 16.


One of the most interesting re-interpretations of Weber's original work is by MOWENEN, W.J. (1978), *The Age of Bureaucracy: Perspectives on the Political Sociology of Max Weber*. For the study of training colleges as bureaucratic institutions, Crozier's work is particularly helpful for the purposes of comparative analysis; CROZIER, M. (1973), *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*; pp. 145-203.

F. Musgrove, in one of the most extensive re-applications of Weber's theory within the field of educational research, has attempted to re-classify his sometimes tenuous categories of bureaucratic activities. Accepting Weber's original division of rules, regulations and hierarchies, Musgrove adds to them clear-cut divisions of labour and the impersonal conduct of officials as being the five attributive factors characteristic of bureaucratic organizations. By adopting this five-factor typology of bureaucratic organizations, Musgrove is able to define educational bureaucracies in the following way:

There is a clear-cut division of labour, and regular activities 'are distributed in a fixed way as official duties'; the organization is hierarchical, 'each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one'; there is a system of rules, and operations are governed 'by the application of these rules to particular cases'; the conduct of officials is impersonal, and duties are performed 'without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm'; and employment is based on technical qualification, it is protected against arbitrary dismissal, and it constitutes a career'; there is a system of promotions, 'according to seniority or to achievement, or both'.


"Some time in the last half of the nineteenth century there was a shift in outlook on the part of our legislators; from being chiefly concerned with removing the shackles on the free actions of individuals, they began to use legislation to benefit the poor, even at some sacrifice to individual freedom". HUGHES, Op. cit.


Ibid. pp. 158-159.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/730 (1918), Education Bill.


PART I

A BREACH IN THE DENOMINATIONAL WALL
CHAPTER 1
The Undergrowth of Secularization

Secularization was not a phenomenon exclusive to the nineteenth century; rather it was something which became manifest in public consciousness during the middle and later parts of this period. Sacred and secular forces had from the beginnings of English society contended for supremacy and consequently early forms of Christian belief were often grafted on to long held heathen practices and customs. In this way early Christianity was penetrated by elements of paganism to such an extent that many of those converted believed their new faith to be a "superior form of magic". While a clear distinction between paganism and secularism needs to be recognised, it can nevertheless be argued that the former provided a cultural tradition from which the latter developed.

Whatever its style or title, foreigners were not slow to detect within English society a persistent form of unbelief lurking behind the outward shows of piety. In 1805 Jules Michelet, a distinguished French historian, declared, "This great English people among so many good and solid qualities has one vice which spoils these very qualities.... From Shakespeare to Milton, from Milton to Byron, their beautiful and sombre literature is sceptical, judaic, satanic, to sum up anti-Christian....".

Having made his specific accusation in terms of the literary tradition of England, Michelet widened his attack, claiming that the Henrican and Elizabethan settlements of religion in Britain could not have been achieved but for the "notorious thread of paganism and
secularism which is woven into the very fabric of that society. Michelet concluded his analysis by describing paganism and secularism as snugly coexisting within English society, "like two maggots in an apple".

Although some of Michelet's evidence is imprecise (at one point he sees paganism and secularism as forming a "continuous thread" quickly modifying this to recognize their separateness in his reference to "two maggots"), his major point is nevertheless quite clear. Secularism in his analysis did not spring newborn into the nineteenth century arena. Rather in his opinion it was closely related to a tradition of paganism which had long been present but masked by the dominant Christian ethos of English society. If Michelet's original point is extended, it can be argued that this masking effect had from the beginning of the eighteenth century largely concealed the already widespread disaffection of the working classes from traditional forms of religious worship. Such disaffection was difficult to detect because it rarely revealed itself in overt forms. Horace Mann in commenting on his 1851 religious census stated "positive infidelity among the working classes is rare and that the masses can be better described as unconscious secularists, having no philosophical grounds for objections to the forms given it by the churches".

Mann's use of the striking phrase "unconscious secularists" is taken up and extended by K.S. Inglis in his book, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England. A major argument advanced by Inglis is that the churches did not lose the support of the working classes in the nineteenth century, for the simple reason that they had never enjoyed it in the first place; "It is not that the Church of God has lost the great towns; it has never had them....". This hypothesis
therefore places a cautionary perspective on the idea that a rapid expansion of secularism in the nineteenth century brought about a corresponding decline in religion. Indeed the work of Inglis, M. Watts and K. Thomas collectively suggests that the influence of secularism was deeply entrenched in English society "long before the onset of industrialism". If this frame of reference is adopted it can be argued that the destruction of the traditional English social structure brought about by the onset of the industrial revolution provided the conditions in which latent forms of secularism became overt and articulate. This was the particular context which enabled Mann's "unconscious secularists" to become politically conscious and, eventually, an identifiable social group.

The foregoing analysis is particularly valuable in demonstrating the manner in which secularization in the nineteenth century derived from a previous tradition. However, it almost certainly underestimates the extent to which post industrial revolutionary conditions actively encouraged the growth and dissemination of secular attitudes and beliefs. Chadwick in positing a counter hypothesis argues that the forces unleashed by the industrial revolution acted as major causal factors in the rapid expansion of secularization. Chadwick contends that while industrialization destroyed traditional social and religious patterns, post revolutionary conditions provided the means and conditions for an antagonistic culture to thrive. In his view the rapid expansion of secularization particularly evident during the latter part of the nineteenth century was a reaction to, and not a continuation of, the previously held Christian tradition. This is perhaps the proper corrective to the view that secularism only burgeoned from a previously predominant Christian ideology.
The second part of this chapter is mainly concerned with an attempt to apply and extend the types of analysis offered by Inglis and Chadwick. In extending their models, the idea of primary and secondary forms of secularization is posited. It is argued that if only primary factors of secularization are accepted (such as industrialization and urbanization) the arguments of Inglis and Thomas appear substantially correct. However, it is suggested that such views need modification in the light of the widespread growth of secondary factors, such as the development of the media industries and the rapid extension of transportation systems, which were characteristic features of what has been termed the second industrial revolution. Through an examination of these secondary factors of secularization, (and the confused responses of denominationalists to them), there emerges a pattern of conflicting values and beliefs. While the conflict between Christianity and the forces of secularism was clearly evident by the end of the nineteenth century, early symptoms of an impending confrontation were discernible during the formative period of the industrial revolution and therefore in this investigation analysis begins at that point.

Living in a society where the first savage manifestations of the industrial revolution have been mellowed by time or lost altogether in subsequent development, we may find it difficult to understand the initial horror felt by eminent Victorians as they witnessed the industrialization of their society. Thomas Carlyle, with a poet's sensitivity, expressed some of their dismay and despair when he confronted the situation prevailing in the North of England during the 1840's. Hordes of masterless men were pouring into the newly created industrial cities and Carlyle's apprehensions centred on the imminent evils that would attend such a sudden loss of social cohesion:
"Black mutinous discontent devours them ... English commerce, with its world-wide, convulsive fluctuations, with its immeasurable Proteus steam demon, makes all paths uncertain for them, all life a bewilderment; society, steadfastness, peaceable continuance, the first blessings of man are not theirs. This world for them no home, but a dingy prison house....".19 It is interesting to note how concisely this quotation enumerates the conditions in which the process of secularization gained an initial impetus. Freed from the stabilizing influences of the traditional agricultural year and its associated social and religious observances, workers entered into an urbanized industrial system which valued their toil but not their persons. The factory and the factory alone was the symbol and consummation of the new order. Benjamin Disraeli in his novel, Sybil or the Two Nations, described for his readers the appearance of one of the new industrial cities: "Wodgate had the appearance of a vast squalid suburb. As you advanced, leaving behind you long lines of little dingy tenements, with infants lying about the road, you expected every moment to emerge into some streets, and encounter buildings bearing some correspondence in their size and comfort, to the considerable swarming and busied around you. Nothing of the kind. There were no public buildings of any sort; no churches, chapels, townhall, institute, theatre, schools and in the principal streets in the heart of the town ... were situated only coarse and grimy shops".20

In the face of such overwhelming and rapid urban expansion, traditional forms of parish organization broke down completely. By the time parishes were introduced to the cities they seemed an anachronistic irrelevance. The expensive provision of large city churches during the 1850's and 1860's could not compensate for a fatal lapse in time and
habits. The Reverend Charles Kingsley had a character in his novel, *Yeast*, declare: "After all the expense, when they've built the church, it's the tradesmen and the gentry and the old folk that fill it, and the working men never come near it from one year's end to another".

This type of evidence tends to confirm the widely held view that industrialization and associated urbanization brought about such a degree of social dislocation that religion, as it were, perished through neglect. Viewed in this way, secularization appears to be an essentially negative movement. It is suggested that the initial lack of religious provision in the cities resulted in a kind of religious inertia taking hold of the workers after which they gradually regressed into a state of casual secularism. This single factor explanation is hardly tenable in the light of considerable evidence pointing towards the rise of a politically informed secularist movement. Thomas Chalmers, a Scottish minister who in 1821 published a book, *Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns*, gave an early warning of the presence among the working classes of a politically informed and motivated body of artisans actively promoting secularist views. Questioned by Parliamentary Commissioners in 1821 regarding the widespread absence of working class people from attendance at religious instruction for their children, Chalmers responded by articulating the views of what he contended was the standpoint of many of them: "The less we have of it[religious instruction], the less we desire it. It is not with the aliment of the soul as it is with the aliment of the body....". Some Anglican bishops, conscious of this open antagonism, explained away the growth of secularism in terms of forces over which they had no control and for which, therefore, they had no responsibility. Following the doctrines of political economy they
equated the laws of supply and demand with the inevitable production of what was euphemistically termed 'the residuum'. Within the residuum were to be found the most ignorant, the most helpless and the most ineffectual members of the work force. In the residuum it was believed, lay the spawning ground of secularism. This was, however, a fallacious explanation of the real situation.

Secularism, in fact, derived its strength from the labour aristocracy, a point grasped by both Edward Miall and Thomas Chalmers. Miall's journal, The Non-conformist, invited its working class readers in 1848 to offer their views on "The Working Classes and Religious Institutions". Even after Miall's non-conformist bias has been discounted, the most critical responses clearly came from those he described as being "politically informed artisans" who complained bitterly of the "almost total want of sympathy manifested by the ministers of religion of every denomination with the privations, wants, and wastes of the working classes". This evidence is strengthened by Chalmers' claim that secularist ideas found receptive audiences within the workshops rather than on the dole queues. Hugh McLeod in his book, Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City, confirms Chalmers early diagnosis when he asserts that by the 1890's "Secularist ideas ... were part of the workshop culture of London". In supporting his statement, McLeod cites the degree of secularist opinion evident among the skilled craftsmen who produced furniture in the London factories. Referring to the evidence offered by William Rossiter, McLeod concludes that by the late 1880's these factories were notorious for developing "a body of artisans who [were] characterised by a very deep and very bitter antipathy to teachers and professors of religion".
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This evidence suggests that the industrial revolution did rather more than dislocate social and religious patterns. It appears that it was within the workshops that the social forms of Christianity which had been imbibed in the home and village were actively challenged. The labour élite, gathering at the work bench and meeting socially in associated working men's clubs, forged their own distinctive secularist programme.

The role played by the working men's clubs in promoting and disseminating secularist opinions is of the utmost importance. Before this role is examined, however, some cautionary perspectives need to be considered. In the light of D. Frazer's meticulous survey of the developmental differences in urban politics between the "four great provincial capitals of Victorian England - Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool", it would be foolish to continue referring to the process of secularization in undifferentiated terms. Just as Frazer has detected violent fluctuations in political fortunes over a relatively small time-scale within and between provincial English cities, the same type of fluctuations almost certainly attended the growth of secularist programmes in the same localities. Therefore in examining the developments of the working men's clubs in London, Manchester, Birmingham and Leicester, the differences, as well as the similarities, associated with the growth of secularization need analysis.

These differences, not surprisingly, often stemmed from the varied personalities of those actively promoting secularist views. In the middle of the nineteenth century London boasted an impressive, but inherently unstable, secularist élite. Led by the popular and controversial Charles Bradlaugh, this pantheon included such notable
members as J.S. Mill, T.H. Huxley, W. O'Brian and intermittently enjoyed the support of Marx, Mazzini and Garibaldi. The potential tensions within such a group are strikingly revealed in contrasting the attitudes of its members to the secularist clubs. Charles Bradlaugh was a frequent guest speaker at such institutions, revelling in their atmosphere of earthy camaraderie. Mill and Huxley, however, tended to find the company of the secularist proletariat unappealing, preferring the solitude of their studies to the boisterous social interchange of the beer halls. Such differences of attitude and approach created a tension within the secularist movement in London. Despite their coarseness, the working men's clubs represented the real basis of popular support for secularist ideas and therefore the intellectual élite ignored them at their peril. Bishop Temple had no hesitation in identifying the clubs as providing the real cutting edge of the secularist movement, describing them as "boils irritating the body politic".  

Temple's condemnation is typical of the extreme postures struck by both sides. It is, therefore, somewhat difficult to uncover the true nature of the clubs and the extent of their devotion to the secular cause as opposed to their pursuit of an alternative social role. William Rossiter, an Anglican who wrote two articles on "Artisan Atheism" in 1887, distinguished between the "few earnest men" who provided the leadership of the secularist clubs and the majority who liked an evening of "Bible, beer and baccy". This last remark gives a clear insight into the kind of routine established by the clubs. On week day evenings the Bible was read so that its contents could be disproved through the application of scientific knowledge. On a Saturday night a visiting speaker might not begin his address until
The Freethinker had been distributed for week-end reading and the proceeds of the Health and Benevolent Sick Fund distributed.

Perhaps though, this is a picture of the clubs at their best. Even when evenings within the clubs started on a disciplined note such gatherings frequently degenerated into drunken riots. Several Anglican clergy interviewed by Charles Booth deplored the influence of the clubs within their parishes, complaining of their members' drunkenness, brawling and the persistent singing of songs "full of beastly innuendo".36 While there is no reason to doubt the honesty of the clergy's comments, it has to be borne in mind that the very presence of the clubs challenged the traditional role of the church. Through the social welfare activities of the clubs, secularists proved that the churches did not have a monopoly on charity.37

In the North, Manchester was a bastion of secularist opinion. Although it did not have the famous names associated with it as did the secularist cause in London, the support of secularism in Manchester was more solid and more deeply rooted. C.S. Davies in his book, North Country Bred, paints a picture of generations of his family and their neighbours brought up "cut and dried"38 in their secularist beliefs. While the activities of the Manchester working men's clubs seem to have broadly conformed to the patterns established in London, the northern city was unique in possessing from 1854 to 1861 a model secular school. This school is important not only because it existed, but because an examination of its foundation and management over a period of nearly a decade39 illustrates the types of political and religious pressure groups whose members combined so as to sustain the experiment.

D.K. Jones in his article, Socialization and Social Science: Manchester Model Secular School 1854-1861, is careful to demonstrate that far from
being founded by members of a fanatical minority the promoters of the
school "were unusually eminent, being a band of men distinguished above
their fellow citizens even in a city which has long been famous for the
enlightened zeal of its leading citizens".\textsuperscript{40} In analysing a sample of
the twenty five most active promoters of the school, Jones notes that,
"Of the sixteen of these people whose religious affiliations can be
ascertained, ten were Unitarians, two Anglicans, two Congregationalists,
one Free Presbyterian and one Baptist". Of these sixteen people
therefore, four were actually ministers of religion.\textsuperscript{41}

The fact that four ministers of religion and other church members
could be persuaded to support the development of a secular school seems
extremely illogical. However, the apparent contradiction between
belief and action lessens when it is recognized that the founders of
the school believed that it was "possible to provide an essentially
religious education without recourse to the Bible and the teaching of
religious doctrine".\textsuperscript{42} This interesting and politically subtle
philosophical position was adopted by the founders of the school as a
result of their acceptance of the teachings of William Ellis and George
Combe, particularly the latter. Combe had consistently argued that the
removal of "doctrinal teaching from school studies" should be the
starting point for the proper religious education of the child,
namely "the training of all his or her faculties".\textsuperscript{43}

Secularists in many cases adopted the Combe manifesto as a means
of prizing church schools away from specifically denominational
management. From their strictly partisan point of view his opinions
were enormously attractive, containing as they did so many ambiguities.
Depending on how they were implemented, Combe's ideas on religious
education could mean everything - or nothing.\textsuperscript{44}
Many non-conformists had good reason to be grateful to George Combe for providing the kind of theological obscurity which allowed them latitude over religious differences in the interests of achieving political co-operation with the secularists. As both Frazer and A.P. Derrington have demonstrated, a combination of impatience and fear gripped some of the non-conformist sects during the 1860's. The impatience stemmed from the failure of the churches to make progress in the industrial cities. In their despair, Unitarians and Congregationalists grasped political economy as a weapon and attempted to cover its philosophy with the trappings of Christianity.

In the Manchester experiment non-conformists joined with secularists in founding a school in which the curriculum was dominated by a consideration of the doctrines of political economy. In some respects the non-conformists may be judged naive in failing to perceive the consequences of a curriculum almost exclusively devoted to the promotion of industry, order, knowledge, economy, punctuality and honesty. The fatal flaw was that the study of political economy, carried to its logical conclusion, made religion irrelevant. This was a fact clearly perceived by secularists, according as it did with predictions made by Marx and Engels whose views were popularized and published by the editors of such radical papers as The Freethinker.

While non-conformists freely condemned the printing of such "socialistic rot" they found themselves impelled to make friends with those who believed it. Neither individuals nor groups were entirely rational in their behaviour. If non-conformists were short-sighted in making alliances with secularists, emotional as much as rational needs were the cause. Secularists and dissenters were both minorities, and both found powerful reasons for sinking their differences in the face
of their shared "alarm at the increasing domination of the Anglican Church". This fear of domination led believers and non-believers to support each other in a much wider struggle, a contest described by Frazer as constituting, "the traditional battle ... freedom against privilege".

The overall effect of this national political contest can be illustrated through an examination of some of the events leading up to the 1885 General Election. Common resentment on the part of both non-conformists and secularists alike at what they perceived to be the unfair privileges enjoyed by church schools and denominational colleges, persuaded Joseph Chamberlain to make it a political issue in the campaign. Leaving his radical citadel in Birmingham, Chamberlain addressed a Liberal party meeting at Bradford on the 1 October, 1885. On this occasion, Chamberlain declared, "The existence of sectarian schools and colleges supported by state grants is no doubt a very serious question in itself, and one which some day or another ought to receive consideration. Whenever that time comes for its discussion, I for one shall not hesitate to express my opinion that contributions of government money, whether great or small, ought in all cases to be accompanied by some form of representative control. To my mind, the spectacle of so-called national schools turned into a private preserve by clerical managers, and used for exclusive purposes of politics or religion, is not one which the law ought to tolerate". Reactions to Chamberlain's speech illustrate the diversity, and its attendant complexities, of the secularist, non-conformist, liberal alliance. Having made the speech, Chamberlain immediately found himself the hero of secularist clubs in Birmingham and throughout the Midlands. The Committee of the long established Leicester Secularist Society, which
sometimes looked askance at the brashness of its Birmingham counter-part, on this occasion voted to send an address to Chamberlain expressing its members' whole-hearted support for his stand. Such support was not lacking from left wing elements of non-conformity, such as the Unitarians, Primitive Baptists and Methodists. However, Wesleyans and Presbyterians bitterly criticized Chamberlain for making what they termed a divisive speech, and in the ensuing Election joined with Anglicans and Catholics to challenge "the godless liberalism of the Whigs".

An analysis of this cameo of political activity is helpful in establishing a number of points. Clearly, by 1885 secularism was part of a complex political and religious matrix. The great divide between unconscious and conscious secularism had been crossed. Although occupying a minority position, secularists by the 1880's were an identifiable part of the radical alliance. In considering the state and progress of secularism in London during this period, McLeod claims that "secularists enjoyed an influence out of all proportion to their numbers".

McLeod's claim, although made on the basis of localised evidence, is a significant one. Its validity is in part confirmed by the reactions of denominationalists to the threat presented by the growth of secularist opinion during this period. Indeed, the progress of secularisation in the latter part of the nineteenth century can in many ways best be charted by following the sometimes confused responses of denominationalists who found it easier to detect the 'speck in their brother's eye than the mote in their own'. In 1888, the Reverend J.H. Rigg, Principal of the Methodist College at Westminster, chose the occasion of his Inaugural Address to incoming students as the
appropriate moment to congratulate them on being English rather than American students. In the part of his lengthy address entitled, "Where the Danger of Secularism might Arise, The Case of America", Rigg chilled the souls of his young students with an account of the "absolutely godless" system of education prevailing in the United States of America. This had come about, according to him, through American teachers ceasing to "carry with them the mint-mark of true Christian training" and the related failure of denominationalists to assert their rights in the management of the American common schools. In attributing blame for this, to him, appalling situation, Rigg rather wildly referred to a malign conspiracy of Roman Catholics and 'free thinkers': "Between the claims and anathemas of the Roman Catholics on the one hand, who demand for themselves Catholic church schools and the objections and criticisms of free thinkers and ultra liberals on the other, the Christian character of the common school is gone".

The obvious inaccuracies of this analysis are in some respects compounded by Rigg's subsequent attempt to apply the lessons to be learnt from the American experience in the British context. Talking of "The True Safeguard Against Secularism" he reveals an oddly assorted combination of realism and complacency. The element of realism in his analysis derives from his accurate identification of some of the factors present in English society during the 1880's that were helping to check the growth of secularist ideas. Here, for instance, is Rigg describing the power base of Christian influence within the English educational system: "The distinctively Christian schools of the country, under the direct inspiration and influence of the Christian churches; and the family Training Colleges, conducted under strictly Christian direction and inspiration, and imbued with positive Christian truth and
teaching - these are the sources from which the whole education of the country, including the School Board system, has been replenished with Christian influence....".61

This is certainly not an unreasonable estimate of the situation, making allowances for the rather idealised terms in which the speaker paints the portrait from a Christian perspective. In the same context Rigg stayed within the boundaries of objective assessment when he confronted his audience with the hypothetical position that would arise if Christian schools and colleges were to be lost. "Let these be done away", he declared, "and the present general harmony is likely before long to give place to discord".62 Such discord, he argued, would inevitably result from pupils being allowed to follow the paths of "untrained individualism". Rigg posed an uncomfortable question to his audience: "The seminaries and training schools of high Christian tradition having been broken up - there being nothing left but a common school level - what security is left?". Responding to his own question he declared that there would be nothing left to prevent the "schools and teachers of England" by degrees descending "to that low ground of a common secularism to which, in the course of fifty years, the American common school system has declined".63

It is at this point that Rigg's analysis shades over from realism towards unwarranted complacency. Having frightened his young listeners with the 'American bogey' he set out to demonstrate the splendid solidity of the English system. Indeed, his subsequent remarks were directed towards reassuring his audience that the threat posed by secularism in England was diminishing, not increasing, in its extent. To this end, Rigg confidently asserted that "during the last twenty years" the public response to "secularist educational demands" had
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become "cool and faint". Since 1870, he claimed, "the movement of opinion has been in the opposite direction.... The secularists are in retreat; the enemies of the Voluntary Schools are in the confusion of uncertain principles and divided counsels". This was a total misrepresentation of the real situation and can be proved to be so from an analysis of subsequent denominationalist statements.

Rigg's comments in 1888 were specifically directed towards the threat of secularism as it affected the education system. Even if for the time being, therefore, all the contrary evidence regarding the growth of secularism in English society during this period is excluded, there is some irony in examining the Valedictory Address given to the same students on the termination of their studies in 1890. On this occasion the Reverend T. Bowman Stephenson found himself unable to reiterate Rigg's note of confident Christianity. In referring to "The High Ideals of the Past" Stephenson confessed himself to be "a little despondent about the present situation". Explaining the causes of his despondency he told the students, "I do not blame the individual teacher, but I cannot help feeling that the systems and conditions of public instruction have lowered very much the ideal of the teacher's life and work....". In pursuing the question of the lowering of standards in education, Stephenson made a lengthy comparison between the role and purposes of teachers in the early elementary schools and their status in the urban board schools of the 1890's. In the early period, he declared, there was "a sanctity about the work of the teacher which lifted it out of the category of a mere profession". Succumbing perhaps to Rigg's tendency to idealise, he painted for his audience a picture of a "teacher of that old type ... in the midst of his scholars, entering into all their interests,
sharing their amusements, knowing everyone by name and studying each one's character; the guide, the philosopher, and friend of his scholars, and not only their taskmaster. 67

It is perhaps right at this point to confront a difficulty of historical interpretation referred to during the introduction of this thesis. Martin in his early paper on the nature of secularization 68 was determined that generalized trends should not be collected together on an ad hoc basis and promptly explained away under the umbrella definition of secularization. On a first reading, Stephenson's remarks seem to represent little more than the kind of ill-defined grumblings not unfamiliar today, namely a belief that somehow everything was better in the past. But even if this is acknowledged as a danger, what makes Stephenson's evidence different is the sharpness of his observation regarding what was then his contemporary situation. Having indulged in some therapeutic grumbling, he follows this with a detailed portrait of "The Typical Schoolmaster of Today". From this description it is possible to identify some of the factors which were combining during the 1890's to bureaucratize and secularize the schoolmaster's role at this time.

Starting from his original point, namely that "the typical schoolmaster of today" is not as good "as his predecessor of forty years ago", Stephenson immediately proceeds to address himself to the critical question, "Why not?". The main difference, he declares, is the problem of the city which has rendered the survival of the old style of teacher "scarcely possible". Clearly not satisfied by the adequacy of this facile explanation, Stephenson cites specific examples of the effects of urbanization on the teacher's role. Here is Stephenson's description of a board school headmaster:
He is very likely to be something of a judge, a little of an executioner and a great deal of a clerk. Of the hundreds of children on his books he can know only a portion by name, and scarcely any of those thoroughly. He probably lives, and I will not blame him for it, at a great distance from his school. The train delivers him at the door only just before the clock strikes, and a moment after school time is over you may see him rushing down the street, pulling on his overcoat as he runs, to catch the outward train, which is due round the corner in two minutes.69

Even a cursory examination of this passage yields a number of striking insights. Perhaps its central theme could be described as impersonalization, one of the hallmarks of the bureaucratization process. The schools are too big, the distances of travel too great and consequently the headmaster becomes a remote figure, concerned with administration and removed from the personal interaction involved in classroom teaching. The passage also seems strangely obsessed with the commuting habits of the headmaster. While Stephenson may have been struck by the novelty of the situation as it appeared to him in 1890, the nature of his description also suggests that he is perturbed by the advent of urban transportation systems. The description of the headmaster "pulling on his overcoat" as he makes an undignified dash for the train coming "round the corner in two minutes" has an unfriendly edge to it. In this passage Stephenson is actually describing a major facet of secondary secularization observable at this time, namely the rapid extension of urban communication systems. The anonymity of an individual's life-style, made possible by the rise of the city, is, suggests Stephenson, increased by his access to means of transportation that enable him to distance himself from his place of work. The fragmentation wrought upon the individual as a result of what the author repeatedly refers to as the "workings of the system", is revealed in his final despairing analysis:
I confess I wonder not that so little good work is done, but that so much good work is done, under such a system — a system so mechanical, and driven at such high pressure.... In such a system, how easy to become a mere official, a Gradgrind at work, a French polisher of manners, a conjuror in producing passes, but failing to touch the deepest springs of conduct, failing to promote the new birth of character, failing to develop any enthusiasm for goodness, or any reverence for God.

Here, stated in the plainest possible terms, is one man's assessment of how the rise of 'the system' is making the individual into a bureaucrat and additionally, immunizing him from the influences of God.

The students who listened to Stephenson's Valedictory Address had good reason to be confused. They had started out on their teacher training course by hearing a confident assertion from the Reverend J.H. Rigg that everywhere (except in America) secularism was in retreat. The more perceptive members of the audience might have felt very uneasy about this claim given the evidence to the contrary cited by Stephenson. It is perhaps fortunate they had all departed to the busy anonymity of their working lives before Rigg was once again asked to give the Inaugural Address to students in 1893. Although he probably did not realize it, in the course of his long address Rigg reversed his 1888 stance. Like many of his contemporaries, this stalwart of non-conformity found himself at odds with "the increasing frivolity, the want of seriousness, the prevalent superficiality of temper, taste and habits of thinking" observable "among our modern school-bred generations". This state of affairs, he declared, derived in part from the mass of cheap literature (often read on trains) designed to be "sensational ... to catch the eye, the fancy, the taste of those multitudes who, though they have learnt to read, are as yet ... not a whit more elevated in character and taste than their predecessors who could not read". Modern life, he lamented in 1893, is too
unsetting, "too frivolous". All its characteristics, such as better means of transportation, instant literature and growing social disharmony (as evidenced in the recent "terrible strikes"), were, according to Rigg, inexorably leading to the "intellectual and moral degradation of society". It would be difficult in the space of one short passage to find a more succinct description of the process of secularization and its apparent effects upon late Victorian society. Ironically, in his 1893 address Rigg produced an almost definitive catalogue of the factors of secularization, a process which he had so stoutly declared to be everywhere on the retreat in 1888.

At this point the reader may well feel interested but unconvinced. It could be argued that the evidence used is much too limited, drawn as it is entirely from Wesleyan sources. The time-scale is also very compressed, a short five-year period between 1888 to 1893. Indeed, it could be claimed that the juxtapositions are just a little too neat and the evidence a little too contrived. While these points will be dealt with more fully in the conclusion to this chapter, an initial response is offered by drawing evidence from Roman Catholic archives of a later date thus moving the time-scale forward into the twentieth century.

On the 19 October, 1901, The Tablet published the first of two articles by the Reverend T.J. Campbell on the topic of "State Paternalism in Education". This evidence continues the American theme, Campbell's original address having been made to the Catholic Young Men's National Union at Philadelphia. In substance, Campbell offered his British audience warnings as to the rampant secularism of American society and the growing centralism of its presidential form of government. Simply but vigorously Campbell began by declaring the wholly secular public school system of education in America to be an affront to Catholic values. The central tenet of the Catholic position, he argued, was
that a state cannot possess exclusive rights to educate all its children. Campbell roundly attacked the rapid expansion of the public school system, warning that its threatened monopoly put at risk the continued existence of "minority schools and interests". These interests, he believed, were further threatened by the secular attitudes prevalent in an increasingly "Godless society". In the light of previous evidence some of his words have a ring of familiarity. He inveighed against the "malign influence" of "cheap literature", "designed to excite the foulest passions and inculcate the vilest principles of human conduct". This "cheap", "deplorable", "popular" culture, thrust before the people, not only in the form of newspapers, books and magazines but everywhere purveyed in the theatres and music halls of the land, was, according to Campbell, the prime cause of a rising tide of social dislocation. It led, he claimed, "to increasing violations of the sacred bonds of marriage", and to a general increase in crime and "every form of social and moral disobedience". It was the price paid, he believed, for a system of public education which "has encouraged a whole generation of children ... not to believe in anything". Altogether, it was an horrendous picture and no doubt acted (as intended), as a dreadful warning to English Catholics as to the price that would be paid for any curtailment of their denominational schools.

In a consideration of the relevance of Campbell's evidence in terms of the British context, the primary question concerns the extent to which Englishmen continued to believe that secularization and bureaucratization were peculiar to the United States. Undoubtedly the traditional insularity of the English persuaded many of them to perceive the threats presented by Campbell as distant manifestations
of 'Yankee culture'. However, the dramatic growth of both phenomena in England by 1900 can in some respects be gauged by the numbers of English people who found the American evidence uncomfortably relevant.

English Catholics under the forceful leadership of Cardinal Manning had no particular need of transatlantic warnings regarding the dangers of secularization. Indeed, domestic siren calls were both frequent and familiar. As D.E. Selby has pointed out, fear of secularization was one of the mainsprings of Manning's life, his intense hatred of the phenomenon acting as a goad to many of his activities.

If English Catholics were well aware of the dangers of secularization, the dangers of bureaucratization were brought home to an even wider spectrum of the laity during the course of the heated public debate on Balfour's 1902 Education Bill. A belief that R.L. Morant (with tacit Unionist support) intended to create one central educational authority, contributed to Michael Sadler's and George Kekewich's shared antipathy towards him. Sadler in particular believed that this centralization could only be achieved at the expense of a perhaps fatal loss of local autonomy in the management of schools.

Sadler's fears regarding centralization, which he set out in his article, The Influence of the State in English Education, were clearly prompted by contemporary events. Indeed, whatever the personal influence of Morant (a problem analysed in a following chapter), evidence available at the turn of the century reveals a decisive shift away from devolved systems of educational management. The Board of Education Act, 1899, which came into operation on the 1 April, 1900, made a single body responsible for functions previously discharged by the Education Department, the Science and Art Department, the Charity
Commissioners and the Board of Agriculture. The new Board gave an early indication of its future policies when, under the Education Code of 1900, it instituted a Block Grant System of educational finance which left schools in no doubt as to the identity and powers of their new paymaster.

It is important to note that increasing bureaucratization was not everywhere opposed. Despite the doubts of Sadler and the sardonic comments of Kekewich, the Government's centralizing tendencies were, in certain quarters, warmly approved. Greater efficiency, both in Government and industry, was being demanded in England at the turn of the century. Indeed, increased efficiency was the tocsin sounded by Sir Joshua Fitch when he addressed a gathering of university extension students at Cambridge on the 18 August, 1900. Talking of the future direction of educational administration, Fitch devoted his opening remarks to a consideration of "the great problem which confronts all governments in regard to education - how to give guidance and regulations to those who need them, and liberty to those who know how to use them". Animated by his vision of a more efficient system, Fitch cast aside academic caution. He asked his audience to contemplate a "readjustment of the relations between the state and the religious bodies", a change which, he claimed, would enable the state to administer the entire education system through "one central authority". Fitch's demand for "one central authority" was greeted with enthusiasm by his immediate audience and subsequently in the popular press. Altogether his speech embodied what may be termed the bureaucratic solution to the government of education, a solution which Fitch privately felt would come about "with or without" the co-operation of the denominational bodies.
Although Fitch's final comment was tendentious and therefore one which he sensibly withheld from general publication, he could afford to await further developments with a degree of quiet confidence. The bureaucratic tide in 1900 was clearly flowing in the direction which he both predicted and advocated. The direction of secularist activity and opinion at the same period was far less certain. The dramatic events of the first Industrial Revolution had, as indicated in the early part of this chapter, revealed equally dramatic evidence of primary secularization. In contrast to these, the manifestations of secondary secularization associated with the closing decades of the century were more diffuse and therefore more elusive. To make them more tangible, it is illuminating to add to the general accusations of the Reverends Rigg, Stephenson and Campbell some statistical data. All three linked the extension of secularist opinions with the extension of popular literature. In this context it is interesting to note that the number of daily newspapers sold in Britain, which had averaged one hundred thousand copies a day in 1850, had by 1890 risen to a million copies a day. Two of the most extreme 'yellow press' week-end newspapers, Lloyd's Weekly and The News of the World, between them took two-thirds of all sales in this particular sector of the market, total sales of week-end newspapers in 1900 averaging one and a half million copies.

The sharp rise in newspaper sales was made possible by the increased speed and efficiency of the distribution systems provided by the railways. In the light of comments regarding access to cheap forms of transportation as a factor contributing to the growth of secular attitudes, the following figures are also significant. The railway network in Britain had increased from six thousand miles of track in 1850 to over twenty thousand miles in 1900. Eight million passengers
were carried annually by the railways in 1890 as compared with three million in 1870. Half of the railway passengers in 1890 were estimated to be commuters, their average journey being twenty miles in distance as compared with twelve miles in 1870. Significantly, a growing number of these commuters worked directly for the Government in a rapidly expanding civil service. For every one person engaged in Government service in 1870, there were three by 1900 and five by 1905.

While the latter figures provide further proof of the emergence of a centralized administrative system, the use of additional contextual statistics should not be seen as an attempt to provide a spurious authenticity for the secularization hypothesis. It is impossible to support the claim that secularization was becoming more widespread by providing firm correlations between the social factors cited. Rather the evidence available proves that the changes which witnesses intuitively felt were occurring, were indeed happening. What can therefore be prudently claimed is that the cultural climate of Britain was changing at a dramatic pace and that it was moving towards a state of cultural pluralism. As D. Martin has argued in his comparative analysis of secularization in the European context, the conditions as they existed in England at the turn of the century helped to encourage the growth of secular attitudes. He summarizes his views in the following way:

Certain broad tendencies towards secularization in industrial society have already been fairly well established. These are of the following kind: that religious institutions are adversely affected to the extent that an area is dominated by heavy industry; that they are the more adversely affected if the area concerned is homogeneously proletarian; that geographical and social mobility erodes stable religious communities organized on a territorial basis; that it also contributes to a relativization of perspectives through extended cultural contact.
This chapter has clearly utilized a number of the perspectives offered by Martin, but has attempted to apply them within an extended analytical framework. It has been argued that by classifying Martin's factors of secularization into primary and secondary categories, it is possible to distinguish two distinct phases of secularization in nineteenth century England. First, an initial phase closely associated with the industrial revolution during which industrialization and urbanization enabled latent secularist attitudes within English society to find expression; secondly, a phase which occurred during the closing decades of the century where a more diffuse, subtle and widespread pattern of secular attitudes emerged, and which were in some respects associated with social changes occurring at this time. Although the idea posited by Inglis that secular attitudes were deeply rooted in English society long before the onset of industrialization is accepted, it has nevertheless been suggested that this 'secular tradition' was not in itself strong enough to have generated the wave of secularization evident towards the end of the century. The extent of the conflict developing between religious and secular interest groups during this latter period strongly suggests that Chadwick may well be correct in his assessment that the rapid growth of secularism at this time represents the birth of a new and antagonistic culture.

In pursuing Chadwick's original hypothesis, the second half of this chapter has mainly been concerned with probing the difficult and complex relationships existing between diffuse factors of social change and the widespread growth of secular attitudes. The attempt to describe the secular drift of English society so characteristic of the second phase, has raised problems of historical interpretation. On one hand, over selectivity in the use of evidence may suggest that possibly the
move towards secularism was not broadly based. However, to label every movement of social change as a factor of secularization makes the umbrella concept of secularization a nonsense. What has therefore been attempted is to provide a typology of those social factors which can most confidently be said to have provided the conditions in which secularism once more began to expand following its initial growth spurt during the first industrial revolution.

Having, as it were, argued for the contextual basis of secularism within society, the following chapter directly applies some of the factors cited to the process and development of teacher training.
"Christianity had been presented to them as a correction, rather than a denial, of their own heathen beliefs.... It made heathens Christian, yet it also made Christianity a little heathen ... the fertility festival to Eastra, a Tuton goddess, purged of its grossness became Easter; Yuletide junketings around the December log fires the Christ Mass or Christmas".


5 Queen Elizabeth's pragmatic approach to religion, and her view of its place within society, is vividly revealed by her comment that men's consciences were safe in her keeping "for she would make no windows into their souls".

REESE, M.M. (1959), The Tudors and Stuarts; p. 97.

7 The words "traditional forms of religious worship" are carefully chosen in order to indicate their relationship to the forms and practices of the Anglican Church. It would be possible to mount a counter hypothesis to the one posited by using the evidence of working class affiliation to non-conformity, although such a case is specifically discounted by E.P. Thompson.


12 "We do not know enough about the religious beliefs and practices of our remote ancestors to be certain of the extent to which religious faith and practices have actually declined.... Not
enough justice has been done to the volume of apathy, heterodoxy and agnosticism which existed long before the onset of industrialism". THOMAS, Op. cit. p. 173.

13 CHADWICK, O. (1972), The Victorian Church; Vol. 11, pp. 423-466.


18 "Great social change took place in the century, but the pattern of religious habit in the second half of the century, certainly of the middling and labouring classes, is basically determined by the habits of the first half; so strong is the law of social habit, a "law" to which churches have paid virtually no attention". WICKHAM, E.R. (1959), Church and People in an Industrial City; quoted by INGLIS, Op. cit. p. 327. For additional contextual evidence see CAMPBELL, C. (1971), Toward a Sociology of Irreligion; pp. 80-104.


20 Disraeli's original text for Sybil or the Two Nations was considered by his publisher "too offensive for public taste". In reality his portrait of Wodgate only touched on the surface details of a northern town. The full horror of the working and living conditions in these cities was revealed by Dr Lyon Playfair in Health of Towns Commission, Vol. 1. Report of the State of Large Towns in Lancashire, 1845. DISRAELI, B. (1845), Sybil or the Two Nations; p. 113.

21 Vestiges of social life and intercourse centred around the gin shops rather than around the church. "The only symbols of normal human society were the gin shops. Here on the rare days of leisure the entire population would repair, men, women and children, to suck themselves into insensibility on 'Cream of the Valley' or 'Godfrey's Cordial". BRYANT, Op. cit. p. 65. Further evidence is provided by E.P. Thompson in his article, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism" in Past and Present, No. 38, December 1967, pp. 56-97.
23 D. Martin has offered the following succinct and cogent analysis: "Certain broad tendencies towards secularization in industrial society have already been fairly well established. These are of the following kind: that religious institutions are adversely affected to the extent that an area is dominated by heavy industry; that they are more adversely affected if the area concerned is homogeneously proletarian; that geographical and social mobility erodes stable religious communities organized on a territorial basis; that it also contributes to a relativization of perspectives through extended culture contact....". MARTIN, D. (1978), A General Theory of Secularization; pp. 2-3.

24 Lord Vansittart clearly expressed this assumption in 1818 when he introduced a bill designed to give parliamentary aid for the purpose of building churches in cities:

A very large proportion of those who did not now attend the worship of the established church, had not voluntarily forsaken the church; but that the church, from an unfortunate train of circumstances, which could not be too soon remedied, had shut her doors upon them.


27 BARRISTER, A. (1865), The Residuum, Christian Observer; May, pp. 420-426. For additional evidence see Parliamentary Papers (1857-8), Vol. IX, Deficiency of the Means of Spiritual Instruction, Select Committee, House of Lords, Appendix S.

28 Miall contended that Christians had a morbid horror of poverty: "The service concludes, and the worshippers retire. Communion with God has not disposed them to communion with each other, beyond the well-defined boundaries of class". MIALL, E. (1848), The British Churches and the British People; pp. 143-4, quoted by INGLIS, Op. cit. p. 19.


34 Letter of Bishop Temple to the Dean of Chichester, 23 February, 1885, Lambeth Palace Library, q.v. SANDFORD, E.G. (1906), Memoirs of Archbishop Temple by Seven Friends.


36 Ibid. p. 93.

37 The challenge of individual secularists to the prevailing Christian ethos of their age is explored in detail by E. Royle in two books: ROYLE, E. (1971), Radical Politics 1790-1900; Religion and Unbelief and ROYLE, E. (1974), Victorian Infidels. The Origins of the British Secularist Movement, 1791-1866. One of Royle's central arguments is that only fear of retribution restrained the working classes from indulging in an orgy of class violence during the middle period of the nineteenth century.


39 It should be noted at this point that the uniqueness of the Manchester Secular School lay in its longevity. While there were other secular schools, to use a biblical phrase, "they withered and perished as leaves on a tree", whereas the Manchester school survived for nearly a decade.


43 "While demanding the separation of Doctrinal teaching from school studies, he is equally strenuous in maintaining the need of Religious education, as an essential part of the school course. He urges the careful training of the Religious faculties in schools, by their constant exercise during all other lessons, especially the teaching science....".

JOLLY, W. (ed.) (1879), Education: its Principles and Practice as Developed by George Combe; p. XLI.

44 Part of the difficulty, as R. Ely has pointed out, concerns what exactly was meant by the term 'secular instruction'. The varied and frequently contradictory use of the term forms the central theme of the following article: ELY, R. (1980), The Origins of the Debate over 'Secular' Instruction, History of Education, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 143-157.

45 "The late 1860's increased the contributory range of pressure groups. The most cited were the National Education League and the Central Non-conformist Committee, both based on Birmingham. The lesser known Welsh Education Alliance provided members.... This radical pedigree provided a cross-section of the reforming spirits of the mid-nineteenth century, who showed a deep desire to enter into the life of the nation.... The Establishment of the Church of England was seen as a barrier by liberal Anglicans and Non-conformists who cared. The disabilities of the latter constituted a source of grievance, and lack of popular representation added to their frustration....". DERRINGTON, A.P. (1979), Education and the Disestablishment Movement, University of Manchester, Ph.D., pp. 79-80.

More detailed information concerning the development and objectives of particular pressure groups may be found in the following theses; DERRINGTON, A.P. (1970), The National Education Association of Great Britain 1839-1952; University of Manchester, M. Ed. TAYLOR, A.F. (1960), Birmingham and the Movement for National Education 1867-1877, University of Leicester, Ph.D. TROTT, A.L. (1966), Wales and the National Education Movement 1868-1870, University of Wales, Ph.D.


47 Ibid. p. 118.

Marx and Engels in their early works devoted little time to attacking religion. Both considered that when a fully Marxist state came into being, religions would be seen as irrelevant. As the century progressed, and religion showed no sign of disappearing, Engels became less sure. He launched a stronger attack on religion as essentially irrelevant, an attack popularised in The Freethinker, 12 March, 1892. For the early position see ENGELS, F. (1845), The Condition of the Working Class in England; Henderson, W.O. and Chaloner, W.H. (eds.) (1958), p. 270. For Engels' reconsidered position see ENGELS, F. (1892), Socialism Utopian and Scientific; in Marx and Engels' Selected Works, 1962, p. 110.


GARVIN, J.L. (1933), The Life of Joseph Chamberlain 1885-1895; Vol. 2, pp. 75-76.


The Times (1885), 7 November, Statement of the Catholic Hierarchy and Denominationalist Responses. The democratic structure of Congregationalism led to a confused response, some Congregationalists supporting Chamberlain, others attacking him.


In 1892 the Inaugural Address to Students at Westminster and Southlands Colleges was given by the Reverend Frederic Greeves, D.D. He urged the students to have constantly before them "the religious character of our work" for without such a purpose, the snares of "a purely secular system of education" would be sure to enfold them. See GREEVES, F. (1892), Inaugural Address to Students at Westminster and Southlands Colleges, Annual Report of the Wesleyan Education Committee, pp. 46-69.

74 Ibid. p. 74.

75 Rigg on this occasion was not a "lone voice crying in the wilderness". A critical assessment of the situation he was attempting to describe is offered by Chadwick in Part II of his history of "The Victorian Church". See Chadwick, O. (1970), The Victorian Church; pp. 423-472.


77 Campbell, T.J. (1901), State Paternalism in Education, The Tablet, October 19 and 26.

78 The timing and publication of Campbell's address in Britain was not coincidental. Published during the strained period leading up to the passage of the 1902 Act, Catholic readers could not fail to note the dire consequences of failing to support the efforts of the Hierarchy to achieve a favourable domestic religious settlement. Once again, it could be argued, English eyes had a sharper focus on the progress of secularization and bureaucratization when both were taking place across the Atlantic Ocean.


80 Ibid. p. 629.

81 Refer to note 78.


83 Manning's detestation of secularist tendencies within English society was made plain during the course of his work on the Cross Commission. On the 16 January, 1886, The Tablet published the following statement from him, intended to alert Catholic readers to the importance of the coming struggle: "The question to be fought out before the Commission is simply this, whether England shall follow in the footsteps of the United States and of France and throw out religious and Christian education from the national
system, or whether on the other hand this country shall preserve its Christian individuality and character....". See SELBY, Op. cit. p. 244.


85 KEKEWICH, G.W. (1920), The Education Department and After; pp. 227-231.

86 "The contention of this article is that under the conditions which prevail in England the part of the State is to inspect, recognize, encourage, and (when needful) aid every kind of efficient and needed school.... It is, therefore, to be hoped that the Board may decide hereafter to revert to its earlier and juster method of recognizing all types of efficient secondary schools as eligible for grant".


87 See note 84.


89 The Members of the Wesleyan Education Committee offered the following warning to lay members concerning the effects of the 'Block Grant System' of finance:

"Higher Grade Schools, both Board and Voluntary, and other highly efficient Schools will suffer serious loss of annual income. So far as the Board Schools are concerned the ratepayer will make up the deficiency, but the supporters of Voluntary Schools, who in many cases have also rates to pay, will have to reduce the school expenditure or maintain the income by increased voluntary contributions".


90 "In 1899 the Education Department and the Science and Art Department were combined as the Board of Education, by the Board of Education Act. I was formally appointed Secretary, but the change made no difference to me, as I was already head of both Departments. The only alteration in my status that I am aware of was that having technically been promoted from the third to the second class of permanent officials (whatever that may mean), I was entitled to wear a good deal more gold on my Court uniform, an expensive privilege of which I never availed myself".


Sir Joshua Pitch, Address to University Extension Students, Cambridge, as reported in The Tablet, 18 August, 1900.

Daily Mail, 19 August, 1900.

Views offered to the Editor of The Tablet but which Sir Joshua Pitch declined to have published in connection with his speech made on the 18 August, 1900.

ARKELL, V.T.J. (1973), Britain Transformed: the Development of Britain since the Eighteenth Century, pp. 119-120.


CHAPTER 2
Secularization, Bureaucratization and the
Development of Teacher Training

The contextual factors associated with secularization and
bureaucratization, described in Chapter 1, played a major part in
determining the development of teacher training in England during the
latter part of the nineteenth century. This chapter begins by
examining the conflicts which took place between secularists and
denominationalists regarding policies for teacher training. In the
course of pursuing this theme the early clash between the rival groups
regarding the administration and future direction of Borough Road
College is highlighted. This initial quarrel was the opening of an
extended argument between denominationalists and secularists over the
purposes of teacher training, an argument which reached its climax in
the debates of the Cross Commission. An analysis of these arguments
and events therefore forms the central thread of this chapter. Not
that a concerted effort will be made to reduce the whole development of
teacher training till it is somehow proved to be dependent upon
secularization and bureaucratization. As Professor D. Tyack has
commented "too extravagant a price" can be paid for attempting to
"strain all the facts of history" into a "single hypothetical jelly
mould - however appropriate it may be".¹ What can more helpfully be
attempted, especially at this early point in the study, is to identify
some of the factors evident in eighteenth and nineteenth century
England which played a major part in restricting rather than encouraging
the growth of an organized system of teacher training.

One central point can be concisely observed. It is difficult to
develop a well organized system of teacher training in the absence of
a well developed system of schooling. England was notorious in the European context for her failure to provide such a school system. This failure can in turn be traced back to a widespread distrust on the part of the majority of Englishmen of any state initiated activity. Indeed, the English determination to preserve individualism contrasted sharply with the paternalism exhibited by successive governments in France and Germany, in their attempts to nurture national systems of education. A marked distrust of government (however benevolent the latter's intentions) can therefore be identified as playing a formative part in the pronounced distaste exhibited by the majority of Englishmen for any type of centralized bureaucratic activity. This general aversion to government interference meant that if progress was to be achieved in the field of teacher training, it was likely to stem from the initiative of individuals and private institutions. The developing pattern of teacher training in England affords a perfect example of individual entrepreneurial activity gradually being given permanence through institutional intervention.

The distrust of centralized control in any form helps explain why recognition of teaching as a professional activity had grown so very slowly in England. Despite Richard Mulcaster's spirited defence of the teacher's role, the English gentry had continued to look upon both teachers and schooling with some contempt. Such views did not escape the sharp eye of John Lyly who in 1579 complained that, "If any man among all his servants shall espy one either filthy in his talk or foolish in his behaviour ... him he committeth ye guiding and tuition of his sons". Such low public esteem, as indicated by Lyly's evidence, hardly augured a rapid rise for the professional status of teachers. Such a rise, in any case, could not take place
so long as the English preoccupation with unfettered individualism allowed anyone, however fitted or unfitted, to assume the role of schoolmaster.

When the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1699 in order to combat "the growth of Vice and Debauchery, especially among the poorer sort", it at least declared that teaching represented "a skilled craft". Beyond this declaration it seems to have done little to provide the staff of its charity schools with any systematic training. Relying on the established tradition of producing primers purporting to contain "the whole art of teaching" and lacking in funds, the Society confined its other training activities to occasional visits by selected staff to its four model schools. For the majority of staff employed by the Society, it was therefore a case of learning by doing, a tenet of belief and practice that was to become almost universally admired during the first industrial revolution.

The high degree of congruence existing between English attitudes to industrialization and schooling is nowhere more evident than in the emergence of the monitorial system. Conceived as the answer to the problem of mass education, monitorial schools were often referred to as "manufactures of knowledge" and were run and organized on the principles of the large cotton factories. Typically, the dominance of the monitorial system came about through the efforts and subsequent rivalry of two individuals - the Reverend Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster. Each, having claimed to have perfected 'the monitorial method', provided a college to equip intending teachers with the exact sequences of their teaching programme. Lancaster's college at Borough Road was probably operating in rudimentary fashion in 1800.
while Bell's rival college at Baldwin Gardens in Central London opened in 1812. It is extremely doubtful if either college provided forms of training which were in any sense substantially better than the earlier efforts made by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Indeed, the training methods employed at both colleges were swift and simple. Observation of, and adherence to, the monitorial method constituted the whole substance of training. As R.W. Rich has crisply observed, "It took nearly forty years for the country to realize that a system which deposes the schoolmaster from the post of teacher, and makes him merely a supervisor, can never be an instrument of true education". 14

If the pursuit of monitorial methods ultimately proved to be unfruitful, the political conflicts attending the foundation of Lancaster's college at Borough Road were as lively as its methods of instruction were dull. Scrutiny of the succession of management crises that dogged the early years of the college reveals the strains and tensions emerging between secularists and denominationalists as to the proper role and purpose of teacher training. 15 Lancaster's financial indiscretions and frailty of character 16 soon led to the setting up of 'Lancasterian Societies' 17 to oversee the work of the college. Endeavouring to cope with bitter and often irrational accusations from Lancaster, the first management committee of the college was itself rent by internal conflicts. Although a Quaker himself, Lancaster had from the outset insisted on the non-denominational character of his schools and colleges. This principle attracted to the early 'Lancasterian Societies' members who were either non-conformists or radicals. In this division of membership lay the seeds of conflict.
In the specific case of Borough Road, the non-conformists led by Allen, Fox and Corston insisted on viewing "the main purpose of the Society's schools and colleges as a religious one, indeed almost a missionary work...". Such a view was strongly opposed by the Benthamities on the committee who had an alternative vision of a general system of elementary education and teacher training, wholly non-religious and non-sectarian in character. Vigorously led by Francis Place, who helped to frame the rules governing the Society, Hume, Mill and Gibbon Wakefield opposed the exclusive use of the Bible in the Society's schools. Personal animosity as well as doctrinal differences caused repeated quarrels between Fox and Place. It is therefore difficult to disentangle the threads of their many arguments, but two points emerge with some clarity. Place, as an outright secularist, wanted Borough Road College to concentrate on giving its students a greater degree of secular knowledge. A dissident committee, which included Mill and Hume, complained in 1814, "No attempt has been made to teach the youths intended for schoolmasters anything beyond the regular routine of school training for children in general". In order to achieve a greater degree of academic teaching within the college and perhaps also to ease the growing financial difficulties of the Society, Place proposed a selective system of entry to Borough Road College. With some shrewdness he had at this early date detected that there was a ready market for those who wanted a form of higher education not entirely governed by vocational considerations. A bitter debate ensued. At one point Place attempted to close the college when his denominational opponents refused to agree to any part of his plan being implemented. Place and his allies almost certainly lost their battle because the secularist solution was at this time premature. As G.F. Bartle has commented, any substantial victory by
the secularists would have caused "wealthy Quakers" and "moderate Whigs" to withdraw from the Society their financial support "on which its very survival depended". The sequel to this very public row was almost inevitable. In 1815 Place was not proposed for re-election to the committee and so the secularist cause lost its main protagonist.

This sharp clash between secularists and denominationalists is of great importance because it represents the first encounter in what was to be a continuing contest. If the secularist cause had prevailed during this early period, it is likely that the thrust of teacher training during the nineteenth century would have been directed towards the academic as opposed to the professional dimension of teacher training.

In their early struggles within the British and Foreign School Society, Place and his early associates had made it clear that they were more interested in knowledge than in dogma and training. This emphasis upon the provision of knowledge uncircumscribed by social or religious dogma was to become a cardinal point of subsequent secularist manifestoes. However, while the disagreement over the character of training at Borough Road College served to clarify the secularist position, there could be no disguising the fact that denominationalists had in the course of this early struggle successfully seized the initiative regarding the future direction of teacher training policy.

The assertion by denominationalists of their right to run training colleges according to specifically religious principles was vindicated by the events of 1839. In 1901, J.H. Yoxall, looking back over the events of the century, wrote a particularly shrill piece of secular polemic. In an article entitled "The Training College Problem"
he declared:

There was once a Cabinet which dared to propose that a state training college should affront the sky in England; the church, the churches killed the idea. . . .
The idea of state training colleges has never been reconsidered by Parliament although the schools and the demand for teachers have multiplied so much since 1839. 23

The events that Yoxall referred to in such partisan fashion concerned the attempts by James Kay-Shuttleworth to found the first state run normal college in England. 24 With hindsight it is not difficult to see why the proposal provoked such a spectacular outburst of sectarian protest. It in fact challenged the right of the churches to educate and asserted in embryonic form the rights and duties of the state in teacher training. The whole episode illustrates in the most striking fashion the English aversion to any form of state initiated activity referred to in the earlier part of this chapter. In the face of overwhelming opposition the Government postponed the 'normal school' project and, as Yoxall's bitter comment reveals, subsequently made few attempts to resurrect their proposal.

The victory by denominationalists in 1839 had the effect of placing the development of teacher training firmly in the hands of private individuals and institutions. Despite his comprehensive defeat, Kay-Shuttleworth boldly decided to form his own training college at Battersea in 1840. Founded on the twin ideals of work and faith, the regime of the college, so vividly described by T. Adkins 25 in his history of the college, left its early students in no doubt regarding the strictly vocational nature of their calling. 26 Perhaps the founding of Battersea College does at last signal the arrival of an authentic training college in England. Such a claim has to be made subject to extensive reservations. As Marjorie Cruickshank and
Malcolm Seaborne have made clear in their respective articles, the honour of founding the first genuine training college in Britain almost certainly belongs to David Stow. Stow, in developing the Glasgow Seminary from 1837, paid attention to the personal development of the individual, striving to encourage "the personal qualities, the piety, the liveliness of mind and sympathetic insight of the master". Although Kay-Shuttleworth undoubtedly assimilated some of Stow's ideas, any personal development on the part of his students was subject to their strict adherence to his limited views regarding the role to be performed by teachers. In this sense the 'Battersea model' as it became known, was a regression from, and not a development of, the pioneering work of Stow in Scotland.

Even after making allowances for the educational limitations of the early English colleges, it is nevertheless hardly possible to underestimate the importance of the 'Battersea model' in the overall development of teacher training. When financial difficulties forced Kay-Shuttleworth to relinquish control of his college in 1843, the National Society in taking over the management of Battersea found they had acquired the ideal model for mass production. Kay-Shuttleworth's principles of training were founded on religious belief and practice. His methods were simple and cheap to apply. Thus, although Seaborne suggests that the National Society brought about "significant changes of emphasis" in the style of training at Battersea, it has to be concluded that these changes were minor rather than major in their subsequent impact. Apart from the appointment of a clergyman as Principal (a precedent that was to become standard practice), the Society found little need to alter existing practices. Not surprisingly these conditions encouraged the National Society to expand its teacher training efforts rapidly. Writing in 1875, Mr. Tufnell,
Kay-Shuttleworth's original partner, proudly declared, "I have had the satisfaction of seeing the establishment of forty training colleges, all founded on the principles first exemplified at Battersea". 31

The British and Foreign School Society, perceiving the threat of Anglican domination represented by the activities of the National Society and referred to extensively in the previous chapter, responded by increasing the numbers of their colleges. Although the Wesleyan college at Westminster and the Congregational college at Homerton developed interesting affiliations with the pattern of teacher training established by Stow, 32 the colleges were, like the Church of England models, both residential and their management imbued with religious principles, albeit non-conformist ones. As Rich has observed, the religious, residential college had "for good or ill" become established as "the type". 33 From 1839 onward therefore, the denominational race was on, with both government and secularists temporarily relegated to the role of impotent onlookers.

It may seem odd to halt a review of English teacher training colleges in the decade 1840-1850. There are, however, good reasons for pausing at this point. By the mid-point of the century the decisive struggles regarding the nature and purposes of training had occurred and the pattern of subsequent development formed. The state's attempt to enter the field of teacher training had been rebuffed and the churches had collectively reasserted their age-old right to educate. The defeat of Lord Melbourne's ministry in 1839 was also a defeat for what may be termed nascent bureaucratic planning. The reverse suffered by the Liberal government in this sphere was accompanied by an equally decisive rejection of secular alternatives for the development of teacher training. Such alternatives were ignored.
in the rapid expansion of colleges of the Kay-Shuttleworth type, founded as they were on the twin ideals of work and faith. The progress of these colleges during the second half of the century may be compared to the journey of a tram: steady forward movement but only along previously determined lines. A close comparison of Adkin's description of Battersea in 1840 with his description of the same college in 1886 reveals changes in detail but not in substance.

Arguably therefore, the events that were eventually to have a profound effect on the colleges occurred beyond rather than within their walls. The passing of two pieces of educational legislation, the Revised Code of 1862 and the Elementary Act of 1870, profoundly changed the political climate in which the colleges operated. Parliamentary support for these two pieces of legislation gave forewarning of a change in public and governmental attitudes, a change dramatically confirmed by the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Elementary Acts, 1888. The remainder of this chapter, therefore, briefly considers the impact on church colleges of educational legislation and considers in detail the formation, progress and recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Elementary Acts more familiarly known as the Cross Commission. There is extended analysis of these recommendations because it was in this Commission that the defeated parties of the 1839 settlement combined in order to reverse the original decision.

Although much has been written about the effects of the Revised Code on elementary education, little notice has been taken of its significance in reasserting state authority in the field of education. J. Hurt has argued "by successfully introducing the Revised Code, Lowe ... vindicated the state's right to make the content of elementary education meet the wider needs of contemporary society".
While disassociating themselves from Hurt's occasionally eccentric defence of the Revised Code, H. Burgess and P. Welsby take his primary analysis further, arguing that Lowe as "an unscrupulous secularist" used the Code as a means of a wider attack on church principles and influence. The substance of their argument is that Lowe by "attaching state aid only to the three R's" effectively undermined the existing emphasis upon religious instruction. This, they declare, was a concerted effort on the part of Lowe, Lingen and an unholy alliance of 'statists' and 'secularists' to achieve the primary aim of the secularist programme, namely the total elimination of "denominational education". If this interpretation is correct (allowances being made for its declared Anglican perspective), from their almost total defeat in 1839 secularists seem to have made a quite remarkable comeback by 1862.

This resurgence of secularist influence can only be explained in terms of the vigorous part played by secularists within the 'radical alliance'. On their own, even with, as on this occasion, the support of such a formidable politician as Lowe, secularist solutions were generally ignored by both Parliament and public. It was quite a different matter, however, when secularists mingled their grievances with those of the non-conformists. With regard to teacher training both parties formed an alliance that was initially promoted by their mutual fear of Anglican domination. On this issue their opposition centred around two perceived grievances: the financing of the Anglican colleges and the number of teacher training places they offered. The intense bitterness of secularist, non-conformist opinion regarding 'the great training robbery' can hardly be appreciated unless it is realized that the expansion of the Anglican
colleges was achieved as a result of the allocation of large sums of public money. From 1854 to 1859 the grant paid to Church of England colleges increased from £10,808 to £29,582.\textsuperscript{41} This meant that in some church colleges Government grants met more than four-fifths of the total expenses. Such heavy state commitment to predominantly Anglican colleges did not bring about a proportionate degree of state control in their management. Indeed, college governors were explicitly allowed by the Committee of Council to select students, "on their own responsibility subject to no other conditions on the part of the Education Department than those relating to age and suitability".\textsuperscript{42} As a result of this ruling, governors of the denominational colleges were able to exclude all but their own flock. J.H. Yoxall expressed the common bitterness of secularists and non-conformists alike regarding this situation when he declared, "At thirty-five out of our forty-four seminaries for teachers the decisive test for the matriculant was not his place on the exam list, but 'Are you an Established Church communicant?'".\textsuperscript{43}

The permanent imbalance between Anglican and other colleges, referred to by Yoxall, brought about a bizarre distribution of training college places. As a Methodist, F.H. Spencer knew that he had to be high in the first half of the Queen's Scholarship Examination list if he was to stand any chance of gaining one of the coveted places at Borough Road or Westminster College.\textsuperscript{44} On the other hand any Catholic on the scholarship list (and indeed some who were not), could confidently expect to gain a place at Saint Mary's\textsuperscript{45} or Notre Dame, such was the shortage of Catholic candidates for teaching during the early periods of both colleges. The constant lament of the Catholic Poor School Committee concerned the persistent shortage of suitably qualified candidates.\textsuperscript{46} During the same period
the handful of non-conformist colleges were turning away four or five well qualified candidates for every student accepted. Such a system offended secularists because of its irrationality and non-conformists because of its partiality. Thus both parties found good reasons for joining to campaign against what each declared to be an "Anglican tyranny".47

The increasingly militant protests of what has earlier been referred to as the radical-liberal alliance, formed the prelude to the passing of the 1870 Elementary Education Act. In almost all respects the Act entirely ignored the issue of teacher training, but its very passage "accustomed an increasing number of people to think of education as a secular matter".48 This change in public attitude came about largely through the spectacle of board schools steadily making progress under non-clerical management and being funded through local rates. Indeed, the irony of increasing numbers of church trained teachers flocking to the new board schools was not missed by those with an animus against the church.49 For, undoubtedly, the passage of the 1870 Act profoundly changed the direction of educational development. In 1839, the school building race was between denominationalists, from 1870 onwards the contest concerned denominationalists and the supporters of state provided education.50 Secularists not unnaturally put all their energies behind the campaign for non-sectarian state schools. In this context the judgment by Burgess and Welsby that the passing of the 1870 Act "opened the door for the progressive secularization of English education"51 is not a claim that can be dismissed lightly.

The extent to which the door was indeed opened can perhaps be best judged by a detailed consideration of the events surrounding the
setting up and subsequent progress of the Cross Commission. Joseph Chamberlain's attack on the excessive privileges enjoyed by denominational schools and colleges made during the 1885 election campaign, has been briefly touched upon in the previous chapter. The militancy of Cardinal Manning's immediate counter-attack on Chamberlain was caused in part by his acute awareness of the growing threat presented by secularism.52

Telling his colleagues that he was determined to place a "Catholic bulwark against the tide of secularist opinion", Manning demanded that Catholics should address two questions to all parliamentary candidates:

(1) Will you place denominational schools on a perfect footing of equality with board schools?

(2) Will you vote for a Royal Commission to inquire into the operation of the Act of 1870?53

Manning's further advice to his flock was terse: "As they answer 'Yes' or 'No' let us decide".54 Seeking to further the discomfort of the Liberals who were clearly shaken by the denominational accord achieved by Catholics and Anglicans under the tacit leadership of Manning,55 Sir Richard Cross, the Conservative Home Secretary, promptly declared that his party, if elected, would immediately appoint a Royal Commission to examine the whole question of "financial subsidies to denominational schools and colleges".56 When it came the election ended in stalemate, with a Conservative Government returned but only with the most slender of margins.57 Within a year of his election pledge to Cardinal Manning, Richard Cross found himself out of office, but with a new role as Viscount Cross, Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Elementary Acts, England and Wales.
In January 1886, the editor of The Tablet gave clear warning to his Catholic readers of the issues that were at stake with regard to the Commission's enquiries:

The question to be fought out before the Commission is simply this, whether England shall follow in the footsteps of the United States and of France, and throw out religious and Christian education from the national system, or whether on the other hand the country shall preserve its Christian individuality and character....

The incoming Liberal Government was in no hurry to confront such highly contentious issues. Regarding the Commission as having been created by a malign combination of denominational pressure and political opportunism, Government ministers largely ignored what they roundly declared to be the progress of a "packed commission". A number of historians of education seem to have rather uncritically accepted Liberal claims that the Commission was denominationally biased. Such judgments seem to ignore two modifying factors. First, the assertions were themselves in part politically motivated, and secondly, they make no allowance for the way in which membership of the Commission evolved while the Liberal party was in power.

It would be difficult in the light of subsequent events to underestimate the importance of the appointment to the second Commission of the Honourable Edward Lyulph Stanley. One of the most active and prominent members of the non-denominational British and Foreign School Society and of the London School Board, Stanley, according to his nephew Bertrand Russell, "spent his time fighting the church on the London Board". While this statement may be something of an exaggeration, Stanley was nevertheless notorious for holding extreme secular views and his appointment to the Commission provoked misgivings within the ranks of incoming Liberal ministers.
One consequence of Stanley's appointment to the Commission was almost immediately evident. The first Commission had approached their task with a degree of industry entirely characteristic of the period. Although there was an undercurrent of tension beneath their seemingly tireless efforts, in public their sessions were at least conducted in a decorous fashion. Stanley's arrival precipitated an outbreak of open verbal warfare among the members of the committee. The first of many disagreements concerned his advocacy of a "wholly secular" system of education. The majority of the Commissioners responded by defending the position of the churches with some vigour, claiming:

It is of the highest importance that all children should receive religious and moral training ... we are also of the opinion that it is of the highest importance that the teachers who are charged with the moral education of the scholars should continue to take part in religious instruction. We should regard any separation of the teacher from the religious teaching of the school as injurious to the morals and secular training of the scholars.64

This was a position from which the majority of the Commissioners refused to retreat, and one which signalled the commencement of a fascinating duel between Stanley and Cardinal Manning.65 In seeking to undermine the Anglo-Catholic stand, Stanley drew to himself the representatives of radical non-conformist opinion. R.W. Dale who had earlier declared, "we should work for the extreme position, universal School Boards, free education and pure secularism",66 gave his support unreservedly to Stanley. This provoked Manning (who in this context clearly believed in the Old Testament adage of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'), to describe Dale as "a Birmingham rough like his master" - his master being Joseph Chamberlain.67 The continuing exchange of insults served to emphasize the deeply seated contrasts of attitudes and beliefs between on the one hand the representatives of established religion and on the other
the views of secularists and radical non-conformists. The traditional paternalism of the Anglican Church strikingly contrasted with the more entreprenurial activities of the secular school boards. During an extended cross-examination the Bishop of Shrewsbury was asked:

Do you find the management of the board schools is as effective as the management of your own voluntary schools?

In responding to this question he replied:

I believe that for inducing heartiness and earnestness in the work there is nothing like the management of a good voluntary school, where the clergy and others who are interested in the schools are continually there, and take a direct and personal interest in the whole thing. The difference I can see between the voluntary schools and the board schools is just the difference between a private firm and a limited liability company.

This defence of voluntary schools is relevant because exactly the same arguments were used in order to defend the position of the denominational training colleges. Underlying all the evidence offered by Anglicans and Catholics was an implicit belief that their colleges were better because they were privately owned institutions. Stanley, in dissenting from this view, embraced the contrary opinion that the state should assume a much more active role in regulating the organization of teacher training.

In making this claim Stanley skilfully played on non-conformist fears of Anglican domination. By suggesting that non-conformists would obtain fairer terms when the state was chiefly responsible for teacher training, he encouraged the Reverend C. Williams of the Baptist Union and Dr. H.W. Crosskey, a Unitarian and Secretary of the Central Non-conformist Committee, to support what in almost every respect was an openly secularist programme. The abrasive attitude
adopted by Crosskey was particularly useful in providing Stanley with a series of opportunities to mount attacks on the issue of the excessive religious privileges enjoyed by Anglicans. This was a tactically astute move, avoiding as it did the combative wrath of Manning, isolating the Anglicans and rallying all shades of non-conformist opinion to enjoy together the discomforture of their traditional foe. Stanley even succeeded in enlisting the partial support of Matthew Arnold, whose idiosyncratic views on the superiority of European methods of teacher training irritated the majority of Commissioners while delighting the minority. 71

While Stanley and his allies could win a tactical advantage, they could never force a complete victory. The ranks of the college principals were solidly against any secular solution for teacher training, 72 as were the majority of the inspectorate. Inspectors Fitch, Oakley and Warburton unanimously supported the statement of their colleague, Sharpe, "that the present system of training colleges is a very cheap bargain for the state". 73 Canon Warburton amplified this statement by flatly asserting "the present arrangement" is indeed "an admirable bargain for the country. It is not only that the country saves twenty-five per cent of the cost of training" he declared, "but it has also saved a very much larger total outlay which would be involved if the management was not private management and looked after by people on the spot". 74

It is perhaps unfortunate that this strongly supported statement representing the majority position is sometimes dismissed by historians of education as the inevitable outcome of a "rigged" commission. As A.W. Jones has argued, "no startling bias" 75 in the selection of the Commissioners can be detected. "Rather" he concludes, "it was not so
much the statistical representation of denominations or interests, but the lack of flexibility and ability to compromise that in the end precluded a unanimous report". The inability to compromise detected by Jones can in large measure be attributed to the inflamed state of relations existing between secularists and denominationalists at this period. Both parties felt too insecure to give ground. Denominationalists had witnessed the steady erosion of their 1839 victory over secularists, an erosion made painfully obvious by Stanley's late inclusion on the Cross Commission. For their part secularists and their radical allies continued to consider themselves victims of Anglican domination and therefore were in no mood to conciliate their declared enemies.

On balance, it may be inferred that the denominationalists were marginally the stronger of the two contesting factions, able in the words of the Old Testament proverb, to give 'here a little and there a little'. A careful analysis of the evidence reveals that while Canon Warburton and the Reverend Sharpe certainly defended the denominational colleges, they did not do so unreservedly. Sharpe was anxious that there should be "a curtailment in the number of hours devoted to study", while Warburton tempered his "admiration for the zeal and energy with which the work is being carried out" in the denominational colleges, by a "sense of disappointment with the intellectual acquirements and technical skill obtained by students as the result of so much forethought, self-denial and watchfulness". This "sense of disappointment" was fully shared by those non-conformists and secularists who by this time composed a permanent minority faction within the overall Commission. Stanley consistently defended the position of knowledge unfettered by dogma, the stand initially taken by Francis Place in the early development of the British and Foreign
School Society. Commenting on the fact that the denominational colleges were constantly championed because of the economy of their operation and the thoroughness of their training methods, Stanley chose to concentrate his criticisms on the alleged importance of students receiving their training within a small Christian community. On this issue Stanley clashed directly with Canon Warburton. The latter, noting "the inferior quality" of students selected by training colleges, felt that a period of residence had a "refining quality". Stanley took exactly the opposite point of view. He declared that the whole system of denominational training was insular and paid excessive attention to particular aspects of training, at the expense of the acquisition of a wider culture. This indeed was the pure milk of secularism and it prompted the radical alliance into advocating measures of reform designed to remedy the deficiencies revealed by Stanley.

The greatest degree of unanimity among the radicals (and among Commissioners generally), was achieved over the need to remove the pupil teacher system, described by Crossley as being, "the cheapest and very worst possible system of supply ... which should be abolished root and branch". This sweeping attack infuriated the Roman Catholics who depended almost entirely on the pupil teacher system to provide Catholic teachers for their schools. In supporting Crossley during his frequent and often bitter arguments with Manning, Stanley plainly stated that he rejected the pupil teacher system because he regarded it as a means of training teachers without educating them. In order to correct this defect, Stanley believed that the abolition of the pupil teacher system should be accompanied by an extension of the teacher training course by a period of one year.
At this point the proposals of the radicals bore the hallmarks of earlier secularist programmes for reform, namely high idealism coupled with a fatal inattention to practicalities. It is doubtful if Stanley's proposal would have achieved a great deal in real terms had it not been given timely support by Patrick Cumin, Secretary to the Education Department. Cumin, during his long tenure of office, had made little secret of his contempt for teachers\(^53\) and his resentment of the role played by denominationalists in education.\(^84\) Failing in health and embittered in attitude towards the churches, he saw a way to give support to Stanley's attack on the denominational training colleges. Aware of experimental work being carried out at the Yorkshire College, Leeds, on a programme of evening classes for pupil teachers,\(^85\) Cumin in his evidence to the Commission argued that such colleges "associated with the universities", would have the effect of "introducing persons of superior education into the profession of elementary teachers and at the same time, improve very greatly the position of the teachers and their merit and teaching power".\(^86\) The majority of the Commissioners baulked at such a claim. They felt that "day training colleges can never be as effective as residential ones",\(^87\) but nevertheless cautiously approved "the experiment of a system of day training for teachers, and of day training colleges on a limited scale".\(^88\)

The extremely diffident approach of the majority was naturally not shared by Stanley and his colleagues.\(^89\) In supporting the cause of the day training colleges they made their position very plain:

We cannot assent to the statement in the report that the existing system of residential training colleges is the best both for the teachers and the scholars.... We look forward to the association of training with higher education, in the great extension of facilities for day students....\(^90\)
This declaration was entirely consistent with Stanley's subsequent demands that education should be subject to 'popular control'. On this latter issue he received the enthusiastic backing of T.E. Heller, Secretary of the National Union of Elementary Teachers. Their joint minority report forthrightly declared, "Nothing short of popular representative management will secure that the teaching shall be thoroughly satisfactory to the community for whom any school (or college) should be maintained".  

The submission of the Stanley-Heller amendment marks a significant mutation within the radical alliance. Methodists refused to support the cause of free education under popular control believing it was a "Godless" system designed only to "increase secularism". Their influence persuaded other elements of non-conformity to hang back, thereby allowing Heller to make a distinctive contribution. It was a contribution that was to have far reaching consequences. By virtue of his union post Heller was the first person recognized by the Department of Education as having a right to represent the views of teachers. Although secularism, socialism and unionism had mingled within the overall camaraderie of the working men's clubs, during the last decade of the nineteenth century it was becoming clear that 'unionism' was rapidly growing in strength and identity. The National Union of Elementary Teachers changed its title during the year that the Cross Commission was published, 1888. As the National Union of Teachers it claimed the right to represent the views of all teachers in all schools. Through the efforts of their 'new' union, teachers were becoming more militant. As M. Sturt has commented, "They had perfected the arts of lobbying and publicity, they were organized, they were formidable". This strong, militant body now threw its weight behind what had originally been a secularist proposal. The
1889 national conference of the National Union of Teachers adopted the Stanley-Heller proposal regarding the necessity of popular control in education as a central point of their overall policy.96

It would in many respects be satisfying at this point to bring the story to a neat conclusion. By adroit manoeuvring it could be argued that secularists and non-conformists had championed an alternative type of teacher training, thus bringing to an end the monopoly of training possessed by denominationalists. It could be further argued that the Stanley-Heller amendment signposted the future direction of the radical alliance, namely the progressive alliance of secularism and unionism accompanied by the gradual demise of non-conformist influence. Unfortunately history, unlike dramatic productions, rarely reaches a conclusive finale. Coincidence, which had brought Stanley on to the Commission, had a further surprise in store. At a critical point in the negotiations, Cumin, Secretary of the Education Department, suddenly died. Heller worked hard to ensure that his successor would be someone more favourably disposed towards teachers. Neither he, nor the teachers he represented, were to be disappointed by the appointment of George Kekewich.97

Kekewich's arrival at what was soon to be the Board of Education was fortuitous in encouraging the progress of the day training colleges. His legislative activity, essentially bureaucratic in a non-pejorative sense, demonstrates the subtle links that begin to emerge at this time between the processes of secularization and bureaucratization. The new secretary threw himself into the work necessary to bring about the creation of the new day training colleges with an energy and enthusiasm that had not characterized his predecessor.98 Kekewich drafted and published the Government Code of 1890-91, a code which embodied in legal and formal form those ideas
which had previously been only the hopes of a minority faction of the Cross Commissioners.\(^9\)

The effects of Kekewich's legislative activity were far reaching. The limited experiment of inaugurating a few day training colleges was quietly put to one side. As F.W.T. Fuller has noted, the concept of a day training college became enlarged and the very title in the new context became inappropriate:

The true difference was not that they were non-residential but that the students were integral members of a university or university college. The 'day colleges' were not all non-residential and none of them was a 'college' in the customary sense of the word.\(^1\)

Students attending such colleges would be able to acquire teacher status by full membership of a university or university college. Making due allowance for Kekewich's anti-denominational bias,\(^1\) there is no evidence to suggest that in drafting the code he intentionally set out to undermine the position of the denominational colleges. The transformation within the code of the original concept of the day training colleges, is the first of many examples cited in this study of how ideas acquired a new life and direction once placed in the hands of 'neutral' civil servants. Of course from many standpoints the neutrality of civil servants was (and still is)\(^1\) questionable. Certainly during this period, 1890-1900, affinities of attitude between bureaucrats and secularists can be clearly identified. Unlike denominationalists whose first question was invariably, 'Is it right?', secularists and bureaucrats tended to ask, 'Is it rational? Is it logical?'. In this manner secularists stood to gain through an extension of bureaucratization in a way that denominationalists, by the nature of their philosophy, could not.
Whatever their origins, by 1891 it was plain for all to see that the university day training colleges were going to be a force to be reckoned with. On the 21 November, 1891, during the course of his address to members of the Islington Secularist Club, Stanley jubilantly declared, "In the day training colleges we have achieved the truly secular solution to the teacher training problem.... These new colleges represent a breach in the denominational wall". In contrast, Anglicans were aghast at the inroads that had been made into their position. They reacted angrily:

What is demanded of the new agitation is not that one or more undenominational colleges should be provided, or the existing ones enlarged; it is that the Christian families of all training colleges should be broken down, their trust deeds violated, and the faith of the Government broken with the churches of the land. 

The sharp tone of the language is evidence of the extent of the dismay felt by Anglicans and other denominationalists, as it became evident that day training colleges were not to be limited in terms of their numbers.

The realization by denominationalists that their monopoly of teacher training had been broken by the arrival of the new colleges, caused them to question the good faith of the Government. The alliance between church and state which had been so strong in 1839, was being questioned by the churches in 1889. In seeking reasons for the breakdown in relationships, the Anglican Inspector of Training Colleges identified as a cause, not secularization itself but rather the effects of secularization. In his annual report for the year 1889, he claimed that in the field of teacher training the Church of England was being forced on to the defensive "by the almost universal clamour for change". "We seem to exist", he lamented, "within a climate of change."
To summarize, the main purpose of this chapter has been to examine the development of teacher training in the light of the processes of bureaucratization and secularization initially described in Chapter 1. While such an analysis certainly does not provide a total explanation, it has been argued that the progress of the two phenomena reveal reasons for changes in the pattern of development. It has been suggested that the almost total rejection of both secularization and centralized control of the training process evident in 1839 was by 1890 being reversed as a result of the renewed growth of both phenomena.

This pattern of reversal has been traced through the implementation of the Revised Code, the passing of the 1870 Education Act and the findings of the Cross Commission, 1888. The latter Commission has been examined in some detail because in its sometimes tortuous progress can be discerned the direct effects of what in Chapter 1 have been referred to as the forces of primary and secondary secularization. Within the context of the Commission's activities it has been suggested that primary secularization came about through the alliance of the political left, socialists, unionists, secularists and left wing elements of non-conformity, who, for varying reasons, all wished to replace religion by politics. While some non-conformists perhaps unwittingly served this cause, it has been emphasized throughout the chapter that a disparate alliance was held together as a result of each member's suspicions of the dominant position achieved by the Church of England. The intensity of suspicion generated among the radical groups enabled them to hold together just long enough to break the denominationalist monopoly of teacher training. However, it has been further argued that towards the end of the Commission a distinctive and potentially divisive alliance was
emerging between secularists and unionists.

In terms of the growth of secondary forms of secularization, it is important to note that the Cross Commission took place at a time when it was possible to detect the start of a secular drift within the middle and upper classes of English society. While in Chapter 1 an attempt was made to identify general trends promoting secularism, in the present chapter a specific attempt has been made to illustrate how bureaucratization complemented and promoted the growth of secularism. It has been argued that the increase in bureaucratic government, with a consequent emphasis on the rational distribution of resources, was inherently favourable to the creation of an administrative context in which secularist solutions became acceptable.

In this particular context it could be said that churches had every right to question the good faith of successive governments. It is doubtful if the Liberal and Conservative administrations of the 1880s and 1890s realized the extent of their own increasing bureaucratization. While elements of non-conformity were short-sighted in serving the secularist cause, secularists were equally myopic in believing that an increasingly powerful state would always be benevolent. In fact, the rise of an omnipotent state was eventually to threaten secularists as much as it did denominationalists. Although both groups differed in ideology and belief, each held minority positions equally vulnerable to coercion from an enlarged state. Secularists during this period seemed oblivious to the fact that bureaucratic logic and rationality might not always complement their own brand of rationalism. In short, during the period under review they were busy supporting the growth of a centralized form of bureaucratic administration which they were later to find far more
difficult to influence than the more diffuse denominational power structures which they so successfully challenged at the time of the Cross Commission.

In 1890 these threats lay in the future. As the final decade of the century opened, attention in the Education Department centred upon the inauguration of the day training colleges. It is perhaps a salutary comment on bureaucratic attitudes (bureaucratic used on this occasion in a pejorative sense) to note that Kekewich was far too engrossed in the task of drafting the relevant legislation to have time to pause and assess denominational reaction to it. Ominously, in terms of the future growth of the denominational colleges, at this early point the officials of the Department of Education seemed able to discount the effects of any denominational backlash. Clearly, in their eyes at least, the future of teacher training lay in the development of the university day training colleges.
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CHAPTER 3

The End of Denominational Supremacy

The present chapter marks a change in emphasis. Because the contextual presence of secularization and bureaucratization within English society was examined in the opening section of this thesis, Chapter 2 was largely concerned with attempting to apply these two phenomena to the development of teacher training. A contextual beginning having paved the way for a narrowing of the focus, the process is now continued and intensified. This chapter attempts to analyse the progress of secularization and bureaucratization in the period 1890 to 1900 by comparing the contrasting values of the new day training colleges with those of their more traditional rivals, the denominational colleges. Such analysis leads to a greater stress upon institutional development. However, arguing a case within institutional parameters does not mean abandoning or neglecting broader issues. The critical issue, the effect of bureaucratization and secularization on teacher training policy, becomes central again in the latter part of the chapter, in which the growing differences in the attitudes of denominationalists and civil servants prior to the 1902 Education Act are examined.

These differences had been emerging for some time. In 1890 day training colleges were established at Birmingham, Nottingham, Cardiff, Manchester, London, Newcastle and Sheffield. The extravagant burst of enthusiasm which greeted their foundation was an oblique rebuke to the traditional denominational colleges. By contrast, popular press journalists acclaimed the innovatory nature of the new institutions while the work of the denominational colleges (many hidden away in
isolated rural districts) went unnoticed, even by the denominations supporting them. Although the day training colleges differed markedly according to their local circumstances, the London papers reported their collective progress in such a way as to make them appear a coherent group. In this tendency to generalize rather than to differentiate, the press could plead that they were following a Department of Education lead. In May 1890 the Department issued Circular 287, a legislative indication that the inspectorate intended to treat the day training colleges as a single group. The detailed nature of the circular suggested the new colleges were to be subjected to the same kind of centralized rigidity characteristic of the Department's dealings with the denominational colleges. The circular required students to be full-time and to live either at home or in a home or lodgings approved by the local committee. The student's private study was to be supervised. A 'normal master or mistress' appointed to undertake such supervision was also expected to lecture on the history and theory of education, and when not engaged on these tasks, to provide 'model lessons' prior to their supervision of teaching practice. Practising schools selected by the day training college authorities had to be approved by the Department and a register of student attendance at lectures made available to the inspectorate. These prescriptive Departmental regulations dispel any notion that day training colleges, because of their university associations, were immune from external regulation. Yet there was one vital clause. The day colleges did not need to follow the Department's syllabuses or to take the Department's examinations, provided they sent copies of their syllabuses and the 'worked papers' to the Department. As J. Tuck has noted, "This was the germ of an academic independence which the residential colleges also were eventually to enjoy." But it was a
germ which developed slowly. The inspectorate "watched the new
departments very closely" and from 1890 to 1902 published detailed
reports on the work and progress of the new day training colleges.

Before examining evidence concerning this slowly developing
autonomy, it is important to examine specific features of a number of
the new colleges to offset the generalized accounts the inspectors
gave of the day colleges after 1896. While these accounts were
carefully based on evidence, they nevertheless constituted broad
judgments. Individual inspectors quite properly differed in their
interpretation of events, but in their collective evidence it is
possible to discern a developing departmental doctrine. This doctrine
rapidly began to assume the dimensions of a self-fulfilling prophecy
in that a departmental view of teacher training encouraged inspectors
to be selective in observing and interpreting evidence.

The two day training colleges identified for closer examination
are King's College, London, and Reading University Day Training
College. The Department of Education at King's College began life
in October, 1890. It was one of the earliest of the new colleges,
and being situated in the heart of the metropolis its students
benefited from the extensive cultural opportunities afforded by the
capital. In contrast, the day training college at Reading, founded
in 1899, was one of the last of the new colleges to be recognized by
the Education Department. Unlike King's, it struggled into existence,
attached to a university college which itself was still very much
rooted in a provincial environment. By the time Reading accepted
its first intake of students, King's had been growing and developing
for nearly a decade.
Both institutions owed debts to their founders, debts of quite different kinds. Although Reading relied to a considerable extent on the inspiration provided by its first Vice Chancellor, W.M. Childs, King's College was assisted incalculably by the formative work achieved by J.W. Adamson. Adamson wrote his own account of the development of the college, but was too modest to credit himself as a major cause of its successful history. However, Adamson left at his college a detailed description of his work and methods in the form of eight log books. These books, covering the period 1890 to 1911, provide a unique record of the emergence of a distinctive college.

J.B. Thomas in his article, "The Curriculum of a Day Training College: The Logbooks of J.W. Adamson", makes the point that Adamson was conscious that he was a pioneer in establishing the study of education as a new academic discipline. Thus, in addition to writing his own books on the subject, he was constantly updating his students' reading lists in the light of books published by other recently appointed professors of education. The thrust of the new department was towards academic knowledge and understanding:

The budding study of education was to be based on more than tips for teachers and descriptions of classrooms and schools. There was a body of educational theory to be built up, based not only on existing disciplines such as history, logic, and philosophy but on the growing new areas of psychology and of comparative education.

Under Adamson's confident direction, the educational studies of his department rapidly developed. At first he was careful to include in all his book lists the titles prescribed by the Department of Education, but by 1896 he had decided to weed out the more dated titles and substitute in their place a whole series of recent publications in the field of the psychology of education. Thus,
in his dealings with the inspectorate, Adamson made it plain that he was to be the master of his material and not the servant of it. Well before 1900 he decided that education as an academic discipline was well grounded and he increasingly devoted his attention towards the integration of theoretical and practical work. Capitalizing on his growing experience of working with two-year certificate students, Adamson not only prepared such students for demonstration lessons but encouraged them to present discussion papers. These papers were designed to test the students' appreciation of the relationship between the theory and practice of education, a theme which was continued in the final examination paper which the students sat. Adamson was convinced of the importance of establishing this relationship in the minds of both certificate and degree students, but he was also moving swiftly to counter inspectorate criticism, such as that offered by H.M.I. Oakeley, in 1894:

> By encouraging students to take a university course, we might lead them to think that all in all and to neglect (more or less) the important technical subjects - teaching and school management. I fully agree that this very dangerous possibility must be very closely borne in mind and that any disposition to regard the main work of their lives as subsidiary must be checked.

Oakeley's criticism in fact was the outcome of increasing numbers of complaints to the Department from the principals of denominational colleges and was possibly not as dispassionate as it might have been. The general tenor of such complaints was that university day training colleges were encouraging in students "academic arrogance at the expense of professional application". Adamson responded to such criticisms when they were conveyed to him by the inspectorate with great skill. He used the criticism as a means of furthering, within his department, lines of development which he had already decided upon.
Inspectorate concern for a proper degree of professional training in the certificate course was a useful check to colleagues who wanted to increase educational theory at the expense of such subjects as blackboard work and penmanship. The conflicting points of view were used by Adamson to produce a creative tension within which he pursued his drive for the proper integration of theory and practice. Although he had secured very favourable reports from the inspectorate during the 1890s, by 1900 he had distanced himself and his department from their influence. Nevertheless, his natural tact and good manners ensured the maintenance of good relations with the new Board of Education and by the turn of the century King's College had become an almost autonomous institution, firmly integrated into the academic life of the university and some distance removed from the utilitarian world of elementary teacher training. Its standing was largely due to Adamson. If all day training colleges had been like King's, Rich's comment that their inauguration marks "one of the most important points in the history of teachers' training in England" would be fully justified.

The converse is illustrated by Reading. In 1900, Reading day training college existed in a different world from that of King's College. The differences were not merely geographical: they involved questions of attitude, of priority and of self-image. Whereas Adamson's success and growing reputation had attracted institutional support for his department, Reading college started with a staff devoid of national reputation and with the overriding necessity of proving themselves able to survive financially. We are reminded of this necessity by comments such as that made by A.B. Crouch, "The recognition in 1899 by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education of Reading college as a day training college brought to that
new and struggling institution a very welcome intake of some eighty students. The fees of these students had to be supplemented by running any type of course for which there was a local demand, and for this reason "the evening and Saturday classes for pupil teachers and for elementary school teachers went on and were to remain an important element in the work of the college for several years". Short courses were found to be particularly popular and lucrative and "a thriving school was held each summer term" to inform students, staff and local townspeople about "themes from country life". Similar evening courses on agricultural methods were interspersed with more familiar topics such as the appreciation of literature and music.

Whatever aspirations the college may have had towards becoming a national institution, financial necessity kept it busy tending its provincial roots. From the previous university extension college the new department inherited a management structure that was local rather than national in character: "The College is governed by a Council of forty-three members, including representatives of the Reading Town Council and the County Councils of Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Hampshire". These councillors looked upon the new college as being part of their political domain. While the Department of Education imposed national standards of entrance, councillors were active in promoting the interests of 'worthy' local students and during the first years of the college, the university authorities were usually happy to accede to special pleading on the part of local dignitaries. However, in 1903, local patronage suffered a severe blow with this decision:

In the selection of candidates for admission as students in training, preference was to be given henceforth to those who had passed the London
Matriculation Examination and were prepared to spend three years at college reading, not only for the Government Certificate Examination, but also for the London Degree of B.A. or B.Sc.\textsuperscript{28}

This is one of the early indications of the Reading college seeking to establish itself as a national rather than as a provincial institution. But the Board of Education, far from encouraging the college to look beyond its provincial boundaries, seemed determined to limit its scope and influence. Staff and students alike were quick to perceive that any work beyond that of the normal certificate course, notably degree studies, was "heavily discouraged by the Board".\textsuperscript{29}

The conflict over direction and purpose caused difficulties within the college. Both certificate students and pupil teachers were unsure how to respond to the atmosphere created within the day training department, an atmosphere which seemed neither fully academic nor properly professional. "Girls who taught in country villages thus met intellectual lecturers with a certain amount of shyness and timidity. Some would hide behind others if required to step forward and admit their mental errors".\textsuperscript{30}

The difficulties of achieving identity within the new day training college sprang not only from the attitude of the Board of Education, but also from a general uncertainty regarding the place of the college within the organization of the university. While Adamson could give the academic study of education respectability through his own achievements, outside of King's education as a discipline continued to be regarded with some scepticism. At Reading, for instance, it was regarded as a nuisance. "The 'staff' consisted of Mr. J.H. Gettins who, harassed but cheerful, worked from morn to night,
giving lectures and supervising school practice, knowing all the time that by reason of the training being concurrent with academic studies his Department was a nuisance." This pattern of evidence suggests that as an academic institution Reading certainly did not experience the swift success and national recognition achieved by King's College. Its process of development was at times uncertain in direction and slow to emerge.

The debate regarding how academic or professional teacher training courses should be has continued unabated since the rapid expansion of day training colleges brought it into prominence. There has however been little debate regarding the relative merits of the day training colleges and the traditional residential colleges. This is largely because the veritable avalanche of evidence provided by the inspectorate tended to concentrate on the innovative and positive work of the new colleges, discreetly ignoring the older residential ones. While the more conservative elements of the inspectorate were fearful of the day training colleges producing students "full of empty academic pride", collectively they realized the new Departments offered "a general appreciation of the academic opportunities in the university classes, of the value of the liberal education provided, and of the opportunity of mixing with other students".

This appreciation was obviously genuine when they considered King's College, but it is doubtful whether it can be sustained in relation to Reading college during the first decade of its existence. And Reading's pattern of development was probably far more typical than that of King's. The day training college at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, for instance, suffered the same difficulties as Reading in recruiting
students.\textsuperscript{33} Shortages of staff meant that those members who were appointed had to assume a wide variety of duties.\textsuperscript{34} Oxford University was not eager to assume any responsibilities for teacher training\textsuperscript{35} and the development of its day training programme was correspondingly slow.\textsuperscript{36} Although Manchester University was altogether swifter than Oxford in assuming a role in teacher education, until the arrival of Michael Sadler in 1903 its day training department was relatively unknown.\textsuperscript{37} When the pattern of evidence provided by a range of colleges such as those discussed is taken into account, it appears that the achievement of the few cast an added lustre to the progress of the many. It appears, too, that the inspectorate played their part in making the progress of the day training colleges seem a little more triumphant than it really was.

G.W. Kekewich has left a vivid, if rather distorted,\textsuperscript{38} picture of the Department of Education (and the Board of Education as it became in 1899) in his book \textit{The Education Department and After}. Kekewich bitterly attacked the system of "caste in educational administration":

\begin{quote}
It has been the constant policy of the Educational Department and the Board of Education to confine the higher appointments of officials, both inside and outside the office, to graduates in honours from Oxford and Cambridge.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

The effect of this policy, according to Kekewich, led to the "great majority of higher officials, Secretary, Assistant Secretary and Examiners" having never seen\textsuperscript{40} an elementary school and showing a "marked distaste"\textsuperscript{41} for anything associated with elementary schools or elementary teacher training. Arthur Acland, the Liberal Vice-President of the Committee of Council, tried in 1892 to open the ranks of the inspectorate to certificated teachers.\textsuperscript{42} But even inspectors were not regarded as senior officials. F.H. Spencer was
one of the few who succeeded in making the journey from the classroom to Whitehall, and only his "typical honesty and balance" saved him from tendering an early resignation. The permanent officials of the Board, following the example of the Secretary, Sir Amhurst Selby-Bigge, declined to make Spencer feel welcome:

I saw the Secretary of the Board, Sir Amhurst Selby-Bigge, who had been just, considerate and entirely unsentimental in his personal dealings with me, which were few. For between the Secretary and an Inspector, even of divisional rank, several great gulfs are ... fixed.

The gulf fixed between Spencer and Selby-Bigge was as great as the distance that most Board officials chose to place between themselves and the process of elementary teacher training. Most inspectors, realizing the importance of maintaining good relations with the churches, were circumspect in their comments on the denominational colleges. H.W.I. Howard in a letter to his son in December 1890, abandoned customary restraint: "I am heartily glad that the new day training colleges are with us. The time is long overdue when the wretched system of 'cram' and 'routine' pursued by the denominational colleges is challenged by the kind of wide, gentlemanly culture that only the universities can provide."

Howard's somewhat intemperate remarks were more judiciously confirmed in the Committee of Council's Annual Report, 1896. Here the emergence of a departmental policy may be clearly identified: "The day and residential colleges are adapted to the needs of different classes of students. The former bring them into contact with academic life and interests, the latter are in a position to secure closer supervision over the individual student." This departmental view can be seen as the natural response of a body of officials who were
themselves the products of the university system. In day training colleges they responded to the presentation of cultural values with which they were themselves imbued. A harsher interpretation would suggest that the Department view of the residential colleges arose from a mixture of ignorance and prejudice, factors which led the inspectorate to overvalue the achievements of the day training colleges. Denominationalists (who were of course victims of their own prejudices) quickly came to suspect that the inspectorate were not pursuing an even-handed policy in their dealings with day and residential types of training college.

In a seriously under-researched area, inspectorate evidence has, not unnaturally, been usually accepted at face value. The stereotype that therefore emerges is of inert denominational colleges being comprehensively overtaken by their better endowed and more enterprising rivals. There is, of course, a measure of truth in this interpretation, but it does not take into account the complex adjustments of relationships and policies that took place between the Education Department and the denominational bodies. The denominations did not ignore the advent of the day training colleges; their problem was, as always, how they could respond. Between 1890 and 1892 both denominationalists and officials within the Department of Education indulged in a degree of self-deception. The National Society, speaking on behalf of the Anglican Church, clung to the comforting thought that the merits of the residential system were so evident that they would continue to carry the day. The Church Inspector of Anglican Training Colleges wrote in his report of 1891:

It is still too early to gauge with any certainty the effect which day training colleges may have on the residential colleges, but there will be no doubt that the latter will continue to be the homes
in which the character of our teachers will be more completely moulded and the power of discipline more fully developed.47

The inspector was, in this brief statement, reasserting the Anglican Church's traditional belief in character before intellect. Despite all the available evidence to the contrary, the National Society persisted in a belief that the day training colleges could be converted to the habits and practices of the residential colleges. "Your committee have authorized the Examinations Board to open the examination of the Archbishop's Certificate to Church of England students in day training colleges and they are glad to report that there is a prospect of some of the students entering the examination".48

The Roman Catholics, although perturbed by the prospect of day training colleges "exalting secular knowledge at the expense of spiritual truth"49 contented themselves with joining Anglicans in a policy of hoping for the best while expecting the worst.

The Department of Education having secured the inauguration of day training colleges, made some attempt to allay the fears of denominationists. H.E. Oakeley in his report for the year 1890-91 assessed the situation in these words:

Some have argued that the day training colleges were needed on account of the shortcomings and defects existing in the residential colleges. I do not at all agree with this, though I am very glad that day colleges are established. Most excellent work has been done by the residential colleges and the peaceful college life, the college routine and discipline, the esprit de corps, the college chapel are great advantages.... If there are not many lecturers who are completely masters of their special subjects ... it is at least certain that nearly all have great power in imparting their knowledge.50

The element of disingenuousness that is present in all these statements served to help the various parties adjust to the new
situation. However, conciliatory attitudes began to falter in the face of growing denominationalist suspicion. The Roman Catholics, who were the most accomplished in the arts of forceful lobbying and who had the least to lose with regard to residential training, broke the unofficial truce with the Department of Education. Attacking the freedom enjoyed by staff in the new day training colleges to set and examine their own certificate papers, the Catholic Poor School Committee in 1891 was sharply critical of the increasingly secular content of such papers:

It is undesirable to introduce questions connected with Mental Philosophy, upon which great differences exist, into the examination in School Management; but if an attempt is to be made to introduce any such questions, it is essential that among alternative books prescribed there should be some not unacceptable to Catholics.

The authorities of the day training colleges ignored such criticism. The Department of Education, anxious to maintain a policy of détente, hastily added Locke, *On Education*, as an alternative to the work of Herbert Spencer, a writer whom the Catholic Hierarchy found particularly objectionable. The proffering of such 'olive branches' did little to avert a sharp deterioration in relationships between Catholics and the Department of Education. At first the Church of England tried to hold itself aloof from a direct confrontation, but the rapid expansion of day training colleges and the general inspectorial acclaim that greeted their arrival, were factors that could no longer be ignored or concealed from church members. In 1893 the Church Inspector for Anglican Colleges declared:

There can be little doubt that the Educational Department favour the extension of day training colleges rather than of residential; it becomes a question whether the Church ought not to press her right to enlarge her means of training her own pupil teachers in training colleges of her own. The protection of a minority is laudable, but that
ought not to make the oppression of the majority necessary. So the desire of a few for undenominational training ought not to be allowed to prevent the honest training of Church people under the influence of the Church's faith.54

This assertion by the Church of England regarding its right to train teachers was made at the point when some staff inspectors, particularly H.M.I. Scott-Coward, were beginning to say openly that there should be no further expansion of denominational training.

The Anglican statement was made in 1893. In 1894 Scott-Coward responded by putting forward a notably sombre picture of the residential colleges in his Annual Report:

What strikes one after some detailed acquaintance with these institutions, as a leading characteristic, is their generally unchanged condition. Their state now seems as a rule to be little altered from what it was when they were founded about half a century ago. This is seen chiefly in their structural aspect. The Education Act of 1870 did not touch them. While it reacted with much and increasingly energetic effect upon the buildings and curriculum of the schools in the country, the training colleges remained outside the influence of the current that was bearing onwards the elementary schools, and except in so far as the higher life of these latter reacted on them by stimulating them into a higher intellectual activity, they remained quiet, or moved only very slowly on their old lines.55

Before making a detailed appraisal of the faults he detected within the colleges, Scott-Coward pondered on the possible fate of the residential colleges:

Probably half a century ago the condition of the training colleges was in harmony with the social life with which they were concerned. It is not so now.... Institutions cannot long survive the pressure of changed sentiment and opinion acting at right angles to their line of movement. The path of history is strewn with the skeletons of organizations which perished by the sheer weight of the new environment of opinion to which they failed to adjust themselves.56

Predictions regarding the imminent demise of their colleges did not please denominationalists, nor did they appreciate the catalogue
of deficiencies noted by a number of different staff inspectors. Scott-Coward concentrated his criticism on the inadequacies of the college buildings, noting that "any elementary school is generally better equipped than the majority of training colleges". He was particularly perturbed by the state of the residential colleges for men:

> It is in the colleges for men that the deficiencies are most serious; and in a small number, even of the best taught and most popular, are to be found bad dormitories, no recreation rooms, no bathrooms, no workshops, nor laboratories, cumbrous and ugly antiquated furniture, no museums, no proper supply of scientific apparatus and no adequate libraries....

The production of an inferior class of elementary teachers could not be altered for the better unless the environment in which they trained was substantially improved:

> The influence for good of spacious rooms, with suitable furniture and adornment cannot be over-estimated.... It is of the highest importance that they should be bright, clean, well furnished, and adequately adorned with pictures or objects calculated to quicken and guide the taste of the students.

Changes in buildings had to be accompanied by new methods of recruiting staff:

> The kindly and most natural desire to maintain the family feeling of the college and to provide for its more attractive or deserving members, as well as to place docile and tractable instruments in the hands of its chief, has led to the practice of choosing the lecturers not from among the best to be found anywhere, but from among old students.... It is not possible to derive from persons so meagrely equipped teaching of a stimulating, quickening, formative character. Its qualities will be accuracy in a narrow sense, the methodical arrangement of facts, no doubt useful, but imparted in a dry, perfunctory manner, a steady view of the gaining of marks, a persistent treatment of knowledge in the restricted professional spirit. Now such teaching cannot form the thoughtful teachers, it cannot produce educators, and as this should be the main aim of training, I do not think I am wrong in saying that a broader spirit should animate the selection of teachers in our colleges.
Although H.M.I.'s Oakeley and Scott-Coward refrained from mentioning the day training colleges by name, these latter remarks were so pointed that denominationalists could hardly fail to miss the point. Members of staff serving in residential colleges were being unfavourably contrasted with those working in day training colleges, almost all of whom possessed a first degree. Moreover, if inspectorate criticism of residential college buildings was not sufficiently cogent, J.H. Yoxall, speaking on behalf of the National Union of Teachers, was even more scathing. "From 1870 onwards", declared Yoxall, "the building of a new church college was almost as rare as the building of a new cathedral".°

Collectively the evidence adds up to damning indictment of the denominational colleges. In 1895 their buildings were declared antiquated, their staff inadequate, their methods of training narrow and their students limited and intellectually inferior to those working in day training colleges. Two questions in particular arise from this portrayal of the residential colleges. To what extent was the inspectorate criticism justified, and how far, if at all, did the denominations respond to it?

For obvious reasons the inspectorate did not single out the colleges of any one particular denomination. They were careful to refer to residential colleges in order to name the type and to include within it the non-denominational colleges owned by the British and Foreign School Society. But the very careful avoidance of discrimination could have justified Methodists feeling resentment at the overall verdict offered on their colleges. For at Westminster they owned a college which, if its buildings were still unpretentious, was clearly aspiring towards greater academic achievement. F.C. Pritchard has drawn attention to this in his history of the
In 1894 two students successfully gained the Degree of Bachelor of Arts at the University of London - William T. Palmer and John Hilton. It should be noted, too, that in that year Westminster gained a higher percentage of Firsts in the Certificate examination than any other college (47 Juniors and 40 Seniors).\(^5\)

Pressure for Westminster students to obtain London University external degrees continued. The very complimentary inspection report of 1901 gives significant details:

The work of the college continues to be highly successful; 68 per cent of the second year students obtained double firsts at last certificate examination. In this respect the college stands second in order of merit among its brother institutions. Fifteen students were last year prepared for university with highly satisfactory results.\(^6\)

In the light of the criticism levelled at the colleges, evidence of academic growth should have been a welcome feature. It was not. Degrees taken by students at Westminster College were no more welcome to the Board of Education than ones obtained by students at Reading day training college. In 1901, H.M.I. Scott-Coward, called to give evidence to the departmental committee on Training College Courses of Instruction, made a number of revealing statements. Referring to the Wesleyan Methodist Colleges at Westminster and Southlands, he acknowledged their good standards but described them "as a little over ambitious".\(^7\) In private correspondence to his colleague, H.M.I. Barnett, he was even more frank. "You will observe how degree hungry the students at Westminster and Southlands are becoming. The Wesleyans are puffed up by their own importance, we shall need to curb their ideas before long...."\(^8\) Although not quite as forthright, Scott-Coward's further evidence to the departmental committee crisply surveyed the efforts of the other major denominations. Roman Catholic Colleges were, he declared, "either very good or very bad" depending
on "the quality of the order" running them. The Church of England Colleges were usually of "the second class", of solid quality "but far too isolated". Despite his somewhat contentious tone, Scott-Coward's remarks were in many respects accurate. The Catholic College of St. Mary's, Hammersmith, was, in 1899, by the incoming Principal's own admission, in severe difficulty. By contrast, the more settled conditions at Notre Dame College, Liverpool, made it one of the most impressive institutions in the country.

The vast majority of Anglican colleges were provincial institutions, quietly going their separate ways and not pretending to anything like the academic excellence sought by Westminster College. At Culham, "none of the weaknesses that the inspectors had commented on in their report for 1891" had received any attention by 1900. In 1899, Lincoln Diocesan Training College was the only college in England still without a students' common room but the college at Derby had neither students' common room nor library in 1894. In the last decade of the nineteenth century the majority of Anglican colleges continued to resemble country houses which had never been properly converted for the purposes of teacher training. In 1888, H.M.I. Oakeley, although impressed by the exterior of Chester College, was perturbed by the crude arrangements for teaching and the general lack of furniture; and described "Desks the worst he had ever seen, want of paint everywhere, no backs to the forms on which students sat".

When pressed by the inspectorate to make improvements, some principals of Anglican colleges took refuge in the argument that they were producing teachers for country schools. Plain living was an appropriate beginning for such a vocation. Of the forty-five
residential colleges recognized by the Board of Education in 1900, the Church of England owned thirty, eleven colleges for men and nineteen for women. In view of the dominant position achieved by the Anglican Church in the field of teacher training, it can only be concluded that the Board's criticism of the residential colleges was mainly, but not entirely, directed towards their colleges. A great deal, therefore, depended on how the Church of England would respond to growing official concern regarding standards within their training institutions.

The Inspector of Church of England Colleges in his report to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, 1894, expressed in large measure the mixture of bewilderment and resentment that assailed Anglicans during this period. His report began by identifying a mood:

Unrest and desire for change, without due consideration or distinct appreciation of consequences, which seem a mark of the present time, have very clearly been brought to bear upon the system hitherto followed, and followed with good results.

Along with this, there is to be observed a direct attempt to disparage the necessity for training the mind in accurate study of Christian doctrine, an impatience of any form of definite statement of revealed Truth, and doubts are freely thrown upon the historic character of the Gospels.

It would, therefore, be surprising if no sign of these things appeared in our training colleges, but, on the other hand, it is a source of great thankfulness that the signs are so few.

An analysis of this statement reveals how deeply secondary factors of secularization were affecting the Anglican Church in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The mood of "unrest and desire for change" derived in part from an expanding popular press and the increased speed of both communication and transport. The popular press, when it dealt with religion at all, tended to view all denominations as
equals. This was a particularly hard blow to the Church of England with its claims to being the Established Church. The press was also quick to publish, in fairly lurid terms, the fruits of German biblical criticism\textsuperscript{82} which cast doubt on "the historic character of the Gospels". The secular revolt against "revealed Truth", which had begun with Darwin and Lyall, was being powerfully assisted in the 1890s by a system of mass communication which found it much easier to respond to the rational claims of science rather than to any religious doctrines. Attempts to discredit the Bible made Baptists and fundamentalists cling more strongly to its teaching, while Roman Catholics were offered strong spiritual guidance through the Hierarchy. Anglicans, however, were left unhappily in the middle. In a church still shaken by the Anglo-Catholic revival and continuing arguments regarding the place of ritual in religious worship,\textsuperscript{83} many Church members were disconcerted to find their religious beliefs and practices being challenged by the progress of scientific enquiry.

In the field of teacher training the temptation for the Church was to keep its training colleges separate, seminaries shielded from an ungrateful world. The Board of Education challenged any movement in this direction through the pressure of their regulations, especially those relating to the curriculum. When the Committee on Training College Courses of Instruction reviewed the topic in 1901, they found that the Department of Education and Board of Education had in a period of eleven years directed training colleges to cover twenty-three different areas of curriculum study which had not been present in the training code of 1890.\textsuperscript{84} The pressure of a curriculum mainly devoted to the acquisition of secular knowledge (see Appendix I), reduced the time available for religious instruction.\textsuperscript{85} The Inspector for Anglican colleges was left to reflect that "four hours per week, which is about
the average time given in our training colleges to religious
instruction, does not seem an extravagant amount for the purpose". In contrast, secularists wished to see religious instruction granted no time at all, and looked approvingly at the curricula of day training colleges devoid of time allocated to either religious instruction or worship. They also campaigned for the abolition of all religious tests for intending teachers, a demand that brought an exasperated response from the Inspector of Anglican colleges:

The whole of the discussion may be put into one question: 'Are we to be allowed to have bona fide Church training colleges according to the trust received from those who founded them and have sustained them up to the present day, and shall we hand them on to a future generation?'

No one seems to deny that our colleges send out good teachers and no one has proved that the day colleges do better work than the residential. Without any disparagement of day training colleges it may be said that character cannot be developed in them as it is developed in the residential, for the opportunity is not given for this purpose.... We can understand why those who do not value religious knowledge, and those who despise it, are eager to put an end to the system; we can understand why those who have no love for the clear teaching of the Church of the Living God desire to destroy the distinctive character of these training colleges, but no faithful member of our Church, no one who longs for the true welfare of our people ... can be slack in doing all that in him lies to uphold institutions which are doing so excellent a work.

This long and bitter report, submitted to the National Society in 1895, marks the nadir in relationships between the Church of England and the Department of Education. Taking their cue from their Inspector of Anglican Colleges, the full Committee of the National Society accused the Department of favouritism. "The mode of examinations in day training colleges," they declared, "is manifestly unfair". They were indignant that while the Department apparently allowed considerable autonomy to the university day colleges over the
questions of examinations and organization, exactly the opposite was the case regarding church colleges. They asserted that it was the high-handed and bureaucratic attitude of the Department that had led it to "contemptuously ignore" the recommendations of governing bodies of residential colleges: "If the Education Department intend thus to ignore the committees, on whom great responsibilities lie, the Department takes a very serious step in the direction of making our training colleges mere state institutions". 90

This was perhaps the nub of the problem. The rapid expansion of the day training colleges was one threat to the status of the residential colleges; the attitude and behaviour of the Department of Education constituted another. In seeking greater instrumental efficiency in the training colleges, it was natural for the internal organization of the Department to be rationalized along bureaucratic lines. The proper distribution of time, space and manpower led the inspectorate to take central decisions. The curricula for residential colleges, 91 the length of their academic year92 and their certificate examination papers93 were settled by H.M.I. in Whitehall. Autonomous governing bodies responsible for individual colleges did not fit into this administratively neat pattern of management. Departmental officials would have welcomed the notion of denominational colleges becoming "state institutions". In 1907, H.M.I. Barnett (a former Principal of Westminster College) commented on the role and policies adopted by the Department of Education from 1895:

In their dealings with the Elementary Training Colleges, the Board have resolutely tackled the vested interests and prejudices of colleges, universities and teachers and have involved themselves in controversies, in action and in organization, far more complicated than those which would issue from a real endeavour to give something better to the schools than a perpetual dribble of incompetent amateurs. 94
This was the positive side of departmental and Board activity. In a private letter commenting on his memorandum, Barnett acknowledged that such activities had negative repercussions:

In retrospect it is clear that we have been heavy-handed with the voluntary colleges and have been tempted to bully them because of their weak organization.... It is time we exercised our strength on the purpose of obtaining more trained teachers and challenge the growing strength of the university and L.E.A. colleges.95

Barnett's final comment regarding the growing strength of the universities was particularly significant. The very success of the university day training colleges brought about a slight improvement in relationships between the denominations and the Department of Education during the years 1896 to 1900. Early in 1896 the popular press, led by the Daily Mail, discovered that a proportion of teachers attending both residential and university colleges were avoiding entrance into the profession at the conclusion of their studies. It was a minor scandal made into a major one by sensational press coverage. The Department of Education made the correct bureaucratic response; it set up a Committee of Enquiry. H.M.I.'s Tucker, Sharpe, Pooley and Kingsford were asked to investigate the problem of teachers who, having been "expensively trained" by the state, "either failed to enter the profession or left it too quickly".96 The committee decided it had two questions to answer:

(1) Can any means be devised to check the waste of trained teachers from causes other than death?

(2) Can any means be devised to secure repayment or partial repayment of the cost of training teachers who leave the profession?97

During the course of their extensive enquiries the committee members were not at all pleased to discover that "at least twelve per cent of the trained male teachers are lost to the profession without having
given any adequate return for the cost of their training". In observing that "the greater portion of those teachers who now leave the profession no doubt do so for the sake of improving their own position", the committee still deplored the manner in which "the receipt of training" gave some students an inflated notion of "their own social value". The university day training colleges were particularly guilty in this respect. "By and large", stated the committee, "the traditional residential colleges" successfully accustom their students "to the arduous tasks and duties of teaching". On the other hand, "The evidence before us points to the existence of some causes which render the class of teachers" in university day training colleges "less ready to remain in the profession":

During the years 1892-1894 (inclusive) 341 male students passed out of day training colleges; of this number 43 or 12.5 per cent have already left the service. During the same period 348 women passed out, and of this number 32, or 9 per cent, have already left the service.... These teachers have had an average service of under three years and the waste compares very unfavourably with the waste of teachers from the residential colleges....".  

Even worse were the numbers of students from university day training colleges who "thinking themselves educated to degree standard" feel no obligation to undertake "useful work" at the completion of their course. The authorities of university colleges were judged to be partly to blame for this state of affairs because, declared the committee, "It appears that only at a few of these colleges are any steps taken to impress upon the students their obligation to enter the profession". The fears of the conservative element within the inspectorate, that the granting of degrees to elementary teachers would only serve to increase their social pretensions, seemed amply vindicated by the findings of the committee. When these findings were circulated to governing bodies of the university day training colleges, 102
the Department failed to secure from them the contrite response it was expecting. To its great surprise and discomfort the Department found itself the object of sharp criticism from the professors of education in the new colleges. Professor H.L. Withers of Owen's College, Manchester, stated that there was "too much central direction from the Board, too many subjects, too many examinations, inflicted on people too young and of inferior intellectual calibre". In the light of this response, the docile and tractable qualities of the traditional denominational colleges suddenly seemed more attractive.

H.M.I. Rankine, in the Annual Report for the Board of Education, 1900, expressed sympathy for the plight in which denominational colleges found themselves:

That these colleges do not attain a higher level is due to conditions which are imposed on them partly by their historical traditions, partly by the conditions under which they work as part of the government system, but mainly through want of funds.... The old enthusiasm which poured forth the first full stream of voluntary effort no longer exists. They have suffered as the voluntary schools have suffered, but without the same help. To them has come no abolition of the 75 per cent limit, no fee grant, no Aid Association. They may have been too proud to plead poverty, but they have felt the pinch.

Rankine's sympathy for the denominational colleges was balanced by his criticism of the university day training colleges. He considered that they, and the students who attended them, enjoyed "undue privileges" with regard to examinations, status and funding. In a surprising reversal of recently acquired Board doctrine, Rankine declared:

The residential colleges are not lagging behind their younger rivals. They, too, are striving strenuously to get into touch with the higher life, to give their students more opportunities for self-development, to open up for them not only wider spheres of practice, but a more intellectual atmosphere.... Battersea, Borough Road, Chelsea
and Stockwell are more successful than any four day training colleges. It is also pretty clear that if the day training colleges are admitted within the university shrine, there cannot be a very strong reason for keeping the residential colleges in the court of the gentiles.

Rankine's criticism of day training colleges, and the sarcastic tenor of his remarks concerning universities, appear to indicate that the warmth that had characterized Board relationships with the universities during the early 1890s was no longer evident in 1900. Undoubtedly the first careless rapture of the relationship was diminishing and was being replaced by a more careful and pragmatic approach on both sides. However, Rankine's judgment has to be treated with some caution. Like his colleagues, he was the master of the carefully balanced phrase, a characteristic of inspectorate reports then, as now. Thus, his apparently outspoken defence of the residential colleges was subtly modified by the repeated insertion of qualifying phrases. "The residential colleges" stated Rankine, "are doing first-rate work; on their own level...."

The last phrase introduces an element of ambivalence, an ambivalence that seems to characterize Board of Education policy with regard to teacher training at the beginning of the twentieth century. Inspectorate admiration for the university colleges was by 1900 tempered by an awareness that these institutions were determined not to be dominated by Board policies. The residential colleges, if intellectually inferior, were at least tractable and responsive to Board decree. Actions speak louder than words. In this context the balance of advantage in 1900 clearly lay with the university day training colleges. Despite Rankine's fine words, Scott-Coward, now a senior inspector, was determinedly pushing ahead with plans to curtail any further expansion of residential training. While a blazing row
broke out between the Board and Roman Catholics over the implementation of this policy, the second wave of university day training colleges were opening their doors. (See Appendix II)

Evidence cited in this chapter has shown how, in 1890, the monopoly of teacher training possessed by the denominational bodies was broken by the introduction of university day training colleges. In tracing in some detail the development of a sample of these colleges, the hypothesis has been posited that their collective progress has usually been portrayed in more triumphant terms than is actually justified by the facts. The experience of the university day training college at Reading, allied to a pattern of evidence from other provincial colleges, suggests that a revisionist critique of the early day training movement may be overdue.

Comments from students who attended the day training colleges might be a particularly fruitful starting point for any such analysis. Elspeth Huxley, studying at Reading University during the mid-1920s, wrote of her experiences there:

I soon discovered that, as in all walks of English life, this unpretentious university of some eight hundred lower middle class students was honeycombed with subtle snobberies. There was a pecking order among studies as well as among people; agriculture ranked high, not because farming was regarded as a snob pursuit ... but because most of the graduates would join the staff of some local authority or government department, the latter in the Empire as it then was....

So to be an 'agri' was all right, and so was a 'horti'; pure scientists, historians and classicists occupied a middle range, and at the bottom, I regret to say, came the future teachers, who read for a two-years' diploma instead of for a three or four years' degree. Why future teachers should have been so poorly thought of I do not know - I suppose because they were so poorly paid. 'Edu's' tended to cluster together, looking earnest, pallid (probably from malnutrition) and even more drearily dressed than the rest of us; to dodge coffees in the buttery...
because twopence was beyond their means; and if girls, to live in a remote hall called St. George's that no one else ever visited.\textsuperscript{106}

It has been suggested that the snobberies so mercilessly revealed by Elspeth Huxley in this extract played a large part in forming what has been termed a 'Board doctrine'. At first the inspectorate responded enthusiastically to the cultural values presented in the day training colleges. They tempered their enthusiasm on discovering that such colleges were determined to pursue an independent line, and that the cultural values which they so admired, succeeded in alienating a significant proportion of students from the profession for which they were training.

Although strains and conflicts can be discerned within the overall inspectorate view of teacher training between 1890-1900, a central and unchallenged tenet of belief was that school teachers should not receive degrees. In actively seeking improvements in the conditions of training, all inspectors consistently stopped short of advocating the award of degrees for elementary school teachers. A variety of good reasons for such a view were put forward, namely the unsettling effect of such knowledge on a person destined to serve in an arduous profession and the strain incurred by a student of inferior intellectual ability attempting a degree. Yet all these statements are riddled with value judgments, and one such judgment was scarcely acknowledged by any inspector; their conviction was that degrees were for gentlemen and that elementary school teachers, though worthy and hardworking, were not gentlemen.

It has been suggested that these cultural values tended to influence the judgment of the inspectorate, causing them to overestimate the achievements of the day training colleges at the expense
of the traditional residential colleges. In the latter case it has been argued that the evidence of the inspectorate was not inaccurate, but too imprecise. The need for harmonious relationships with the denominations prevented the inspectorate from singling out the work of any one denominational body. However, it became clear that although disliked by the inspectorate for their 'degree hunger', the Wesleyan colleges at Westminster and Southlands were outstanding during this period. The Catholics, according to the inspectorate, possessed some of the best and the worst colleges, leaving the weight of their criticism to fall where it was intended, on the thirty residential colleges owned by the Church of England.

The combination of the forces of secularization and bureaucratization evident during this final decade of the nineteenth century, dealt particularly harshly with the Anglican Church. The pace of change further confused an already strife-torn church. The fruits of Biblical criticism, disseminated by an increasingly powerful press, fuelled a secular disillusionment with any form of "revealed Truth". Although the Board of Education was not immediately involved in this controversy, it was indirectly contributing to the spread of secular attitudes by its style of management and its insistence on priority for secular curricula in the colleges. The increasingly bureaucratic policies of the Board found a response in the management structures adopted by Wesleyans, Roman Catholics, and the British and Foreign School Society. All of these bodies, owing to their relatively small commitment to teacher training, possessed central committees able to deal directly with the Board of Education on matters concerning their colleges. The Church of England on the other hand, had no such committee, and while the National Society did its best, it found that the governing bodies of Anglican colleges jealously preserved the
independence granted to them in the founding trusts of their colleges. The isolation of the majority of Anglican colleges, an isolation both physical and intellectual, made them vulnerable to criticism. As H.M.I. Barnett confessed, the denominational colleges were 'bullied' because their organization was so weak.

In 1901, H.M.I. Scott-Coward, by now Chief Inspector for Training Colleges, was asked to name the best colleges in England. He unhesitatingly identified the London colleges as being "in the first rank". Perhaps the urban-provincial separation promoted by Scott-Coward is more fruitful than any contrast between residential and day training colleges. For secularization, as has been noted in a previous chapter, was and is an urban phenomenon. London in 1900 possessed the most advanced media and transport system in the country. Secondary features of secularization were clearly to be seen at work within the capital. The diverse cultural life of the city paradoxically provided affinities between the London colleges, day and residential, which were quite remarkable. All the colleges were large, academically ambitious, able to attract the élite of both staff and students.

In reverse measure the problems of a provincial college such as Reading, were, in essence, the problems that beset all the provincial denominational colleges. It is arguable that the progress of King's College is more accurately gauged by comparing it with Stockwell or Westminster Colleges than with any provincial day training college.

In the earlier part of the nineteenth century there had been much discussion concerning 'two Englands'. A redefinition of this theory in 1900 might have identified an urban-secularized England, and a rural-modestly-Christian England. The contrast between the two worlds is succinctly encapsulated by Chadwick: "In 1895 golfers were said to
give a little scandal in country towns by arriving at the station just when folk were on their way to church".110 The vast majority of Anglican and other denominational colleges were rooted, metaphorically and physically, in the rural Christian world. As a result of this, as the inspectorate warned, there was some danger of their becoming social dinosaurs. While this was the threat, the provincial colleges continued to turn out modestly equipped, but well socialized, young teachers. There is some irony in perceiving that much of the criticism that was heaped upon them by the Board of Education, was as a result of their performing this limited task too well.
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CHAPTER 4

The Administrative Solution

George Bernard Shaw once complained that the only factor uniting the warring factions of English society during the nineteenth century was their collective and "obstinate prejudice against the organization of any competent bureaucracy". Shaw offered his judgment during the last decade of the century, precisely at a moment when perhaps it was a little less appropriate than it might have been. Faced with growing foreign competition in trade and armaments, there is now an increasing amount of evidence indicating that successive Liberal and Unionist administrations had by the 1890s accepted the need for the rational distribution of finance and manpower. Education was not exempt from this rationalizing process, indeed the Board of Education during the decade developed policies which considerably increased its control over both the processes and direction of teacher training.

An examination and analysis of the increase in centralized bureaucratic power forms the major theme of this chapter. It is argued that denominationalist preparations for, and responses to, the 1902 Education Act reveal a decisive shift in the balance of power as between centralized and devolved systems of administration. The 1902 Act is therefore considered in some detail, not because of a slavish adherence to what may be termed a traditional approach to the history of education, but rather because the Act is seen as confirming the unfavourable trend of Government legislation towards the denominational training colleges apparent since 1888. In this context, Professor Simon's case that the Act represents a triumph for denominational interests is challenged. Indeed, it is argued that the Act left the denominational
colleges in a position where henceforward they were destined to be, 'a waning influence'. This fate, it is argued, was not the result of a secularist conspiracy but was rather an outcome of the bureaucratic and secularist emphasis that was settling upon English society at the beginning of the twentieth century.

One indicator of the increase in centralized administrative power achieved by Government at this time is the range and frequency of Codes drafted by the Board of Education. The Board of Education Act, formulated in 1899, is itself the turning point in this centralizing process, vesting as it did all administrative responsibilities for education in a "single Department of the Executive Government presided over by a Minister responsible to Parliament". Although the Act received extremely subdued applause in the national press (Lyulph Stanley declaring it to be nothing more than "a miserable little piece of departmental machinery"), its significance was magnified by the fact that it was the precursor of further educational legislation. As such its enactment persuaded all the denominational authorities to do some stock-taking regarding their policies and positions. Teacher training did not rate high on the denominationalists' list of educational priorities. The imminence of a major new Education Act directed public attention towards the future of the voluntary schools, already under intense pressure from rate-aided board schools. Consideration of the position of the voluntary colleges was consequently subordinated (particularly in the Anglican sector) to an overriding determination on the part of denominationalists to save their schools. As the administrative outline of the Bill slowly became apparent, an analysis of the policies and positions adopted by the various denominationalists reveals how frequently the latter found themselves imprisoned within public postures inherited from previous conflicts.
Although deeply divided theologically, Methodists and Catholics actually shared a number of advantages which were to serve them well during the periods of bitter quarrelling prevailing both before and after the publication of the Education Bill. Each denomination possessed well defined policies regarding the role and purpose of their teacher training colleges and consequently were in a favourable position to defend their training interests. Although in the case of Methodism such unity of purpose was fortuitous, Catholic unity derived from a studied exercise in political management conducted by the Hierarchy.

Paradoxically, Methodist unity regarding the importance of their training colleges stemmed from the almost endemic divisions within the Methodist Church on most issues, including persistent agonizing about the morality of owning distinctively denominational schools. On this latter issue, the Methodist Representative Committee, in January 1891, had been forced into passing a series of often mutually contradictory declarations. The first resolution which enjoyed the strong support of Primitive Methodists boldly proclaimed that "the primary object of the Methodist policy in the matter of elementary education should be the establishment of school boards everywhere ... placing Christian unsectarian schools within reasonable distance of every family, especially in the rural districts". This point of principle did not commend itself to the more conservative elements of Methodism. In particular the majority of Wesleyans, determined to retain control of their voluntary schools, forced the inclusion of resolution four which stated: "That so long as denominational schools form part of the national system of education, our Connexional Day Schools and Training Colleges should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency". The inclusion of this latter declaration served to avert a major division within the Methodist body. However, in practice, and by tacit
agreement of all parties, the "full vigour" of Methodists was henceforth transferred to the support of their training colleges, an element of policy on which all factions could agree.

The Methodist colleges at Westminster and Southlands benefited enormously from this strong, sustained support. After initial qualms, Methodists\(^7\) felt confident enough to join with members of the non-denominational British and Foreign School Society in welcoming the introduction of day training colleges. Both parties issued a joint statement which declared: "the establishment of day training colleges in connection with local colleges in many parts of the country is an event which we hail with satisfaction, feeling confident that there is ample work for our residential colleges and for them also".\(^{18}\) While making the day training colleges welcome, Methodists were nevertheless determined to ensure that their own colleges would be as good as, if not better than, the new institutions. Large sums of money were allocated for the development of both colleges by the Wesleyan Education Committee and consequently all sections of Methodism began to acquire a proprietorial pride in their development.\(^{19}\) Thus, as the 1902 Act came nearer, while Methodists would join with other elements of non-conformity in opposing unrestricted aid to voluntary schools, they were nevertheless determined to preserve their position within the field of teacher training.

Roman Catholics were just as determined to defend their training interests, although these were somewhat different in type and kind from those associated with other denominations. B. Sacks has observed that just prior to the 1902 Act the whole nation seemed to be in the grip of a collective mania.\(^{20}\) Within this overall condition the individual denominations were gripped by their own particular obsessions. In the
case of the Catholics obsessional interest and hypersensitivity of response were evident in their often frantic attempts to defend the pupil teacher system. In 1900 Catholics possessed only three residential training colleges recognized by the Board of Education. As a result of this shortage of residential accommodation, they relied very heavily on the pupil teacher system to provide sufficient numbers of elementary teachers to fulfil their declared policy of having all Catholic children educated in Catholic schools by Catholic teachers. In these circumstances, any attack on the pupil teacher system was likely to be construed by Catholics as an attack on their vital interests. During the stormy prelude to the 1902 Act such attacks were being launched from all quarters, thereby adding to the Catholic state of paranoia.

In Chapter 2 of this study Manning's angry reaction to criticisms of the pupil teacher system offered by Crosskey and Stanley during the course of the Cross Commission, have been noted. Privately, Manning was perturbed by the strength of the opposition mounted against the continuation of the system, and mobilized the Catholic Poor School Committee to take defensive measures. Accordingly, in 1890 the Committee issued a circular to the head teachers of all Catholic schools reminding them of their obligations to pupil teachers. The Catholic Code of Practice stipulated that:

1. No pupil teacher should, at any period of his/her engagement, teach more than five hours a day.
2. A good school library should be at their disposal.
3. They should receive tuition in Drawing and Music.

In the light of conditions prevailing in the Catholic schools at this period, the issuing of the Code was very much a case of the road to hell being paved with good intentions. Commissioned in 1895 to
make a "private and discreet" investigation as to the working of the Code in Catholic schools, R. Hunnybun, Secretary to Catholic Poor School Committee, was dismayed to find that its recommendations were almost entirely ignored. Hunnybun found that in schools "swarming with children, Catholic pupil teachers were, on average, teaching twenty-five hours a week, in addition to being employed 'minding' children in dinner hours". He also estimated that a significant number of pupil teachers were "teaching thirty-five hours a week" and that their private studies varied from "nil to twenty-seven hours a week". The significance of this last set of figures was indicated by Hunnybun in his comment that all "private study for pupil teachers is additional to their working a full school day from nine a.m. to four-thirty p.m.". The cumulative effect of this was to impose on "children of tender age" a working week frequently in "excess of sixty hours".

The findings of Hunnybun's 1895 enquiry placed the Catholic authorities in an extremely difficult position, confirming as they did earlier criticisms made by the inspectorate. To remedy the situation the Hierarchy, acting through the Catholic Poor School Committee, attempted to set up Catholic pupil teacher centres along the lines of those already established by the school boards. Such efforts were strongly opposed by the inspectorate, who countered this initiative in 1896 by instituting a Commission of Enquiry into the workings of the pupil teacher system.

If the Department of Education hoped that the Commissioners would provide them with further evidence with which to exert pressure on the Catholics, their hopes were amply rewarded. The final report of the Committee of Enquiry published in 1898 was severely critical of the recently developed Catholic pupil teacher centres, referring to them
as "cram schools" and contrasting their work unfavourably with the "liberal and enlightening courses of study offered at the school board centres". In the circumstances, the Catholic authorities decided that attack constituted the best form of defence. Noting the heavy representation of senior H.M.I.'s on the Commission, the Catholic Poor School Committee sarcastically commented that the Commissioners "from their point of view are admirably qualified to indicate the notorious defects of the present pupil teacher system.... Whether they are equally qualified to suggest practical and practicable remedies is a matter of opinion....". In the light of Kekewich's subsequent revelations regarding the work habits of some inspectors, it was a shrewd blow in a sensitive area.

This barbed attack illustrates the extent to which in 1898 the Department of Education and the Catholic authorities were completely at loggerheads over the formulation of policy for teacher training. The Catholic Poor School Committee in September, 1898, openly accused the Department of seeking to "erase gradually the system of pupil teachers" by "putting their faith in day training colleges and residential colleges ... a policy severely discouraging to Catholic interests". The continual attacks on the Catholic position mounted by the Department at this time forced the Catholic Hierarchy into undertaking a fundamental review of their policies and positions. In many respects it can therefore be claimed that the outcome of the 1902 Act, from a Catholic point of view, was actually decided in 1898. The Catholic Hierarchy, led by Manning, were collectively far too intelligent not to realize that the Department was attempting to coerce their position through the use of bureaucratic devices (such as a well timed Commission of Enquiry) and they therefore decided to fight fire with fire. The increasingly centralized direction of policy by the
Department was countered by a Catholic decision to make their responses to the Board national rather than local in origin. This was achieved by the setting up of a Catholic Schools Committee, the fore-runner of the Catholic Education Council.34

The significance of this action can be judged in terms of the way in which the national representation on the Committee35 ensured that all elements of the Catholic faith were bound together in a united defence of Catholic policy and principles. Swiftly grasping the point that their freedom to defend matters of principle depended on their financial independence, the Committee (acting on the advice of the Hierarchy), mounted a campaign to persuade Catholics to view their teacher training commitments as a "national missionary effort".36 Church members were urged not to allow any single Roman Catholic college to "limp along on local charity",37 In order to prevent this, leading Catholics were urged to subscribe directly to the Catholic Poor School Committee. Additionally, public meetings throughout the land were advocated as a means of drawing the attention of the laity to the work of the Committee, which was charged with co-ordinating all fund raising activities.38

As in the case of the Methodist colleges, Roman Catholic training institutions benefited enormously from a unification of their control and management. While Anglican colleges continued jealously preserving their local autonomy, Catholic colleges from 1898 began to enjoy the benefits of national funding channelled to them through the Catholic Schools Committee. Any departmental directive touching on matters of policy regarding training first had to come to the Committee (and through them to the Hierarchy) for scrutiny. In this way individual college principals were not left bereft of support in
their dealings with the inspectorate. They could, and did, refer to the central Committee for guidance.\textsuperscript{39}

This confident and skilful response by the Hierarchy to attempts by the Department to achieve a decisive degree of control over Catholic policies for training can be partly explained by reference to the overall state of the religious denominations in 1900. At this time only Catholics could direct public attention to the fact that they were enjoying increasing support; more converts gained, more money donated, more schools and colleges built.\textsuperscript{40} Such an upward trend gave Catholics everywhere a great psychological advantage, one which they were not slow to exploit.\textsuperscript{41} Indeed, problems were transformed into advantages. Disagreements over the pupil teacher system meant that the Hierarchy had before 1902 rallied Catholics behind their traditional policy of separate Catholic education and training under distinctive Catholic control. There were no ambiguities surrounding their policy. The Hierarchy therefore approached the 1902 negotiations from a position of considerable strength. If there was a price to be paid for obtaining Catholic unity, it lay in the fact that bureaucratic interventions by the Board of Education had provoked an already autocratically controlled denomination to become even more bureaucratic. Perhaps though, as one secularist maliciously observed, "any Catholic extension of bureaucracy was in any case only a natural extension of its autocracy".\textsuperscript{42}

Compared with the tightly organized campaign masterminded by the Catholic Hierarchy, the Anglican preparations for the 1902 contest were neither so well defined nor so closely controlled. It would, however, be entirely false to depict the Anglican Church at this time as being in an advanced state of decline. Cosmo Gordon Lang, looking back at the period in later life, claimed that despite the Church of England's
increasing financial impoverishment, the last decade of the nineteenth century marked a busy and purposeful time in its work and ministry. But Anglicans, like all the other parties embroiled in the 1902 debate, were gripped by particular obsessions. If Catholics were hypersensitive regarding any threat to the pupil teacher system, Anglicans from the Archbishop down to the usually ill-informed rural clergy were at one in their absolute determination to save the voluntary schools. The result of such determination was a Church "formidably organized" to repel any attacks on this front. Unfortunately, such concentration of attention on a single issue left other aspects of Anglican educational involvement, including teacher training, open to sudden attack.

The meticulous preparations made by Anglicans for the defence of their schools, were not matched by measures to defend their training colleges. The causes of this neglect were complex in origin. The influence of the National Society, the only central Anglican body capable of defending the interests of the widely scattered residential colleges, was weakened by differences within the Church of England regarding educational policy. The National Society would have liked to have joined hands with the Catholic Poor School Committee in demanding rate aid for denominational schools, but Archbishop Benson refused to support such a policy on the grounds that state aid could only lead to eventual state control.

Although in 1896 Dr. Temple, Benson's successor, hastily reversed his predecessor's policies in the interests of securing a common denominational policy prior to the 1902 Act, such a reversal could not immediately restore the influence and prestige of the National Society. Indeed, the series of snubs administered to the Committee of the National Society by Benson induced a crisis of confidence within the
Society from which it had failed to recover during the critical years leading up to the Education Act.

This state of affairs rendered any semblance of centralized control of the Church of England colleges, never strong at the best of times, virtually non-existent in 1900. In any case, bureaucratic control of the disparate parts of the Church was effectively checked at this time by the passionate attachment exhibited by all Anglicans, and in particular the clergy, to the cause of local autonomy. This weakness of central organization might not have proved fatal had it not been for the steady encroachment within the Anglican colleges of secular attitudes and beliefs. In 1897 the Anglican Inspector of Church Colleges began to ascribe the "moral decline" and "spiritual sickness" that he detected in the colleges to what he described as "an attempt ... in certain quarters to undenominationalize our colleges". Although he stopped short of categorically listing the guilty parties, from his subsequent evidence it is not difficult to identify the people and the factors responsible, in his judgment, for bringing about this "subversion of our spiritual mission".

On the eve of the first public presentation of the Education Act the inspector wrote:

There is cause for anxiety in the general tone of some of the men's colleges; their attitude with regard to religious subjects is at times flippant and careless: they seem only to have a professional interest in what they are doing, they show little sign of love for the work of those they are going to teach and in many cases there is an utter absence of love for the Church.

The primary cause of this unhappy state of affairs was unhesitatingly identified by the inspector as being attributable to the "malign influence" exerted by the secular school boards. "Many of
our college students", he declared, "come from board schools, they go back to board schools, and the two years at a church college have not been sought because they are churchmen but because they are teachers". When board school students had formed a minority of the student body in the Anglican colleges, their presence, in the judgment of the inspector, had been deleterious to the work of the colleges but not fatal. In 1901, for the first time, in both men's and women's colleges, board school students formed a majority and the result was, in the words of the inspector, "quite intolerable".

The Inspector of Anglican Colleges justified his strong words by pointing to the manner in which the presence of a majority of school board students was effectively dragging the colleges away from their religious foundations and purposes. Such students, he said, followed the example of their counterparts in the day training colleges where "knowledge is everything". The National Union of Teachers agitation for an end to denominational restrictions on entry to residential colleges coupled with a Board of Education emphasis on the secular content of the training curriculum had, in the opinion of the inspector, encouraged all students to devalue the importance of religious studies. "The religious work of the colleges", he declared somewhat bitterly in 1898, "becomes a burden only because the secular work is excessive". Some college principals he considered were not blameless in regard to this matter. He accused a minority of them of actively encouraging their students to devote all their energies to acquiring "secular knowledge" at the expense of any "spiritual appreciation" of their "present studies or future work".

It is impossible not to admire the honesty and integrity of the Anglican inspector. In 1899, when it was clear to everyone that the
Government was nerving itself to take decisive action in the field of educational legislation, his criticism of the Anglican colleges was exceedingly frank. Like the Methodist Principal, J.H. Rigg, he castigated the tone and moral tenor of too many of the colleges as being "frivolous". On making an unannounced visit to a women's college on a Sunday, he was scandalized to find the students not at Chapel but playing "cards, draughts, battledore and shuttlecock". When he spoke privately to such students they in their turn were very frank in making plain their complaints concerning college life. "We live between four walls", they declared, "we do everything to the sound of bells: it is all routine". Ironically, the greatest number of student complaints concerned the poor quality of religious instruction and the inspector did not attempt to conceal his reservations regarding the limited abilities of some members of staff in the Anglican colleges, particularly those serving in the rural institutions. L. Naylor's description of Culham College in 1900 testifies to the accuracy of the inspector's observations.

All these problems and difficulties, many of which can be attributed to a lack of sufficient bureaucratic management allied to the alarmingly swift progress of secular attitudes, came to a climax in 1901. It was an extremely inopportune moment for such a crisis to occur. The Anglican Inspector of Church Colleges, in attempting to instigate a full-scale debate on the future prospects of the colleges, as they were in 1901, found the majority of his colleagues unwilling to face up to the sharp disagreements that any such discussion was bound to arouse. "What is to be the future of the Church training colleges?" he asked. "This is a question to which I pointedly draw attention. At a recent important meeting it was the general wish that the matter should not be discussed". This "general wish" to smother potentially decisive
issues, though understandable in the circumstances, was to prove unhelpful to the Anglican cause. Unlike the Catholics who had seized the opportunity to define their policies in 1898, Anglicans, by postponing consideration of contentious issues, left themselves in the anomalous position of having no policy at all.

The absence of any coherent policy for the development of the Anglican colleges left them in a weak and dangerously isolated position. Their activities were largely unknown, and therefore unconsidered, by the great majority of the Anglican laity. Even the commendable honesty of the inspector's reports concerning the colleges in the years immediately preceding the 1902 Act rebounded to their disadvantage. Among informed Anglican lay members his criticisms caused a minor groundswell of dissatisfaction to develop, which led to a questioning of the wisdom of maintaining such costly institutions. Equally, his references to students playing cards on Sunday led to wildly exaggerated rumours of indiscipline among students living in residential institutions. Unfortunately for both staff and students, the principals of the colleges were so out of touch with affairs that the rumours continued without refutation. This only served to reinforce the inspector's tart observation that "the trouble with some colleges" was "their existence for nearly half a century in a state of walled seclusion". Such observations, however true, were hardly calculated to stimulate support among Anglicans for their Church's training institutions. Unlike the Church schools, the Church colleges in 1902 enjoyed very little support from those in the pews. Thus their representatives, in Ernest Bevin's vivid phrase, "walked naked into the conference chamber".

In this unhappy context the Church Inspector was left to ponder ruefully the likely course of events. He predicted that the opponents
of the Anglican colleges were almost certain to press for a "conscience clause" thereby allowing all students, religious or secular in inclination, automatic right of entry to Church of England colleges if they were otherwise suitably qualified. While he acknowledged "there are earnest churchmen who would witness" the insertion of a conscience clause into the governing statutes of residential colleges "without concern", he privately deplored the outcome of any such move. "It would", he declared, "at a stroke, completely change the character of our colleges". Due to the pressure of events and the quickening pace of public debate the fears of the inspector went unregarded. He was therefore left in the invidious position of knowing where the blow was likely to fall but unable to take any steps to prevent or deflect it.

In the midst of their difficulties, Anglicans derived some comfort from learning that their troubles were minor ones compared with the "chaos and paralysis" that began to afflict the Board of Education from 1898 onwards. The extent of a breakdown in relationships within that Department was the subject of an embarrassingly frank article published by the Editor of the magazine Truth in August 1901. Castigating the Board for its general inertia, the editor sarcastically noted, "the Duke of Devonshire ... sometimes visits his Department; Sir John Gorst goes there a little more frequently". Unfortunately, the latter's visits "are of little use" declared the author, because he has "practically ceased to be on speaking terms with the permanent Secretary of the Board, Sir George Kekewich". The result of this breakdown in personal relationships brought about what the writer roundly declared to be a "scandalous situation". "Thanks to the indolence of the Duke", he wrote, "and active misfeasance on the part of Sir John Gorst, the condition of the Education Office, which under Mr. Acland was one of the most efficient of Government bureaux, has become in the highest
degree scandalous". 71

The paralysis existing in the Board of Education during this period was to have a significant influence on the eventual outcome of the Education Act. The internal discords within the Department brought about a cessation of the bureaucratic drive for instrumental efficiency which it had been pursuing since 1890. It was not that the Board ceased to promote new legislation, but rather that the hiatus in both administrative and political leadership rendered its implementation of such legislation ineffective. How ineffective is graphically illustrated by the almost contemptuous ease with which the Catholic Hierarchy flouted its policies concerning the development of residential training colleges. 72 Such an easy victory would not have been achieved if, in Norant's phrase, Kekewich had not by this time become "superannuated in authority" 73 and his political masters continually at odds over the management of the Board. Indeed, the impossibility of getting Gorst and Devonshire to work satisfactorily together meant that when the Education Bill finally came before Parliament, neither man was entrusted with the task of defending the legislation. The First Lord of the Treasury, A.J. Balfour, therefore assumed the unenviable task of presenting the Education Bill to a deeply divided House of Commons. 74

When Balfour rose at four twenty p.m. on the afternoon of the 24 March, 1902, to introduce the Education Bill to the House of Commons, he could have scarcely foreseen that the legislation would be before the House for fifty-nine days and under further consideration by the Lords for another nine. The sheer volume of material generated by the conflict, which simmered for nearly a decade within and beyond Parliament, 75 makes it difficult to analyse the debate as a whole. The length and complexity of the Bill has led historians to indulge in
a plethora of special pleading regarding the consequences which followed the implementation of particular aspects of the Act. The ensuing analysis does not claim to have avoided the dangers of selectivity but does make explicit the basis on which selection has taken place. The perspective adopted for particular analysis is a denominationalist one; the debate is examined in order to demonstrate the attitudes and policies assumed by denominationalists and to reveal how these shifted and reformed under political pressure. In order to counteract the narrowness inherent in this type of approach, extensive bibliographical citation is offered regarding contextual material and the chapter concludes by offering some overall judgments regarding the significance of the Act. Perhaps this latter comment on the Act's significance is an essential preliminary to any form of analysis. The religious passions aroused by the debate cannot be comprehended without some prior awareness of how the Bill had come to symbolize, and indeed exaggerate, the enmities existing between established religion and dissent.

Balfour went to great lengths to cool religious antagonisms in his opening speech, which was both reasoned and reasonable in content and tone. With disarming candour he frankly admitted that both denominationalists and their opponents stood to lose something as a result of the passing of the Bill. Addressing militant denominationalists Balfour conceded that they would "lose the complete control of their schools". School managers, he conceded, "will no longer be free from responsibility to anyone except His Majesty's Inspector of Schools and the Department at Whitehall.... They will have to fall into line, so far as secular instruction is concerned, with other schools". Turning his attention to militant anti-denominationalists Balfour admitted that they had reasons for "disliking this Bill". However, he maintained
"they will also gain something by it". One of the principal gains, he said, would be the provision of more places in training colleges of a non-denominational character for non-conformist and secular candidates. In this context he referred specifically to the new training colleges envisaged under the Act, whose construction and management would be one of the responsibilities of the newly formed Local Education Authorities. Facing a silent but suspicious opposition, Balfour insisted that the primary motive of the Government in introducing the Bill was essentially administrative. It was needed, he asserted, because "ours is the most antiquated, the most ineffectual and most wasteful method yet invented for providing a national education".

Campbell-Bannerman, replying as leader of the Liberal opposition, responded tardily to Balfour's claims that the Tories had brought in the Bill as a response to administrative muddle. His concluding comments highlighted fears prevailing among Liberals, both in the House, and in the country. "If the Bill is found to be open to the fear that it is, after all, only an effort to obtain better terms for the Church schools", he declared, "I think the fact would greatly endanger its chances of success". "We trust", he went on, "that when great financial aid is given to the Church schools it will be accompanied by a popular control which will not be illusory but real". Campbell-Bannerman's comments were mild in comparison with the kind of invective being heaped on the Bill by some of his colleagues, and in particular by Lord Rosebery. The latter's harshness of tone was as much designed to enlist Liberal support as it was to frighten the Government. Indeed, there is now evidence suggesting that Rosebury, leading the elements of non-conformity who had "discovered their consciences", led a campaign that was as much designed to unseat Campbell-Bannerman as Opposition leader as it was to discomfort the
In these muddy political waters conflicting secular and denominational factions were quick to assert their positions in the hope of seizing the political initiative. From the confusion of so many charges and countercharges, one point can be concisely observed. The radical alliance which had combined so effectively at the time of the Cross Commission was still in formidably good working order in 1902. For example, on the 24 March, Mr. Compton-Rickett speaking on behalf of secularists, declared himself unable to "join in the chorus of congratulations with which the Bill has been saluted". Far from ridding the country of a denominational presence in education, the Bill, Compton-Rickett contended, was designed to perpetuate "the religious blight". Significantly, the strongest support for this outright secularist condemnation of the Bill came from Mr. Perks, a Methodist whose extreme left wing views had led to his expulsion from the Liberal Reform Club. Perks claimed that the Bill amounted to "the entrenching of one religious community in the Church of England in a position of authority and power ... which it ought not to occupy". "It offered", he said, "no practical hope for putting non-conformist bodies", in a position of, "Equality with the Church of England". This evidence clearly indicates that shared resentment of the privileges enjoyed by Anglicans was the single largest factor uniting secularist and radical elements of non-conformity in their opposition to the Bill.

As the turbulent debate continued, with Balfour harried as much by right wing elements of his own party as by the radical alliance, the decisive moment for the denominational training colleges came on the 2 July, 1902. The occasion was an amendment proposed by an Opposition member, Mr. Channing, which, if it had been accepted, would
have forced a conscience clause on all denominational colleges thereby bringing about the unpleasant consequences so percipiently foreseen by the Anglican Inspector of Training Colleges. By demanding right of entry for all students into the denominational colleges, irrespective of their religious beliefs, Channing was seeking, through his amendment, to bring the colleges under increased state control. On this occasion even Balfour, who in the course of the prolonged Parliamentary conflict had demonstrated debating skills of the highest order, found himself hard put to defend the Government position. He at first resorted to sustained references to the maze of technicalities surrounding this point of the Bill and then concentrated on the hopes for undenominational teacher training offered by the intended provision of training colleges by Local Authorities. Coming from a debater as incisive as Balfour usually was, these references were very vague; the Liberal opposition was not slow to sense the weakness of the Government's position.

Dr. MacNamara, an ex-pupil teacher, possessed the kind of hard facts so obviously missing from Balfour's statement. In the course of a long speech he proved that of approximately three thousand teacher training places available in colleges of all types, only a third were open to undenominational candidates. He also claimed that two-thirds of every two thousand pounds spent on denominational colleges was a result of Government grants and public money, leaving only a derisory balance contributed by denominational and private sources.

This inequality of funding was one of the weakest points in any claim made by the denominational colleges for a continuation of their autonomy. MacNamara was in fact only exploiting still further a state of affairs initially exposed by Lloyd George, then a rising star in the
Liberal firmament. Lloyd George seized on the particular evidence afforded by the case of the Oxford Diocesan College to discredit all the denominational colleges:

The training colleges are mostly denominational, but built largely and maintained almost exclusively out of state funds. Only one-twentieth of the expense of maintaining the Anglican colleges is provided by the subscriptions of the Anglican Church. Take the case of the Oxford Diocesan Training College. The total expense was one thousand three hundred pounds; the voluntary subscriptions from individuals were nil, and from the Diocesan Board thirteen pounds and ten shillings, the remainder coming from Government grants and the pockets of students. These are the denominational colleges.98

The early attacks by Lloyd George, and their continuation by MacNamara, were parried by Lord Hugh Cecil who strongly defended the achievements and religious ethos of the denominational colleges.99 Balfour, however, remained silent. Cursed with the probably fatal ability in terms of partisan politics of being able to see more than one side of a question,100 he was perturbed by MacNamara's revelations. In a letter dated the 3 July, 1902, and sent to Mr. Morgan, M.P., Balfour confessed that "his Dr. MacNamara's statement upon this subject had great effect upon the House, and persuaded or half persuaded many members that the title of the denominations to their training colleges was technical rather than substantial".101

The Bill went on its acrimonious way, finally receiving the Royal Assent on the 18 December, 1902, but already the damage, as far as the denominational colleges were concerned, had been done. While it is true that the amendment proposing the conscience clause was rejected, it must be concluded that this rejection owed more to party loyalty than to personal convictions on the part of Unionist M.P.'s. Balfour appears not to have been alone in having to reconsider his position regarding the exclusive rights of denominationalists to own and manage their
respective teacher training colleges. Significantly, in the latter part of the protracted debate, there was little Unionist opposition to the provisions in the Bill entitling County Councils to develop non-sectarian training colleges. Balfour, always a skilful tactician, made sure that these provisions were vague and permissive in nature. In any case he was intent on getting the Bill through, having come under heavy pressure from Anglicans to speed its passage towards the statute book. With the rescue of their voluntary schools almost within their grasp, Anglicans and other denominationalists were not disposed to examine too closely legislation which, while ominous for the long term future of their colleges, presented no immediate threat. Thus, a bargain was struck. The voluntary schools were apparently saved and a future role for colleges built by Local Education Authorities (however ill-defined) was accepted by all parties, including denominationalists.

The dissensions apparent during the 1902 Parliamentary debate have been faithfully mirrored in subsequent historical analysis of the consequences brought about by the passing of the Act. These differences of interpretation have recently received further illumination by the debate between Dr. M. Cruickshank and Prof. B. Simon. Dr. Cruickshank in her article, "A Defence of the 1902 Act", defends it on the grounds that it successfully ended "the intolerable strain and conflict within the dual system of schools" and established "unity in educational administration". In sharp contrast, Simon views the passage of the Act as "a disaster", the product of a kick back by the Tory-Anglican alliance designed to eliminate the school boards and sever the "direct relationship between the people and local school systems".

It is not the purpose of this study to re-analyse the arguments and evidence of the controversialists in order to vindicate any single
view of the Act. Rather, the intention is to apply some of the analytical perspectives offered, within the particular context of the bureaucratization and secularization of teacher training. In this context, it can be briefly noted that there is no disagreement between the disputants that the passing of the Act ended the life and development of the school boards. Perhaps because the point is so obvious, Simon does not unduly emphasize the decisive victory gained by centralism over localism. While Cruickshank is almost certainly correct in her alternative judgment that the permissive format of the Act offered scope for local initiative, this latter comment has to be interpreted in terms of a time scale. The vagueness of the legislation, particularly those provisions relating to teacher training, meant that any substantial development of Local Education Authority responsibility for teacher training would take time. Arguably, therefore, in the famous partnership of administrative responsibilities resulting from the 1902 settlement, in the field of teacher training the Board of Education in Whitehall emerged as the dominant partner and has continued in this role ever since.

This result is all the more remarkable when the total disarray of the Board of Education at the time of the Act is taken into account. An explanation can, however, be found by identifying the powerful forces that were combining to hasten the process of Government bureaucratization. During the long debate on the Education Bill, fear of foreign competition in trade and armaments, especially the threat presented by Germany, made many speakers espouse the cause of "a single authority" for Education. Increased centralization of the processes of government came to be seen and accepted as an appropriate response to foreign efficiency. James Bryce was almost alone in dismissing the notion of "a single authority" as representing nothing
more than "a catch penny phrase". Rather the simplicity and order
of the centralized administrative solution caught the public's
imagination. Parts of the popular press, and in particular the
Daily Mail, took up Haldane's repeated pleas for increased efficiency
in both education and Government. Centralism, in short, was popular.

Diffuse forces, however powerful, need some form of human
embodiment. The single person most responsible for making centralized,
bureaucratic (in non-pejorative terms) government possible was
undoubtedly Robert Morant. Although the observation is offered that
the role of A.J. Balfour during the passage of the 1902 legislation
has been seriously underestimated, Morant's determination to bring
about the centralized control of English education was crucial. In
his private and confidential memorandum on the state of the pupil
teacher system written immediately prior to the drafting of the 1902
legislation, Morant made his intentions clear. "The Education
Department needs", he argued, "to become a national department".
"Instead of tinkering with concessions which merely evade and slur over
the real educational problems of our period", he continued, "what we
urgently require is a 'national body' to oversee the 'whole'"). Morant never wavered from this firmly held conviction, and more
important, did not allow Government ministers to temporize in the face
of virulent opposition attacks occasioned by the proposed dismemberment
of the local school boards.

While it is understandable that commentators should have sharply
differing views regarding the injustice of moving control towards the
centre (Simon regrets it as an attack on local democracy, Cruickshank
tends to view it as an inevitable price paid for increased
administrative efficiency), there is no doubt that the overall effect
of the 1902 Act was bureaucratic. The Act concentrated and rationalized the organization and control of English education. By 1903, three hundred and eighteen Local Education Authorities had replaced two thousand five hundred and sixty-eight school boards. The new authorities similarly replaced over fourteen thousand voluntary school management boards and eight hundred school attendance committees. In one respect, this undoubtedly paved the way for a rise of those objectionable features often associated with bureaucratic management, namely, impersonalization and over much attention paid to procedure and detail. However, such difficulties, which in any case lay in the future, have to be set against the achievements of the legislation. In G.A.N. Lowndes' estimation, the "legislative revolution" accomplished by the passage of the 1902 Act, formed the "bedrock" on which the system of education in England subsequently developed.

The denominational colleges had to develop (or at least exist) within the new system. As some of the immediate political passions generated by the Act began to subside, few denominationalists reviewing their respective positions found there was much comfort to be derived from the Act in so far as it concerned teacher training. In this respect, and indeed in a wider context, it is possible to take issue with Professor Simon's view that the 1902 Act represented a victory for denominational interests, especially Anglican ones. If indeed it was a Church victory, it was a Pyrrhic one. Certainly the voluntary schools were allowed to continue as a result of the Act, but as S.G. Platten has observed, "The voluntary schools that were preserved by the 1902 Act were very different from those schools talked of prior to 1870". The thrust of Platten's comments is directed towards revealing the price paid by denominationalists for the continuation of their schools and colleges. The Kenyon-Slaney amendment inserted into the Bill removed...
the responsibility for religious instruction in voluntary schools from the local incumbent and placed it instead with the managers. The managers were in turn no longer exclusively appointed by denominational authorities. Secular and local authority representatives had to be included on voluntary school management boards, and here may be discerned the initial growth points of the secular and bureaucratic control mechanisms that were eventually to swamp the voluntary schools in 1944.

If the passing of the Act represented the kind of victory that Professor Simon suggests it was, denominationalists were remarkably ungrateful for it. While non-conformist responses were predictably hostile, Catholics and Anglicans should have been delighted. They were not. Although a handful of Catholics gave the legislation a cautious welcome, the majority greeted it with hostility. Furious at the insertion into the Bill of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment, Catholic hostility was increased by the curt treatment their representatives received from the first group of Local Education Authorities. To the great alarm of both Catholics and Anglicans, the local authorities set up at Heywood, Bury and Rochdale, in Lancashire, all exhibited markedly secularist tendencies. The Catholic Hierarchy responded angrily to the total exclusion of their representatives from the new authorities, particularly as they regarded Lancashire as one of their traditional spheres of influence. Anglicans were equally mortified to see their representation on the new authorities cut to a bare minimum. The pendulum of power was moving. The secular tendencies of the new administrative bodies left Anglicans and Catholics alarmed that the pendulum was beginning to swing beyond their reach.

Comparable doubts assailed them in the field of teacher training, where Catholic and Anglican authorities were despondent about the
future of their colleges. On this subject, the Anglican inspector spoke for both when he stated that there was reason for "considerable anxiety as to the future of our colleges". "That future", he said, "has not been safeguarded enough in recent legislation.... Attempts will be made not to secularize but to undenominationalize them....". At this point the inspector was indulging in some uncharacteristically muddy thinking. To "undenominationalize" the colleges was, in fact, but a first step along the road to their secularization. His comment, however confined, is more significant as an indication of the growing disillusionment of Anglicans regarding the fruits of the Bill. All denominationalists concerned with teacher training began to realize (having faced a veritable deluge of legislation) that their only reward was to see yet another rival system of teacher training - the London Education Authority colleges - added to the already highly successful system of university day training colleges. This was a galling prospect for Anglicans who were supposed to have benefited most from the Bill. The Anglican inspector summed up their feelings with the bitter comment, "It is a very unholy trinity of training being imposed upon the country".

Methodist and Roman Catholics (while they could not afford to be complacent) could look upon the imposition of a 'trinity system' of training colleges with rather more equanimity than Anglicans. Both the former denominations had already centralized their training college administration in order to meet the challenge of centralized educational government. The Anglicans had not. The level of funding for the Catholic and Methodist colleges was relatively high, that of the Anglican colleges relatively low. The desperate efforts made by Anglicans to save their schools had cost them dearly. In Platten's judgment such efforts left them in the immediate post-1902 period
"prostrate", henceforward to be nothing more than "a waning influence".

"No longer", he declared, "was the Church even an equal partner in education.... It was to act as a very junior partner in the nation's schools, its influence confined to its remaining schools and colleges".\textsuperscript{128} It was a strange aftermath for what had supposedly been such a signal victory.
Since the publication of the 1890 Code which was primarily concerned with physical training, methods of manual work, the liberalization of evening schools and the extension of day training colleges, the weight and frequency of Board legislation was remarkable. The publication by the Department of the 1895 Code brought about the enactment of another thirty articles concerning the definition, provision and organization of the residential colleges. This, combined with evidence from the Bryce Commission in 1894 which argued for the setting up of a unified, central authority for education, paved the way for the passing of the Board of Education Act in 1899. See Department of Education, Annual Report (1894-5), The Day School Code. Part II Training Colleges; pp. 335-341 and the BRYCE Commission on Secondary Education; Vol I, i.

The chief provisions of the Board of Education Act 1899 were:

1. The creation of a Minister of Education responsible for all education, primary, secondary and technical in England and Wales;
2. Creation of a Consultative Committee;
3. Provision for a Register of Qualified Teachers;
4. Provision for the Inspection and Examination of Secondary Schools by the Board's Officers;
5. The incorporation in the Board of the former Departments of Education, Science and Art (including some of the powers formerly
exercised by the Privy Council and the Charity Commissioners); 

(6) The publication by the Board of Annual Reports concerning its activities.


11 Some secularists and unionists refused to believe claims made by the denominationalists, that their schools were in dire financial difficulties. R.L. Morant in a "strictly confidential" memorandum concerning the financial state of the voluntary schools, found that fifty-six per cent of them "were under water in 1900", that is to say, their income fell short of their expenditure. Ministry of Education Ed. 24/13A/13/10a (1902), Confidential Memorandum by R.L. Morant on the Financial Condition of Voluntary Schools; in SHAKOOR, Op. cit. p. 115-156.


13 Ibid. pp. 221-235.


16 Ibid. p. 9.

In his Inaugural Address to the students of Westminster and Southlands Colleges, J.H. Rigg, Principal of Westminster College, commented on the dissension within Methodist ranks about whether or not the Church should continue to support Wesleyan schools. Such disagreements, in his estimation, had caused "the languishing of educational effort" and had served to allow other denominational and secular schools "to wax fat at Methodist expense". Reverend J.H. Rigg in the Wesleyan Educational Report, (1888), Movement of Opinion since 1869, pp. 61-63.
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19 Wesleyan Educational Reports (1894-97).


21 P.R.O. Ed. 24/70. The three colleges were St. Mary's, Hammersmith, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, and Wandsworth. Catholic attempts to expand their residential colleges were hindered by financial difficulties and problems of attracting the right type of teaching orders to such colleges. See Centenary Record of St. Mary's College, Hammersmith 1850-1925, Op. cit. pp. 1-25.

22 "This policy had been formulated and adhered to by Catholics in England since the restoration of the Hierarchy in 1850". TURKETINE, J.E. (1967), Some Aspects of Social Change in Catholic Colleges of Education in the Twentieth Century; University of Leicester, M.Ed., p. 21.


24 Many of the defects of the pupil teacher system were exposed by Sir John Gorst on 12 May, 1900. In a speech devoted to a consideration of "The New Code" Gorst declared: "The training of the pupil teacher is his preparation for an examination. I am sorry to say that pupil teachers are hardly educated at all. They spend half their time in working in school and the other half they spend in preparing for an examination, which is not, in my opinion, education at all.... The sort of things they prepare are most deplorable. There are pupil teachers who can tell you with perfect accuracy the number of square miles which are drained by the River Amazon, but when they are asked what are the manufactures of Staffordshire they do not know Staffordshire is the centre of the pottery industry in this country". The Tablet, (1900), 12 May.

25 Catholic Poor School Committee, Annual Report (1890).

26 Catholic Poor School Committee, Annual Report (1895), Enquiry by Mr. Hunnybun into the State of Catholic Pupil Teachers.

27 Ibid. Hunnybun went on to observe that the "substantial library" advocated by the Committee all too often consisted of three or four books in a "broken backed" cupboard, or sometimes a library that was non-existent except in the imagination of the head teacher.

28 H.M.I. Scott-Coward, although a practising Catholic, deviated not an inch from applying Departmental policy regarding
opposition to the development of separate Catholic Pupil Teacher Centres. He bluntly informed the Catholic Poor School Committee that "he considered that Catholic masters were inferior in culture and tone to School Board masters". The solution, he insisted, was to raise "the social refinement of Roman Catholic male teachers" by fully integrating them into the types of training received by other candidates "at School Board Centres". Scott-Coward's brusque directive violated fundamental principles of Catholic policy and was therefore totally ignored by the Hierarchy. Catholic Poor School Committee, *Annual Report* (1896), Report of the Sub-Committee on Pupil Teacher Centres.


30 The Departmental Committee on the Pupil Teacher System was composed of the Senior Chief Inspector acting as Chairman, three H.M.I.'s of training colleges, five Principals of training colleges, two Head Teachers of London pupil teacher centres and one Head Teacher of an elementary school. Catholic Poor School Committee, *Annual Report* (1898).

31 Ibid. Annual Report (1898).

32 "Many of the Chief Inspectors ... were clergy ... several of whom, in consideration of long service, had obtained one of the coveted London districts, lived in London and not in their divisions and only visited the latter at rare intervals....". KEKEWICH, Op. cit. p. 12.

33 Catholic Poor School Committee, *Annual Report* (1898).

34 The Catholic Education Council was set up in 1904 mainly as a response to the 1902 Act.

35 The formation of the Catholic Schools Committee in 1898 was shrewdly managed by the Hierarchy so as to ensure comprehensive representation of Catholic interests. With a total membership of forty-eight, twenty-two representatives from the Public Schools Associations held the largest block of seats. However, this was skillfully balanced by nominations from the Bishops, who also held the power to nominate ten chosen laymen. Catholic Poor School Committee, *Annual Report* (1897).


37 Loc. cit.


The increase in Catholic strength in the field of teacher training was clearly revealed in figures published by the National Society in 1891. A rise in the number of Catholic students was accompanied by a sharp rise in financial support, which was made possible, in part, by the increased number of converts.

See Appendix IV - Comparative strength of the denominations with reference to numbers of students and financial support, 1889-1891.

The Catholic Hierarchy were in a particularly ebullient mood during the period preceding the 1902 Act. Their note of confidence can be detected in the pages of *The Tablet*, where in an article entitled "Catholics and the Coming Education Bill", all Catholics were enjoined to "strike but listen". *The Tablet* (1902), 25 January.

Robert Price, Address to the Islington Secularist Club, 21 June, 1900.

Lang powerfully assisted the task of pastoral renewal within the Anglican Church, through the example of his ministry in the Parish of Portsea, 1896-1901. LOCKHART, J.G. (1949), *Cosmo Gordon Lang*; pp. 116-128.

The Reverend John Walter Spurling, Anglican Vicar of the then rural parish of Crowthorne in Berkshire, wrote in his diary on the 13 February, 1899, "we must save our schools or we are finished as a great Church".

"The position of the Catholic Church had improved; within the Anglican Church, the position of the High Church had improved to the detriment of the Low Church; and the position of the Anglican Church had improved to the detriment of the non-conformist sects". HALEVEY, E. (1961), *Imperialism and the Rise of Labour, 1895-1905*; in SIMON, Op. cit. p. 208.

In 1900 thirty of the thirty-three Anglican colleges were affiliated to the National Society.
57 The offenders received from the Inspector a little card on which were printed the words, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all else shall be added unto you".

58 The Government and Pupil Teachers, The Tablet (1899), 29 April.

The Inspector noted that students on teaching practice invariably lost the main point of a parable, "through a deplorable concentration on detail". Refraining from criticizing them too heavily, the Inspector acknowledged that they were "only copying the methods of their tutors". Ibid., Annual Report, 1900.

62 In these types of colleges the Inspector was dismayed by the determination evinced by a majority of staff to adhere strictly to what he described as "outmoded routine". He cited as an example the practice of having an early morning lecture:

It is not right for an hour's work to be done in the morning before any refreshment is taken, and it is not right to give only bread and butter for breakfast; nor is it right to say, as the only excuse for so doing, 'We cannot afford to do more....'.

Ibid., Annual Report, 1899.


64 For reasons noted earlier in the chapter the National Society at this time was in such a state of upheaval that it was unable to act as the forum for any contentious debate. Therefore one reason why the Inspector's demands were ignored was a withdrawal of lay influence at a moment when Anglican Bishops, like their Catholic counterparts, were straining every nerve to achieve unity. Ibid., Annual Report, 1901.

65 In 1891 an accountant employed on behalf of the National Society estimated that since its inception in 1811, the Society had spent £13,232,795 on building training colleges and schools and had additionally incurred costs of £21,461,029 on maintenance. The problem by 1900 was that while costs incurred by the Society in the sphere of teacher training were rising sharply, its income was falling. See Annual Reports of the National Society, 1891 and 1900.

66 The rumours were almost entirely false; the majority of colleges were models of economic management and the majority of students within them were models of good conduct. Indeed the discipline in most Anglican colleges was almost certainly too severe. See NAYLOR, Op. cit. pp. 70-71.

67 Church Inspector to the Principal of Culham College, The Reverend W.S.F. Long, 2 November, 1897, National Society Archives.
"How will the colleges be influenced by the changes which are in front of us? What if they are put under the County Councils, or under the 'local authority' whatsoever it may be. The first important change that such a body would introduce might be a conscience clause".
Ibid., Annual Report, 1901.

Ibid., Annual Report, 1901.


Truth (1901), Chaos in the Education Department, 15 August. Morant "flying from one Cabinet Minister to another" and "receiving the frankest confessions from them all" was well placed to provide Beatrice Webb with the following graphic description of the situation as it was in April, 1902:

The Duke of Devonshire ... failing through inertia and stupidity to grasp any complicated detail half-an-hour after he has listened to the clearest exposition of it, preoccupied with Newmarket, and in bed till twelve o'clock; Kekewich trying to outstay this Government and quite superannuated in authority; Gorst cynical and careless having given up even the semblance of any interest in the office; the Cabinet absorbed in other affairs and impatient and bored with the whole question of Education".

In 1899 the Department issued a Minute enforcing the opening of a day training college, with a conscience clause, in connection with the opening of any new residential college. The Catholic authorities were anxious at this time to open a new college at Salford, but refused to do so under the terms of the Department's legislation. The Catholic Poor School Committee therefore directed the funds set aside for Salford to be used to expand traditional Catholic colleges. In this way they retained full denominational control of their colleges and easily avoided the whole purpose of Government legislation.

The Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, retired in July, 1902, and Balfour on the 13 July became Prime Minister. Professor Simon in his article "The 1902 Education Act - A Wrong Turning" comments that "The fact that Balfour, when he took over as Prime Minister, himself piloted the Act through the House of Commons indicates the importance the Government gave its passage". Although correct in itself, this is only a partial explanation.
Balfour, when First Lord of the Treasury, assumed responsibility for the legislation because Devonshire was judged unable to lead the fight for the Bill because of his position in the Lords. As Gorst was by this time universally distrusted and ignored by both Devonshire and Kekewich, Balfour found himself as the Senior Minister left to carry the legislation. By the time Balfour was able to rid himself of both Devonshire and Gorst (in August, 1902, Lord Londonderry became titular head of the Education Department and Gorst was replaced by Sir William Anson), he had little option but to continue leading for the Government because of the lack of experience of his new Cabinet.


76 Only four of the fifty-nine days devoted by the House of Commons to a consideration of the Bill were given over to educational matters, the rest being consumed by passionate arguments concerning the role and place of denominationalists in education.


79 Parliamentary Papers, Hansard 24 March (1902), Education, England and Wales, Introductory Speech by the First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. A.J. Balfour.

80 Loc. cit.


82 H.H. Asquith drew strong support from Liberal Members of Parliament when he declared that "the framers of this Bill have burned a pinch of academic incense at the altar of popular control, while they leave the management in the hands of a body with no representative authority and no popular responsibility. That, from the Liberal point of view, is the fatal vice of the Bill". Parliamentary Papers, Hansard 8 May (1902). See also ASQUITH, H.H. (1902), The Country and the Education Bill, A speech delivered at the Queens Hall, London, to the Liberal League on 10 June, 1902.
The popular press had been sharply divided as to the merits of the Education Bill since May 1901. Papers supporting the Government tended to refer to the Bill as a long overdue measure of administrative reform. Typical of such an editorial stance was The Standard which on the 6 May, 1901, complimented the Government on promoting "unity of control and management in Education". The Daily News, The School Guardian and The Tablet were consistently supportive of the Government's intended legislation. See The Tablet 11 May, 1901, The Education Bill, and The Tablet 25 January, 1902, Catholics and the Coming Education Bill.

Papers favourable to Liberal and Non-Conformist opinion, such as the News Chronicle, in printing Campbell Bannerman's reply were quick to publish the more vehement denunciations of the Bill offered by his senior colleagues. Lord Rosebury's view that the intended legislation represented "a sop thrown to placate the impoverished managers of voluntary schools and extend still further the hegemony of the Anglican Church", gained wide publicity. See ROSEBURY, A.P.P. (1902), The Education Bill; A Speech delivered at the City Liberal Club, Walbrook, to the Liberal League, 16 October, Liberal League Publication No. 29.

"The Education Bill conflicts with every Liberal principle, and is destined, at a moment when we need all our educational forces to equip and stimulate our nation for the commercial combat in which she is engaged, to deprive us of real and effective education and to sterilize national education for generations to come".


Parliamentary Papers, Hansard 24 March (1902), Education, England and Wales; Speech of Mr. Compton Rickett.


Parliamentary Papers, Hansard 2 July (1902), Education, England and Wales; Speech of Mr. Perks.

Prominent among these were Catholic representatives whose opinions were forwarded by Lord Edmund Talbut. Talbut wasted little time in letting it be known that in his opinion "it was by no means an ideal Bill". "Only those satisfied with a
modicum of indefinite religious teaching in schools", he contended, "will find the implementation of the Bill a comforting prospect"; Hansard 5 May (1902). For other shades of Catholic opinion see T.P. O'Connor, Hansard 24 March (1902) and Mr. Dillon, Hansard 7 May (1902). More damaging to Balfour than Catholic reservations were the strong attacks launched on the Bill by his relative, Lord Hugh Cecil; Hansard 2 July (1902). Cecil's extremely cutting remarks were only equalled by the Archbishop of Canterbury who said that "he thought that on the whole the Government were well disposed towards the Church and Church schools, but it was not a very brave Government and they were a little timid fighting battles". The Archbishop of Canterbury, 23 July, 1901, quoted by Mr. Perks, 5 May, 1902 during the Education Debate.

92 "In page two, line ten, after the word 'Act' to insert the words, 'for the training of teachers shall require that in any school, college, or class so provided or aided, no pupil shall be excluded on the ground of religious belief'. Amendment forwarded in the name of Mr. Channing, Hansard 2 July (1902).

93 Hansard 2 July (1902).

94 Loc. cit.

95 "Balfour was the master of the mellifluous but essentially meaningless phrase... When he chose, he could express himself with extraordinary clarity. On other occasions, he could spin a cocoon of paraphrase, qualification and ambiguity around the most fundamental issue, and remove it from the level of plain speaking to the often confusing heights of metaphysics". JUDD, D. (1968), Balfour and the British Empire: A Study in Imperial Evolution 1874-1932; p. 123.

96 Hansard 2 July (1902).


98 Hansard 8 May (1902).

99 The introduction of a 'conscience clause' to training colleges would, declared Cecil, "seriously modify their character and interfere with the effectiveness of their church influence by introducing a foreign element, and prevent them being distinctly denominational". Hansard 2 July (1902).
In addition to writing to Morgan, Balfour seems to have made little attempt to withhold from other back-bench M.P.'s his doubts concerning the denominational position regarding training colleges.

The Committee of the National Society earnestly hope that the Bill will be pressed forward at an early date after Easter and passed into law during the present session of Parliament, since the miscarriage of another educational measure would cause educationalists throughout the country the keenest disappointment. Resolution of the National Society forwarded to A.J. Balfour, Annual General Meeting of the National Society, 1902, Minutes, National Society Archives.

As Shakoor has commented, the provision of teacher training colleges by Local Education Authorities "was a new assignment ... the local authorities would not know where they stood in law in respect of teacher training and many timorous authorities would rather leave the training of teachers untouched". SHAKOOR, Op. cit. p. 157.

The fact is that in this country we have neglected the training and treatment of our teachers.... The German maxim is 'As the teacher, so the school'. To make our education great we must
make up intellectually what we have lost materially". Sir Albert Rollit, M.P., Hansard 24 March (1902).

J. Bryce, Hansard 24 June (1902).

"What we want above all is efficiency in our education and the raising of the standard....". R. Haldane, Hansard 24 March (1902).


P.R.O. Ed. 24/76. MORANT, R., Private and Confidential Memorandum on the State of the Pupil Teacher System. On this rare occasion Morant's views were in accord with those of Sir John Gorst. In a speech concerning the New Education Code of 1900, Gorst referred in scathing terms to the state of the pupil teacher system:

The training of the pupil teacher is his preparation for an examination. I am sorry to say that pupil teachers are hardly educated at all. They spend half their time in working in school, and the other half they spend in preparing for an examination which is not in my opinion, education at all.... The sort of things they prepare are most deplorable. There are pupil teachers who can tell you with perfect accuracy the number of square miles which are drained by the River Amazon, but when they are asked what are the manufactures of Staffordshire they do not know that Staffordshire is the centre of the pottery industry in this country.

GORST, SIR JOHN (1900), The New Education Code: Pupil Teachers, The Tablet, 12 May.


"On its passage [1902 Education Act], England found herself for the first time in possession of the three essential ingredients of a democratic system of education: first, a Department of the Central Government responsible for the general supervision of all forms of education.... Second, Local Education Authorities each responsible for the detailed control of education.... Third, bodies of local residents to serve as the governors or managers of actual schools". LOWDES, G.A.N. (1969), The Silent Social Revolution: An Account of the Expansion of Public Education in England and Wales 1895-1965; p. 75.
The Kenyon-Slaney amendment denoted a real rather than a cosmetic shift in the balance of power. Evidence for this is to be found in the horror evinced by both Catholics and Anglicans when it became plain that the Amendment would be carried. The National Society at its Annual General Meeting in 1903 forwarded the following motion:

"The Committee earnestly protest against the Amendment recently introduced into the Education Bill on the motion of Col. Kenyon-Slaney".


In the course of the debate, Haldane offered the opinion that the dual system had to be ended or amended. In retrospect it appears that the state could not end the dual system because it did not possess the financial resources to buy out denominational interests. Therefore it appears that the only realistic option open to the Government was to amend the system, and this they did - on not unfavourable terms for themselves.

"The Conference expresses its deep regret that in the Educational measures which His Majesty's Government have submitted to Parliament there has been no recognition of the principle so often affirmed by the Conference, namely the placing of a Christian unsectarian school under adequate and representative public management within reach of every child.... Conference earnestly appeals to His Majesty's Government and to Parliament to repeal the above measures....".


Canon Keatinge, speaking within the Catholic Poor School Committee, "thought the Bill a great step forward. It has some blots but it represents practically the opinion of the man in the street who takes an intelligent interest in schools". Keatinge made his statement in 1901 and before the insertion into the Bill of the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment. He subsequently made no attempt to defend the Act, although he was present at the 1902 Annual General Meeting of the Catholic Poor School Committee when the Act was generally condemned.

Catholic Poor School Committee (1901), Annual General Meeting, Minutes.

"In Lancashire at Heywood, Bury and Rochdale the demands for Catholic representation have been met by the unqualified and almost insulting refusal of the Local Authorities...."
Resolution:
"That this committee notes with regret the refusal of a number of Local Authorities to admit representatives of Catholic schools to their Educational Authorities; and urges the Board of Education to make it clear that in every case there must be adequate 'bona fide' and permanent representation of the interests of each school".

Catholic Poor School Committee (1902), Resolutions and Minutes of the Annual General Meeting.


126 Letter from the Anglican Inspector of Training Colleges, 3 June, 1903, to the Dean of Chichester, National Society, Archives.

127 See Appendix IV.

CHAPTER 5

A Waning Influence

In 1901 a book written by S.S. Laurie entitled *The Training of Teachers and Methods of Instruction* was first published. Reviewers focussed their attention on Laurie's central theme, namely the innovative impact achieved by the new university day training colleges. Such an emphasis led many critics to disregard the context of Laurie's work, especially his perceptive and prophetic words on the subject of the increasing centralization of national government. "Two questions are now, I think, to the front", declared Laurie, "local autonomy, and the higher training of the teacher". "Centralization", he argued, "has done its work, and decentralization (subject of course to central control of a general kind) is now necessary if we are to engage the intellect and moral energy of the country more fully in the work of education....".

The patina of success already associated with university colleges meant that these observations were brushed aside. Yet in the context of this study Laurie's minor themes are accentuated because they denote the direction of this chapter. Previously, it has been argued that the 1902 Act left denominational authorities in a weakened position regarding their provision of teacher training. The present chapter pursues the notion of a general denominational decline, a decline hastened by the failure of an increasingly centralized state to acknowledge the rights of what Laurie refers to as "local autonomy". Loss of local autonomy was especially threatening to Anglicans, who managed their training colleges on the basis of devolved powers with a minimum of central direction. Such a system ran counter to what has been referred to as 'the rise of the corporate state'. The increasing friction between
the two management styles is one major factor contributing to the very marked decline of Anglican influence within the field of teacher training, evident during the period 1906 to 1914.

The deterioration of Church of England influence came about largely because Anglicans, like Laurie, mistakenly came to believe that "Centralization" had "done its work....". The Anglican position was a moral as well as a rational analysis of the situation, and in adopting it they shared to the full Laurie's general distrust of autocracy. In arguing for the retention of a degree of local managerial control, Laurie, as far as Anglicans were concerned, was preaching to the converted. They were as keenly aware of the dangers inherent in the policies being developed by Board of Education officials as was Laurie, who referred to them in uncompromising terms:

I have had long experience of Government officials, and I know that much depends on the mental attitude of the central authority as represented by them. If they have in view merely the working of "articles" in a legal and bureaucratic spirit instead of using the code as an instrument to promote the local efforts being made by earnest men in every part of the kingdom to advance education, they may obstruct all progress and stamp out the most fruitful ideas. Codes may be so constructed and administered as to help forward education, and they may also be so constructed and administered that every article is a trap for the unwary and an obstacle to the zealous. 

While Laurie hastened to add a plea for the "generous" and "liberal" interpretation of educational codes, he had nevertheless offered, in the plainest terms, a warning. Education codes were not, argued Laurie, "answers to all problems". Devoid of "sensitive" and "generous application", codes could not bring about either "efficiency or innovation" in the education system. Anglicans generally shared his views and promptly fell into the trap of believing their own constructs as representing reality. Unfortunately,
Laurie's views were offered at precisely the moment when the Board of Education, under the direction of Robert Morant, began to extend its bureaucratic powers.

E. Eaglesham in his article "Implementing the Education Act of 1902," describes how the dominant influence achieved by Morant during the planning of the legislation was continued in his new role as Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education. Until his transfer from the Board in 1911 Morant's legislative activity constituted a practical denial of Laurie's claim that the centralization of educational administration had gone far enough in 1901.

At first, Morant's bureaucratic reformation of the Department was neither unfruitful nor unappreciated, even by denominationalists. In June 1904, C. Brereton wrote an article in The Monthly Review entitled "Revolution at the Board of Education". Brereton responded enthusiastically to evidence of both a simplification and a liberalization of the Board's legislative codes. "When we compare", he declared, "the revised version of the code with its older form, the first thing that strikes us is the immense reduction ... in the number of articles, which have been cut down by more than half - fifty-seven against one hundred and thirty-three". "This", he continued, "has been effected by eliminating the superfluous and by freely shunting the more technical portions into the schedules - the road through is clear from end to end".

The streamlining and simplification of the education codes, so warmly approved of by Brereton, was an essential preliminary for the grander works that Morant was contemplating. Although most of these concerned the reform of the pupil teacher system, Morant encouraged the inspectorate to be extremely active on his behalf in examining all
aspects of teacher training. In this respect the inspectors found him little different from his predecessor, George Kekewich. In a private letter written on the 12 January, 1903, H.M.I. Barnett sardonically commented that "King Log has been replaced by King Stork". However, although they found him an autocratic and humourless master the inspectorate under his firm direction worked as they had never worked before.

The general preoccupation of the Department with the 1902 legislation had caused a backlog of work to build up by the time Morant officially took up his post on the 1 November, 1902. For example, the Memorandum of the Departmental Committee on Training College Courses of Instruction presented in 1901, required some official acknowledgment. The Committee, whose terms of reference had been to draw up specimen courses of instruction for students in training colleges with a view to increasing the numbers of qualified teachers, presented Morant with a number of problems. Throughout the period of the enquiry differences of opinion about the right balance between the personal education and professional preparation of a teacher in a training programme were evident. At one point during the enquiry a sharp exchange took place between H.M.I. Scott-Coward and Miss Manley, Principal of Stockwell College. Scott-Coward asked her if examinations conducted in her college were sufficiently "Vigorous in terms of their intellectual standards", or were they, he suggested, "so poor that they would break down as compared with the official ones?". Stung by the implication of the question, Manley retorted, "We do far too much examining as it is.... How can we hope to make teachers if we continue to make them feel they are still children?". Manley's forthright response encouraged the Reverend H. Wesley-Dennis to extend the college principal's attack upon the inspectorate. Inspectorate policies and
attitudes, he implied, had made college courses too 'narrow'. "What they need", he asserted, "is academic work of a degree level to make them properly educative".16

The inspectorate, who clearly disagreed with this judgment, did so on grounds other than class prejudice. G. Hodgson in an article entitled "The Training of Teachers", written in 1904, offered the independent comment that "Training cannot make a good teacher out of those whom nature has made totally unfit".17 She added some equally uncompromising remarks about the overall irrelevance of training college work. "When the genuine teacher is found to decry training", she declared, "it will most probably appear that he, or she, is remembering some more than usually futile colleague, full to the brim of the shibboleths of the training college but hopelessly incapable when faced with the actual duties and routines of school life....".18 Hodgson's remarks are significant because the inspectorate concurred with the substance of them regarding the intellectual inadequacy of both students and lecturers in the majority of training colleges. Although in deference to the feelings of the colleges their comments were generally more muted, they were nevertheless unmistakable in intent.19 Because of this generally unfavourable inspectorate view of training colleges, the Board's policy of opposition to elementary school teachers obtaining degrees continued under Morant's regime. Staff Inspector Perry, editing the final report of the Departmental Committee on Training College Courses of Instruction, ruthlessly expunged from the document any references to courses that he considered smacked of academic pretension. In a section entitled "Theory and Practice of Teaching" Perry came across a course purporting to examine "Scientific Principles of Education, including the simple outlines of Psychology, Logic and Ethics". In the margin he wrote in red ink,
"Too useless". The time gained through his summary deletion of this course was allocated by Perry to extensions of "Practically based courses in Rural Subjects", notably gardening and bee-keeping.

Arbitrary and high-handed though Perry's actions undoubtedly were, they were not products of thoughtless Philistinism. A consequence of Morant's reorganization of the Department was that reports of individual inspectors circulated among colleagues in fact rather than in fiction. It is therefore unlikely that Staff Inspector Perry was unaware of the report by his colleague Holmes on the training of teachers. The emphasis in this report on the deficiencies of teachers in rural schools perhaps persuaded Perry to recommend extending time given in training colleges to rural studies.

While welcoming the changes occurring in the nature of the 'all age' country school, Holmes had been perturbed by the lack of trained teachers able to take advantage of the new facilities. "When the infants have been provided with separate classrooms", he observed, "the question arises, 'Who is to teach them?'". The answer, he caustically remarked, was for managers to choose as infant teachers "Women who have no other qualifications than those of age and successful vaccination", a practice as foolish as attempting to "place a land-lubber in charge of a battleship". Holmes' observations provided Morant and senior Board officials with a mandate to introduce extensive changes in the system of teacher training. Holmes looked forward to the day when there would be "A complete system of training colleges" and untrained teachers would be "a minority instead of a majority". Such a system, as Holmes acknowledged, was, in 1902, no more than a dream. "Only a small minority of our adult teachers have been trained", he wrote, "and in a poor district like mine the trained teachers are probably not more than one-fifth of the whole number....".
Holmes' reference to "a complete system of training colleges" was a deliberate reminder to Morant of the opportunity afforded by the 1902 Act to develop the teacher training system by introducing municipal colleges. At first, Morant handled this potentially explosive issue adroitly. The Board's Command Paper 2134 (30 June 1904) which gave legislative substance to certain recommendations of the Departmental Committee, also recognized "a new type of training college". This recognition, inserted as it was in the midst of a series of proposals designed to improve the grants and examination procedures of students in training, was intended to minimize any offence to the traditional residential colleges. The Board's tactics proved remarkably successful.

One factor contributing to this success was the quiescent attitude adopted by the Church of England. In the inflamed religious atmosphere existing in the post-1902 period both Anglicans and Catholics became uncomfortably aware that the 1902 settlement was not, in many respects, a settlement at all. The continuing hostility of dissenters to the 1902 legislation was illustrated by the way in which annual Methodist conferences successively reaffirmed their resolution of 1903 urging "Methodist people ... to use every legitimate means to secure an early amendment to the Education Act". Confronted by continuing hostility on the part of non-conformists and sensing a weakening in their own position, Anglicans responded by attempting to make the Board of Education their ally. The Anglican Inspector of Training Colleges, in his 1904 Report to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, offered a coolly realistic appraisal of the situation:

It was never more necessary than at the present moment that the colleges should be efficient both as to premises and staff - especially the latter. It is
the intention of the local authorities in some parts of the country, especially in the North, to build colleges of their own - in some cases close to existing institutions. This would press hardly upon us, for these authorities could spend unlimited sums and offer attractions that are beyond our means. The intention of crushing out our colleges is in some places openly avowed, and we must look to the Board of Education to prevent it....27

This statement has been quoted at some length and detail because of its unusual significance. It marks the inception of Anglican claims to enjoy 'a special relationship' with the Board of Education, a facet of Church of England policy that was later to infuriate secularists and non-conformists alike. In fact Anglicans (certainly at this period) were assuming a special relationship which did not exist. When Morant received a knighthood from the Liberal Prime Minister, H.H. Asquith, in 1907, he used the occasion to deny charges concerning his alleged political bias. In a letter to a Liberal Member of Parliament, Alfred Emmott, he said, "Though the 'K' in itself is but a symbol, I hope it means that the Government believe that I have done my best to serve them just as I did to serve the late Government".28 Morant's actions, taken in conjunction with the protestations of this letter, indicate the degree of self-delusion existing in Anglican circles regarding any special relationship.

Trust in such arrangements had complex origins. Increasing awareness of their own declining position (judged by temporal criteria) persuaded Anglicans in the higher levels of the Church to put their faith in understandings with Government that were more than a little fictional. An alliance with the mighty served to ward off a full realization of their own powerlessness. It also avoided unrest among the laity. Such factors persuaded the rulers of the Church to claim an alliance with Government which, regardless of party, was steadily
becoming more bureaucratic and more secular in actions and attitudes. One day the claims for a special relationship between Church and State might be made good, with incalculable consequences for Church policy. In seeking short term political advantages the Church of England was, between 1904 to 1906, offering itself as a hostage to fortune.

However ill-founded, Anglican trust in such understandings meant that in 1904 they were anxious to conciliate the Board of Education. Thus, despite private anxieties, there was little public Anglican opposition to the recognition by the Board of the new Local Education Authority colleges. Non-conformists welcomed the inauguration of the new colleges, seeing them as the means to erode still further the waning monopoly held by Anglicans in the field of teacher training. Only the recently formed Catholic Education Council sounded a discordant note. In a joint statement the Hierarchy and the Council declared themselves "Determined to resolutely repel any Local Education Authority encroachment into Roman Catholic schools or colleges". Although bravely spoken, such declarations carried less menace than when they commanded Anglican support. On this occasion such support was clearly absent. Morant could therefore congratulate himself on having introduced the local authority colleges into the system with the minimum of denominational acrimony.

It is perhaps unfortunate for Morant's reputation that he chose to remain at the Board of Education after the Liberal assumption of power in 1906. Whatever the controversies surrounding his role in the passing of the 1902 legislation, his record as an administrator at the Board of Education between 1902 and 1906 was outstanding. Board policies, like the education codes, were, under his direction, given a coherence and cogency that they had never previously enjoyed.
field of teacher training he set in motion the long overdue reform of the pupil teacher system and successfully introduced the local authority colleges without alienating the majority of denominational interests. It was a record of bureaucratic (in a non-pejorative sense) innovation and reform of which any man could have been justly proud. In 1907 all this suddenly began to go awry. Perhaps the wheel of fortune had simply turned too far. Whatever the causes, Morant's programme began to come under increasing attack from both denominationalists and teachers.

In the October of 1907, Michael Sadler, the man Morant had so ruthlessly ousted from the Board of Education, contributed an article to The Church Quarterly Review entitled, "The Influence of the State in English Education". In tracing the concept and rise of an enlarged state in England, Sadler turned in the conclusion of his article to confront the problem which had so concerned Laurie in 1901. Laurie had argued that the proper limits of the centralization in government had been reached at the turn of the century. Sadler probed this claim. "What", he pondered, "are the rights of the individual against the authority of the organized State?". In seeking answers to this fundamental question, Sadler found himself confronted with associated second order questions. "Does education", he asked, "necessarily involve the question of personal belief about the ultimate problems of human destiny?". Arguing that it did, Sadler wondered whether in such a context "Englishmen are sufficiently agreed as to the form of social organization ... to entrust the moulding of it ... to the authoritative power of the centralized State, and further, to give to the State the full right of determining the course and spirit of national education".
A superficial analysis of Sadler's paper could convey the impression that it was yet one more contribution to the age-old philosophical debate as to the relative rights and duties of the individual and the state. On one level this is a correct interpretation but Sadler also made it very clear that this article was inspired by contemporary events. Profoundly uneasy in his own mind at "the idea of the State" beginning to acquire an almost "sacred authority", Sadler argued that the policies being pursued by the Board of Education were swinging from bureaucratic neutrality towards bureaucratic coercion. He cited as evidence the policy adopted by Morant regarding the future of the denominational colleges. "Objection may be taken", Sadler wrote, "to the recent change in the Policy of the Board of Education with regard to training colleges.... The new regulations seem designed less for the encouragement of educational efficiency than to deal a blow at denominational training colleges".

The legislation to which Sadler objected was set out in the Annual Report of the Board of Education, 1907. Under the overall heading "New Regulations for Training Colleges" the Board declared that from 1908, "the application of a candidate may in no circumstances be rejected on the ground of religious faith or by reason of his refusal to undertake to attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship". In order to ensure that this injunction was adhered to, the Board further directed college principals to keep a "register of candidates for admission showing their qualifications so far as are known, in the order in which the applications are received and opened". The significance of this, as the Wesleyan authorities were shortly to find out, was that any refusal of a candidate had to be accompanied by written reasons explaining the grounds on which the applicant had been turned down. Wesleyans, who should have been most gratified by the
new regulations, were in fact rather cool in their reception of the new legislation. Although they welcomed the Board's determination to prevent students being granted "preference" on the grounds of their "religious creed or social status" they were nevertheless extremely irritated by the Board's discouragement of the practice of interviewing candidates for training. Dr. Workman, Principal of Westminster College, resented the requirement to accept candidates "holding nothing more than paper qualifications" as strongly as any of his Anglican colleagues.

While the Board's legislative activity has been applauded as a necessary measure to achieve social justice, the motives of Morant and his colleagues seem questionable in the light of the final legislation enacted under the 1907 Code. From the 1 August of that year, the Board placed a ban on the founding of new denominational training colleges. "Henceforth", it ruled, "no Institution will be recognized unless it is either provided by a Local Education Authority or conducted by a Body of Governors acting under an instrument approved by us". In such colleges the Board decreed "no catechism or formulary distinctive of any particular religious denomination may be taught except to students whose parents or guardians have required the Governors in writing to provide such instruction".

These explicit instructions worded in Morant's clear, unambiguous style have to be seen in the context of the Liberal Party's assumption of power in 1906. Having campaigned on a platform in which the revision of the 1902 legislation was a prominent feature, the majority of new Liberal Members of Parliament were, in Kekewich's words, looking for "Action, plain, quick and strong". As Majorie Cruickshank and Benjamin Sacks indicate in their respective accounts,
the three attempts made by the incoming Liberal Government to settle the denominational schools issue were notably unsuccessful. Some of the ensuing Liberal frustration was vented upon the denominational colleges. These in 1906, as in 1902, proved to be an easier target than the denominational schools. Indeed, the "Instant and explosive Anglican reaction" to the publication of the new regulations was in part caused by "the apparent ruse of the Liberal Government to do by administrative regulation what they could not achieve by legislation". The Spectator openly accused non-conformists of having said to the Government "that even if you cannot destroy Church predominance in the voluntary schools by Act of Parliament, you can make the Church exceedingly uncomfortable in the training colleges and produce a state of things so intolerable that they will be glad to come to a compromise".

In this inflamed atmosphere, when Morant's impartiality was questioned by his former Conservative colleagues, the Anglican response to the McKenna Code was even more militant than the customary intransigent posture adopted by Roman Catholics. The Anglican Standard called for "Resistance to the regulations even to the extent of closing all the training colleges and leaving the Government to find its own accommodations". The more private responses of Anglicans reveal the gulf existing at this time between their perception of the role to be played by the training colleges and contrary views held by the Board of Education. The Church of England view was one still dominated by Victorian paternalism. "Our colleges", declared the Anglican inspector, "are families". "No one", he continued, "would like a person forced into his family entirely at variance with the spirit of his household". McKenna's imposition of a conscience clause, declared the Editor of the Morning Post, would
have the effect of thrusting into such Christian families "atheists, Jews and secularists".54

While appalled at such a prospect, the Anglican inspector doubted the ability of the colleges to resist McKenna's legislation. None of the weaknesses of these institutions as revealed by the 1902 legislation had been remedied by 1908. Indeed, the Anglican determination to allow their colleges to remain self-governing local institutions made them especially vulnerable to any centralized Government initiative. "The colleges live so apart from the world", stated the Anglican inspector, "that at times their existence is scarcely known".55 This isolation, so fiercely defended on the grounds of local autonomy, allowed the colleges to develop very much along their own lines. "The colleges vary much and have distinct characteristics", commented the inspector, "some are calm and immovable, some excited, some are anxious, others neither know nor care what is about to happen; some are always changing; others do not seem to have heard of the doctrine of evolution; some are invariably in a hurry, one does not know what about; others would not be disturbed by an earthquake".56 In these circumstances, he observed, the characteristic features of such colleges often "stem from the influence and character of the Principal" and therefore "owe more to personality than to Government regulations". Such a system, he candidly confessed, could not withstand a vigorously pursued state initiative to modernize the denominational colleges. While welcoming this prospect in one sense, the inspector perceived the difficulties that would ensue. Modernization would expose the financial weakness of the Church and, in his own estimation, secularize the colleges to an unacceptable degree. The Church of England was, therefore, tethered to the status quo. To move forward would destroy the balance of forces and traditions that sustained their colleges.
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On the other hand, the swift evolution of both the university and local authority colleges meant that there could be no turning back. It was an almost impossible dilemma.

The Catholic authorities did not share the pessimism of their Anglican rivals. Confronted by hostile legislation in the form of the McKenna Code, they fought with a desperation founded on faith. The Catholic Times proclaimed that their colleges were to their teachers "What the seminaries are to our clergy". "The teacher", claimed the paper's editor, "instructed" "for heaven and earth and so needs a special preparation in a special atmosphere for his sacred office". Catholics, in fighting McKenna's legislation, were quite clear in their own minds that they were fighting the coercive powers of an increasingly centralized state. At the outset of the Liberal Government's attempts to find a solution to the denominational problem, Catholics had issued a statement clarifying their position regarding education. "Religion", they declared, "is an essential factor in Education.... Parents have the duty and therefore the right to educate their children in the religion which they believe to be true". These two fundamental propositions led them to the central point of their case. "These rights are given by God, not by the state and therefore cannot be taken away by the state". The logical progression of their arguments made the subsequent statement referring specifically to the position of the teacher training colleges almost superfluous. "No settlement can be acceptable", they argued, "which does not provide for the continuance and maintenance of the existing Catholic training colleges and Catholic pupil teacher centres and which does not grant facilities for extending the means of giving Catholic training to Catholic teachers". No amount of pressure,
even from dissident Catholics, Catholic intentions of disobedience were conveyed personally to McKenna by Cardinal Bourne on the 25 July, 1907, and were widely reported in the press. The Catholic deputation to Government ministers had been preceded five days earlier by an Anglican deputation, led by Dr. Davidson the Archbishop of Canterbury. They were accorded the privilege of meeting both McKenna and the Prime Minister, Asquith, at Number Ten, Downing Street. The meeting, which took place on Saturday, 20 July, 1907, only emphasized how far apart the two parties were. Each side having stated its position found little common ground on which to negotiate and the discussion degenerated into desultory wrangling. "We have just enlarged our colleges", declared Davidson, "do you take no account of what has been spent in the last three years?". "You retain the denominational atmosphere in the college and the hostel", retorted McKenna. "The remedy will be obtained when we get training colleges over the whole country. When we get them the whole problem will be solved". This in fact was a slightly ingenuous statement. Neither McKenna nor Asquith would give any promise to the deputation that when training college accommodation was sufficient denominational colleges could revert to a system of recruiting students of their own faith. The meeting therefore broke up with problems unresolved and Anglicans irritated by what they regarded as McKenna's evasive attitude.

The hardening of attitudes on both sides evident during the meeting caused immediate repercussions. In seeking to preserve the denominational integrity of their colleges, Anglicans sought legal
advice which was to the effect that "the Regulations could not be
complied with without a violation of the Trusts" on which the
denominational colleges were founded. Davidson's submission of these
legal opinions met with a firm response from both the Board of Education
and from McKenna personally. The Board crisply observed that the
Governors of any denominational college who felt that their trust deeds
were being violated would have "to decide whether ... they are desirous
of continuing to receive grants from public funds". In a letter to
the Archbishop of Canterbury, McKenna reiterated the Government's
position regarding the denominational issue. "The Authorities" of any
residential college refusing access to non-denominational students, he
stated, "will clearly not be eligible after September next to grants
from public funds". The inference was very clear; 'he who pays the
piper calls the tune'.

In retrospect it is difficult to determine how far each party to
the dispute was prepared to go. Brinkmanship, often thought of as a
recent political phenomenon, was clearly apparent in the tactics
adopted in the 1908 crisis. Diehards on both sides were urging a
decisive confrontation. Davidson, despite an initial tough stand, subsequently used his influence to bring about a compromise settlement.
His efforts were constantly endangered by High Church Anglicans who
wished to join hands with the Catholics and close the colleges rather
than suffer further state interference. For his part, McKenna found
his grounds for manoeuvre greatly circumscribed both by the temper of
his party and the climate of public opinion. Frustrated by the failure
of the 1906 legislation and with their electoral popularity sliding
dangerously in the country, Liberals were in no mood for further
compromise. Nor were the fifty-three Labour members who had been
returned to Parliament in 1906. On September 7, 1907, the Trades Union
Congress adopted by one million, two hundred and thirty-nine thousand
votes to one hundred and twenty-six thousand a resolution that there should be in England "A national system of education under full popular control, free and secular, from the primary school to the university". 75 Overwhelming support by trade unionists for this secular solution to the denominational problem placed Labour Members of Parliament in a strong position to use the issue of the denominational training colleges as a test of the Liberal Government's radical intentions. 76 Neither side was therefore in a position to allow the other to claim a victory. The impasse dragged on, ending with both sides claiming victory, while in fact compromising.

The terms of the compromise arrived at in June 1908 between Runciman (McKenna's successor as President of the Board of Education) 77 and the Archbishop of Canterbury were detailed without enthusiasm by the Standing Committee of the British and Foreign School Society in their Annual Report for 1909. 78 The Society which in marked contrast to the Methodists 79 had given unwavering support to the Government in its attempts to impose a secular solution, 80 regarded the final compromise as a defeat. The terms of the final agreement stipulated that for a period of one year the Church of England training colleges would make available fifty per cent of their total places to students not of the Anglican faith. While the committee members of the British and Foreign School Society conceded that this was a marked improvement on the previous position, they were nevertheless bitter about the conditions under which such students would live. Their Chairman noted that while "some of the non-Anglican students" would be allowed to "live in college" the majority would have to reside in "annexes, hostels or lodgings approved of by the Board of Education". 81 Referring to this as "a leper colony" mode of proceeding, the Standing Committee concentrated its criticism on the fact that Roman Catholics
had refused to make even these meagre concessions. As Cardinal Bourne
had warned, Catholics continued to ignore Government legislation.
Non-conformists responded by joining the British and Foreign School
Society in castigating the Government for their pusillanimity in
allowing Roman Catholics to "flout Government legislation" without
"incurring any penalties".82

In the light of this markedly hostile response from non-conformists,
the Archbishop of Canterbury could have been forgiven for wondering
if, in launching their attacks, his supporters were referring to the
same legislation. Although Davidson could derive some comfort from
The Times commendation of his "statesmanlike behaviour",83 reaction
within his own Church was generally critical.84 The Archbishop paid
the price of being seen to compromise while others did not.

The Reverend Taylor in successive articles in The Church Times85 and
The School Guardian86 declared that the settlement reached constituted
"An abandonment of colleges' trust deeds". Taylor voiced the fears
of many High Church Anglicans when he predicted that "the agreement
entered into for a year ... without prejudice" already had the marks
of "permanence" written across it. In any case, he argued, as there
were no hostels, non-church students would for some time be mingling
with Church students. The only possible result, he concluded, would be
a rapid extension of "a secularized atmosphere"87 throughout the
Anglican colleges.

Whatever their reasons for criticizing Davidson (some of which
bore only marginal relevance to the immediate issue), Anglo-Catholics
were accurate in their predictions. The "modus vivendi" reached over
the intake of non-Anglican students became permanent88 and the result
was, as Taylor had warned, a sharp increase in the secularization of
the colleges. The compromise proved as illusory as the 1902 settlement, but on this occasion recriminations took the form of repeated protests from the Church of England regarding the unfairness of Board of Education policies. Any notions of a special relationship were discarded when Morant became personally involved in the alleged exclusion from King Alfred's College of a student on religious grounds.\footnote{This incident was soon followed by Board intervention at Truro where the Governors stubbornly refused to allow entry to non-conformist students.\footnote{The swift ruling by the Board of Education that the Governors of Truro had to provide a hostel to accommodate at least six non-Anglican students, led to protests from the National Society.}} L.A. Selby-Bigge, who had been recruited to the Board by Morant shortly before his own departure, analysed the Anglican position as it appeared to him in 1912. "The Church of England grievance under the 'modus vivendi'," he wrote in a letter to the President of the Board, "was always mainly a theoretical one.... The protest by the National Society is, I think, made more to assert a principle than because there is a practical grievance". "The number of non-conformist students admitted to the Church of England colleges under the conscience clause", he added, "has never been anything like fifty per cent and has not exceeded ten per cent of the total admissions in any year".\footnote{In the light of the figures quoted by Selby-Bigge the protests by Anglicans concerning the imposition of a conscience clause seem exaggerated. However, some of the disparity of reaction was caused by the fact that while Selby-Bigge could be dispassionate in his appraisal of the situation, Anglicans could not. By 1912 the decline of the}
Church of England colleges relative to their major rivals, the university day training colleges and the newly built local authority institutions, was becoming obvious. This decline was symbolized by the imposition by a Liberal Government of a conscience clause. Yet while the sound and the fury centred around this particular measure, the real decline of the Anglican colleges was being effected by less controversial Board measures. In its Annual Report for the year 1908-09, the Board of Education provided a brief summary of the effect of its programme of building grants for training colleges. Noting that "A grant representing twenty-five per cent of the total expenditure" incurred in building new residential colleges had failed to persuade the majority of Local Education Authorities to provide new colleges, the compiler of the Annual Report observed with some pride that since 1906 the Board had "been prepared to make grants up to seventy-five per cent of the total expenditure".

The success of this policy in encouraging authorities to build new colleges is demonstrated by the fact that of the twenty-one Local Education Authority colleges built between 1904 and 1922, twelve were founded in the years 1906 to 1911. The inauguration of these colleges, the majority of which were generously equipped, ended forever the dominant position enjoyed by denominationalists in the field of teacher training. In the parlance of the motor trade, the new models proved to be irresistibly attractive.

In 1904 the National Society published figures showing that Anglican colleges trained almost half of the total number of teachers in the country. According to the Board of Education's own private estimate this position had not significantly altered in 1906, when the new, more generous building grants were announced. Between 1906...
and 1912 the situation altered dramatically. While the number of denominational places remained static at around four thousand eight hundred, the number of places in university and local authority colleges doubled from approximately four thousand places in 1906 to over eight thousand places in 1911-12. In just six years Anglicans saw their position of dominance steadily eroded until in 1912 they were effectively reduced to being a junior partner in the teacher training enterprise.

The Anglican eclipse is the key feature of all Board of Education statistics published between 1906 to 1912. Figures tend to be regarded as figures unless they convey an interior meaning. All the denominations outside the Anglican communion were in the fortunate position of being able to regard the statistics published by the Board of Education from a neutral standpoint. Indeed, all shades of non-conformity were generally encouraged by the trends revealed. The British and Foreign School Society was flattered by the extensive enquiries made in 1909 by the Board of Education regarding the provision of "undenominational religion" within their six colleges. The Board, seeking an uncontroversial pattern for the provision of religious instruction in local authority colleges, was delighted by the candid evidence submitted to them by the Principal of Homerton. In writing to R.G. Mayor she frankly admitted: "The religious teaching in the British and Foreign School Society colleges has never amounted to very much and this has been a cardinal principle of progress within the colleges.... Religious bigotry has to be kept out of teacher training".

Methodists were generally able to support such sentiments, in a vague kind of way. With only two colleges they were not unhappy to see
the growth of the local authority colleges diminishing the power of their Anglican rivals. In 1908, the Reverend Albert Clayton in his valedictory address to the students of Westminster and Southlands colleges spoke of the need "to eradicate the deep-seated snobbishness in the educational system". One way to achieve this was, he argued, "to supply a national as opposed to a denominational system". Although the full Methodist Conference of 1908 modified Clayton's stand slightly by insisting on the need "for simple biblical instruction" in both state schools and colleges, it was certainly not antagonistic to the rapid growth of state provided colleges.

In marked contrast, Roman Catholics as a body most certainly were hostile to any extension of the authority of the state in the provision of education. Unfortunately their opposition provided little comfort or succour for increasingly beleaguered Anglicans. Following the open break with McKenna in 1907, Catholic authorities ignored Government policies. Like the cat, the Catholic Hierarchy began to walk by itself. In an interview with the author one Catholic official likened the relationships existing between the Board of Education and the Catholic authorities during the period 1907-1914 as "constituting a delicate game of chess where every coercive move by the Board of Education was rendered stalemate by the swift retaliatory responses of the Hierarchy". Evidence to support this claim is not difficult to find. From 1907, Board of Education policy was directed towards enabling increasing numbers of non-denominational students to enter the voluntary colleges. The Catholic response was to make entrance to their colleges more exclusive, even at the price of antagonizing their own college principals. In 1908, Father Byrne of Hammersmith College wrote in his Annual Report: "For the first time since the regulation was made, the rule was enforced last year of admitting to college only
those who had passed the Catholic Diocesan Examinations. Candidates who had achieved certain distinctions in the Preliminary Certificate Lists were deliberately passed over, and the preference given to those who had passed the Diocesan Examinations. Clearly upset at having lost a number of well qualified students, Byrne went on to comment, "We can ill afford to dispense with those who are better qualified on the secular side, and it is much to be hoped that the college shall not be required to make a similar sacrifice again....". Father Byrne's hopes were unfulfilled. Indeed, he and his fellow principals were given a sharp reminder by the Catholic Education Council of the conditions under which intending students could be admitted to Catholic colleges. In order to counteract the increasing emphasis given by principals to a student's place on the King's Scholarship List, the Council pointedly reminded principals that they should recruit "Those for whom the colleges were founded and those who propose to teach in Catholic schools".

Such a policy of exclusive denominational recruitment did not commend itself to the Board of Education. Indeed, it was both so extreme and so exclusive that it separated Catholics from all other denominations, including Anglicans. However, the ultimate strength of the Catholic position lay in the fact that they were prepared, if absolutely necessary, to operate outside the state system and thus beyond state control. The confidence necessary to carry through this kind of policy partly derived from the strong position achieved by Catholics in the field of teacher training during the early part of the twentieth century. During this period requests from the Catholic orders to found colleges were so numerous that they actually embarrassed the Catholic Education Council. Apprehensive of their ability to finance so many colleges, the fears of the Council members...
subsided when the new institutions proved to be remarkably self-sufficient. Costs compared with those of comparable institutions were incredibly low. Nuns from the teaching orders gave their services free, frequently beginning their teacher training instruction on church property and without purchasing expensive specialized equipment. These economical methods were further assisted by the dividends resulting from shrewd investment in stocks and shares on the part of brokers acting for the Hierarchy. Annual dividends, added to twice yearly silver collections, helped to finance the steady expansion of the Catholic colleges. As a result, and to the intense annoyance of Board of Education officials, a highly independent sector of teacher training emerged during the years 1904 to 1914.

Although Catholics and Anglicans were united in their antipathy towards the expansion of local authority colleges, the Catholic response only served to point up the difficulties encountered in this field by the Church of England. The Catholic policy of self-sufficiency and sturdy independence was envied by Anglo-Catholics who wished to adopt it for Anglican purposes. On the other hand, Catholic policy was repudiated by the evangelical wing of the Church and made broad Churchmen uncomfortable because of its too obvious dangers. In short, the Roman example was disastrous. It underlined the fissiparous nature of the Church of England. It also dangled before Archbishop Davidson a policy which he either could not, or would not, pursue.

Davidson's position as head of the Established Church, and the attitudes he brought to the task, have a direct bearing on the lack of policy concerning Anglican colleges evident in the decade preceding the First World War. The dramatic loss of status and power which Anglicans suffered in the teacher training field during the period
1906 to 1912 would have precipitated a crisis within almost any comparable organization. Davidson, with the help of his Bishops, was largely responsible for containing the incipient crisis, thereby enabling the policy of drift to continue within the individual colleges.

The National Society, theoretically responsible for the welfare of the majority of Anglican colleges, was in no doubt that a crisis had been reached in 1911. During this year the Anglican Inspector of Colleges sent the following clear warning to Davidson. "The danger ahead", he wrote, "is serious. The reckless building of training colleges by local authorities with unlimited funds is already making it difficult for our colleges to be filled, and unless they are full they must work at a financial loss.... Some colleges are raising money to make themselves as attractive as their rivals. This method is not always possible....". Perhaps through tact or through the reticence felt by officials in communicating with their Archbishop, the inspector did not add the blunt truth that improvement in many of the colleges was impossible because they were nearly bankrupt. Only when Davidson was warned by the inspector of "a deliberate intention to ruin the Church colleges", a warning accompanied by evidence of a sharp fall in the numbers of candidates entering Anglican colleges, was he finally persuaded to give his attention to the problem.

Davidson's evident reluctance to act was no doubt caused in part by his keen anticipation of the difficulties he would encounter when forced to put aside his customary role of administrative neutrality. The root of the problem concerned the "modus vivendi". Davidson, despite internal opposition, had accepted the position that Anglican colleges would grant entry to a possible fifty per cent of non-denominational candidates. Having agreed to this compromise he was
in a good position to press for more generous building grants from the Board of Education on the grounds that the colleges were catering for a substantial number of non-denominational students. Such action, however logical and helpful to the colleges, would be seen as an admission by the Archbishop that the "modus vivendi" had become an accepted feature of Anglican policy. In the face of militant opposition from Anglo-Catholics and the more sober reservations of the National Society,118 Davidson chose to evade the issue. The "modus vivendi" remained, in official terms, a temporary administrative measure.

The Archbishop was left with a number of options, none of which sheltered him from the wrath of at least one influential section of the Church. The Anglo-Catholics urged him to adopt the role and policies of the Catholics regarding teacher training. Davidson recoiled in horror from such a prospect. Believing "completely in the constitutional connection between Church and state",119 and closely enmeshed in the social and political circles of Edwardian society,120 Davidson would have no part in promoting a policy that could only lead to confrontation between Church and state. By nature a man of compromise, he sought without success to find an uncontroversial solution to the teacher training problem. Unable to obtain further Government finance for the Anglican colleges, he was forced to plead for purely denominational funds. In 1910, the poor financial situation of the National Society led him to launch a special appeal on its behalf. He and the Archbishop of York asked Anglicans to contribute twenty thousand pounds towards the Society, the money raised to be allocated for the Society's maintenance of Church schools and colleges.121 The response was disappointing, only six thousand pounds being subscribed. While George Kekewich would no doubt have attributed
the meagre response to the "rooted aversion of denominationalists to putting their hands in their pockets", \(^{122}\) on this occasion the Archbishop was himself more than a little to blame. The appeal was not accompanied by any clear statement from him of the desperate need for such funds to sustain the Society and the Church schools and colleges dependent on it. \(^{123}\) In fact crisis measures were taken without their being any hint of a crisis.

The poor response inevitably led to further financial appeals. In 1911, the Centenary Year of the National Society, an appeal was made for a million shillings. Although the response was somewhat better, Davidson's preoccupation with avoiding a crisis at almost any cost meant that evidence revealing Anglican shortcomings in the teacher training area was generally withheld. Indeed, his customary policy of indulging in extensive consultations\(^ {124}\) enabled him on this occasion to temporize for a quite inordinate period of time. His refusal to enunciate any clear-cut policy seems to have stemmed from his belief that the traditional isolation of the colleges within the Anglican body would prevent their joining together to demand a programme of action.

In this respect, the Archbishop's judgment was perfectly correct. The Anglican colleges continued along the pathways of individual autonomy, although the price was collective irresponsibility. By placating the major pressure groups in the Church through adopting temporary ameliorative measures, Davidson enabled the policy of individual laissez-faire to continue. In this way the crisis was postponed but not averted. Davidson's policy of having no policy did not bring about the harmony that he so genuinely desired. Faced with constantly deteriorating conditions in the Anglican colleges, the
National Society from 1910 until the outbreak of war in 1914, increasingly resorted to independent action. Indeed, the arbitrary actions of the Society and the growing desperation of their appeals to the Church for greater help, are one indication of the very serious difficulties affecting the colleges which the majority of Anglicans, in company with their Archbishop, generally chose to ignore. While it is easy to be critical of the apathetic response of the Anglican laity, this response was often a product of both widespread ignorance and, in some cases, genuine alienation of Church members from their colleges.

The latter condition was not infrequently a grass root response to the evident secularization of the colleges. The extent to which the denominational integrity of the Anglican colleges had been breached by Davidson's agreement to accept, albeit on an annual basis, the "modus vivendi" was demonstrated by the National Society's urgent enquiry during 1909 into "The Pre-Collegiate Religious Training of Intending Teachers". The demise of the pupil teacher system, acknowledged by the Committee of Enquiry to be "fast passing away",\(^{125}\) caused them to lament "the end of the generally happy and beneficient relationships between young student teachers ... and parish clergy",\(^{126}\) which the system had helped to facilitate. In retrospect, it can be clearly perceived that Board of Education policy, which under Morant's direction encouraged all intending teachers to undertake "a liberal secondary education",\(^{127}\) was in fact taking student teachers beyond the influence of the clergy. The nature of the Committee's enquiries and their final recommendations collectively suggest that this was the first of many attempts made by the Anglican authorities to recover, through their primary schools, ground that had been lost in the secondary schools and colleges.

If from a contemporary standpoint the policy adopted by the Society does not seem particularly realistic, it was in fact one of the few
courses of action left open to it. All denominationalists at this time (other than Roman Catholics) became increasingly aware that they were "Living in the shadow of the state". Consequently, the National Society had the unenviable choice of attempting something, however futile, or through inaction allowing its colleges to come under full state control. It was the latter prospect that finally roused Davidson to some realization of the very real dangers surrounding the Anglican colleges. In attempting once more to gain funds for them, the Archbishop addressed an invited audience at Church House on the 2 June, 1913. He emphasized in his speech "the grave danger of the secularization of our public system of education by a side wind" and asked for donations on behalf of the training colleges "in the special circumstances which have contributed to their critical condition". The Anglican Inspector of Church Colleges, who was grateful for the Archbishop's last ditch intervention, hastened to elaborate on his reference to the colleges "critical condition". "The shortage of students and the rivalry of the Local Education Authority colleges are the most serious difficulties", he wrote, "and some of our best colleges are in danger". "There are some colleges", he added, "which feel crushed by the competition, others which are determined to 'go one better' and have provided advantages, which do not prove to be advantageous....".

This final rather curious and elliptical remark was in fact a covert reference by the inspector to the increasing secularization of some of the Anglican colleges. Having previously referred to the "irresistible attraction of secular knowledge in the university day training colleges", he was distressed by the determination shown by many principals in the voluntary colleges to compete with rival
institutions in terms of knowledge rather than values. Left very much to their own devices, many Church principals chose at this time to place their energies behind programmes of academic reform. The old denominational imperative was subtly down-graded by such a scale of priorities, especially at a time when traditional denominational attitudes were coming under Liberal attack. It is difficult to see how such a system of unfettered local autonomy in the individual colleges could have continued for very much longer. The outbreak of war came at a moment when some of the Anglican institutions were at the very limits of their survival capacities. The Principal of Bishop Otter College, Chichester, was not alone in wondering if she would live to see her college reopen "under the auspices of the Church".

In attempting to provide both a summary and a coherent explanation of the many diverse events described in this chapter, it is perhaps helpful to begin with some comments made by Stephen Yeo in his book Religion and Voluntary Organizations in Crisis. In formulating his own conclusions regarding the fate suffered by many voluntary organizations in the twentieth century, Yeo observes:

There is a way of getting the worst of all possible worlds and it is a way frequently not chosen but drifted into. Organizations can stick to the forms and assumptions of an earlier phase (and, of course, human organizations being what they are it is extremely difficult not to), find that they are not experiencing the success which they desire except on unacceptable terms, and proceed to blame themselves for this situation rather than surrounding circumstances.

This analysis is highly relevant to the experience of the Anglican colleges between the years 1902 to 1914. In almost every respect Anglican attitudes towards their colleges were appropriate to a bygone era. Davidson's alternating policies of paternalism and laissez faire were the product of his Victorian upbringing. Each was an acceptable
response to the situation of the colleges in the final decade of the nineteenth century, but both were grossly inappropriate to their needs in the early twentieth century. Quite simply, Davidson ended up by "getting the worst of all possible worlds". Through failing to make the "modus vivendi" a permanent feature of Anglican policy he cut the Church colleges off from desperately needed state finance for capital building programmes. On the other hand, in being seen to compromise when the Catholics most certainly did not, Davidson lowered the enthusiasm of his own supporters and alienated the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church. Indeed, many High Church Anglicans from 1909 onwards saw the colleges as proof of the folly of their Archbishop’s vacillating policy. They complained loudly of the "secularized atmosphere" spreading unchecked throughout such institutions and began to compare them unfavourably with their Catholic counterparts. Although such claims were exaggerated they contained an element of truth. Some principals of Anglican colleges, facing competition from both university and local authority colleges, abandoned old denominational values and competed for students in terms of purely academic criteria. This movement towards an academic meritocracy, so uncompromisingly checked by the Catholic Hierarchy within the Roman Catholic colleges, went unchallenged in the Anglican field. The actions of a minority of Anglican principals afford a perfect illustration of Yeo's comments concerning the desire of organizations and individuals to experience success. Having achieved it, value oriented organizations such as denominations frequently find that it has been achieved on "unacceptable terms". The unacceptable face of success was secularization. College principals (like their Archbishop) were therefore placed in an invidious position. The academic success
of their colleges could not be achieved at the price of their too obvious secularization. Secular attitudes in the colleges therefore spread stealthily and unobtrusively, their presence being not infrequently denied. 139

Those among the Anglican principals who rejected the academic solution, found that denominational support for their efforts to maintain a value oriented system was barely sufficient to keep individual colleges in being. One retired principal described the situation to the author as "Like attempting to keep a car on the road knowing that you could never afford major repairs". 140

Such acutely embarrassing shortages of funds originated in the Anglican case from deficiencies of central management. In 1914 the Anglican inspector was arguing the case for a Sustentation Fund to enable the colleges to borrow money from the Church in order to finance temporary deficits. 141 Not only had Catholics operated a similar system since 1904, but in 1912 they took steps to refine still further the system of financing their colleges. One of the duties of the newly-appointed Organizing Secretary to the Catholic Education Council was to anticipate and fund financial deficiencies before they occurred. 142 Superior centralized management therefore enabled the Catholic and non-conformist colleges to withstand the pressures of competition more easily than their Anglican counterparts. Catholic colleges were particularly fortunate to be given such a strong lead by the Catholic Hierarchy and shielded by them from public attack. Individual Catholic institutions were often savagely criticized by the inspectorate. 143 Such criticisms were not allowed to reach the laity and certainly did not shake the determination of the Hierarchy to maintain the denominational integrity and independence of their colleges.
Although this evidence serves to illustrate the markedly differing responses of different denominations to the bureaucratic pressures placed upon them during the pre-war period, in one respect they all suffered in a similar fashion. In A.A. Evans' words, denominationalists collectively "paid the penalty of being pioneers" ['their colleges'] "cabined, cribbed and confined" ['unhappily reflecting'] "the conception of teacher training as it had been in the nineteenth century". 144

Out of date policies, therefore, were all too frequently applied in out of date buildings. 145 Continuous pressure was exerted by officials from the Board of Education on all denominational authorities to make them bring their buildings up to the standards of the newly-built local authority colleges. The million shillings appeal on behalf of the National Society launched in 1911 was one response directly attributable to such pressure. The Secretary of the National Society commented at the Annual General Meeting of the Society during its Centenary Year that there was no slackening in the pressure exercised by local authorities and the Board of Education in their structural and educational requirements. "On the contrary", he declared, "the tendency of those requirements is always to become more stringent...." 146

In the light of these contemporary opinions, it is perhaps appropriate that this chapter should conclude where it began, namely, in considering the growth of bureaucratization in government. Many writers, among them Hilaire Belloc, 147 have applauded the increasingly coercive role adopted by governments in twentieth century Britain because of the gains achieved by such management in the field of social justice. 148 It is therefore interesting that one of the last acts performed by Morant before he left the Board of Education suggests that the increasingly interventionist role pursued by his Department
was, in the field of teacher training, bringing about counter
productive results.

On the 20 February, 1911, Morant received from Miss C.G. Luard, Principal of Whitelands Training College, her confidential memorandum concerning "Defects of the Present System of Training Elementary School Teachers". In a cogently argued paper, Luard addressed herself first to long standing problems, namely the brevity of the training college course and the academic deficiencies of most of the students recruited into the profession. However, she saved the major part of her criticism for the inspectorate and the work they were expected to perform on behalf of the Board. "The main cause of the present unsatisfactory state of things", she wrote, "is the undoubted over pressure which is resulting from the ever increasing demands of the Board.... The standard in every subject tends to be raised ... but there is no additional time". The result of such pressure, she declared, led to "students constantly getting knocked up and overdone". She forthrightly concluded that Board demands for a balanced curriculum resulted in "fourteen or fifteen subjects jostling each other, everything spoiling everything else" and leading inevitably to "intellectual indigestion". The only remedy for such evils she declared, was "much greater elasticity in the Regulations of the Board and more options of all sorts". Her memorandum, in many respects, was an urgent plea to Morant to consider the case for the decentralized management of the teacher training colleges.

Morant did not remain at the Board of Education long enough to respond to such pleas. In any case it is difficult to see how he, even if he had chosen to do so, could have reversed the kind of centralization that was affecting all levels of government.
Miss Luard, as the Principal of a Church college, was therefore left in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand she found herself given freedom but few resources from her Church, and on the other, resources from the Board of Education rendered negative by their accompanying restrictions. In philosophical terms she was confronted by the dilemma of 'freedom from' and 'freedom for'. In attempting to resolve her difficulties, Miss Luard (along with the majority of her colleagues) had come to accept that by the time of Morant's final departure from the Board, power over the colleges had slipped irreversibly into the hands of central government.\textsuperscript{153}

T.H. Warren, in his excellent but little known history of the Winchester Diocesan Training College, entitles his chapter dealing with the years 1900-1912 "The Hand of Whitehall". Such a title aptly summarizes the central theme of this chapter. By 1912 it could be said that the hand of Whitehall had reached out to grip and control all but the Catholic denominational colleges. The events of the First World War, which precipitated a massive growth in the bureaucratization of Government, served only to strengthen the control over the denominational colleges already achieved by the Board of Education during the 'Morant Era'.
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In 1904, the National Society published figures of the numbers of students in denominational teacher training colleges for that year. Church of England colleges had in training three thousand and thirty-five students, Undenominational and Non-conformist colleges had one thousand one hundred and fifty-one, and Roman Catholic colleges two hundred and ninety-eight. The significant figure was the jump in candidates attending university day training colleges - one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five students in 1904. Although the Church of England was still the largest single denominational provider of teacher training places, it could no longer claim pre-eminence. In fact during
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Catholics thus met centralization with centralization, the new Council being able "to represent the Bishops and the Catholic body in matters which concern Catholic education". For further information on representation and powers of the Council see Formation and First Report of the Catholic Education Council, 1904.
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41 "The Methodist authorities had been forced to bow before the orders of the Board of Education ... no longer were they able
to hold a personal interview with each candidate for admission. From the college point of view this was a serious matter. Results had abundantly proved the wisdom of that interview, providing, as it had done, an opportunity for assessing character. Men now entered Westminster virtually on paper qualifications only. During those early years of the new order there were a number of disciplinary troubles ... partly due to the lack of that valuable interview".


42 Wesleyan Educational Report (1907), p. 27.

43 "These were great measures of reform that went a long way to freeing educational institutions from the grip of clerical control which had dominated them all along since their very inception". SHAHOO, Op. cit. p. 238.
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45 The result of the General Election in 1906 was a massive victory for the Liberal Party due largely to differences within the Unionist Party over the issue of tariffs. The result of the Election reduced Conservative and Unionist numbers in Parliament and brought about the eventual resignation of Balfour as Leader of the Party; Result: three hundred and seventy-seven Liberals, fifty-three Labour, eighty-three Irish members, one hundred and fifty-seven Conservative/Unionists. RAMSDEN, J. (1978), The Age of Balfour and Baldwin 1902-1940; pp. 16-20.
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41 The Catholic Hierarchy had received a disturbing report from their own Sub-Committee who had been charged with the task of enquiring into the supply and training of teachers. The Committee had warned that Catholic schools were employing "Six per cent more unqualified teachers than the country as a whole". While the majority of the Committee loyally supported the position of Catholic teachers for Catholic schools, a minority wished to increase the numbers of qualified teachers in Catholic schools, even if such teachers were not trained in Catholic colleges or Catholic pupil teacher centres. The views of the minority were not published in the final report and were in any case ignored by the Hierarchy. Report of the Secondary Education Sub-Committee on the Question of the Supply and Training of Teachers 1903-05 in Catholic Education Council Annual Report, 1906.
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This "body of Anglican dissidents" struck the "decisive blow" that wrecked any lingering hope of a settlement between the Church of England and the Liberal Government over the issue of denominational schools. CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 110.


McKenna was replaced by Runciman in the Cabinet reorganization that followed the death of Campbell-Bannerman and H.H. Asquith's succession to power as the new Liberal Prime Minister. CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 105.


During the period 1907 to 1908 the British and Foreign School Society published a series of articles urging the Liberal Government to grasp "the denominational nettle". For examples of these publications see BOURNE, A. (1907), The Secular Solution to the Educational Religious Difficulty, The Educational Record, June, pp. 279-286, and The Education Bill of 1908, The Educational Record, June, pp. 555-559.


The Times (1908), 29 June.

Initially many Anglican journals took an equivocal position. For example: The School Guardian, following the lead given by The Times, at first gave a cautious welcome to the settlement. They had entirely misjudged popular feeling. The strength of grass root hostility to the compromise illustrated in the
Letter Pages of both The Times and The School Guardian caused the latter journal somewhat hastily to reverse its position. See The Times, 29 June, 1908 and The School Guardian, 4 July and 18 July, 1908.
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86 The School Guardian (1908), 18 July.

87 In talking of a "secularized atmosphere" in the articles cited, Taylor saw the "compromise" reached as being the inevitable conclusion to the secular drift which, in his opinion, had been evident since 1870.

88 P.R.O. Ed. 24/1829 (1912), Protest to the Board of Education from the Church of England (National Society) regarding Provision of Places to Dissenting Students.

89 From R. Morant to Mr. MacNamara, M.P.: "If your correspondent, Mr Woodford, really thinks that his son has been excluded from Winchester Training College solely on the grounds of failure to pass the Scripture Test ... it might conceivably be worth his while to write officially to this department to ask for his case to be investigated".

P.R.O. Ed. 24/493.

90 "An inquiry held in this case last summer at the request of the Cornwall Authority showed that no non-conformist student had been admitted to this college although many had applied, and that the college authorities had regularly discouraged applications from non-conformists....".

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1829.

91 P.R.O. Ed. 24/1829.

92 "Building Grants: 61. It was accordingly decided to offer building grants to local education authorities undertaking to provide training colleges under certain prescribed conditions. A grant representing twenty-five per cent of the total expenditure was first offered in 1904, and in 1906 the Board announced that they were prepared to make grants up to seventy-five per cent of the total expenditure....".

Board of Education (1908-09), Annual Report, p. 61.
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See also Board of Education (1906-07), Annual Report, Provision of Training Colleges, pp. 57-58 and Board of Education (1914), Annual Report, Accommodation in Training Colleges, pp. 158-160. A concise summary of these figures appears in the Board of
Education Annual Report for the year 1919-20, see Training Colleges for Teachers for Elementary Schools: Number of Colleges and Students, p. 61.


95 Appendix VII Institutions, 1904; figures published by the National Society in their Annual Report, 1904-05.

96 Board of Education (1908-09), Annual Report, p. 60.

97 Loc. cit.

98 Two tables prepared confidentially by the Board of Education in 1917 are particularly revealing as to the dangers that began to envelope the denominational colleges during the pre-war years. Not only were the majority of such colleges too small for economic management, all the growth during this period occurred in rival institutions. See Appendix VII Denominational Training Colleges, 1906-1918.

99 P.R.O. Ed. 24/294 (1909), Enquiries on the part of the Board of Education as to the manner of Religious Instruction in the British and Foreign School Society colleges.

100 The six colleges owned by the British and Foreign School Society were: Borough Road, Bangor Normal, Stockwell, Darlington, Swansea and Homerton.

101 The Principal of Homerton College to R.G. Mayor Esq., Board of Education. In associated written evidence, F.H. Dale, the Principal of Borough Road College, offered the following comment. Speaking of the type of student recruited to his college he stated, "They are drawn from the lower middle class which is in the habit of attendance at religious services.... They have not been touched either by the doubts of the educated classes or by the secularization of some of the working classes". P.R.O. Ed. 24/294.

The enquiry by the Board of Education into religious provision in British and Foreign School Society colleges in many respects marks the swan-song of that body. The aims of the Society were rapidly being fulfilled through the inauguration of the new Local Education Authority Colleges and the decline of the Society (in respect of teacher training) can be dated from approximately 1910.

102 Wesleyan Education Report (1907-08), Valedictory Address of the late Reverend Albert Clayton to the Students of Westminster and Southlands Colleges.
"It reaffirms its demand for the establishment of a completely national system of education free from all denominational restrictions and especially from the imposition of ecclesiastical tests upon teachers". Wesleyan Education Report (1907-08), Resolution of the Methodist Conference.

Interview A.


Code of Practice for Admission of Students to Catholic Teacher Training Colleges:

(i) Those for whom the colleges were founded, viz. those who propose to teach in Catholic schools.

(ii) Those who succeed best in qualifying examinations.

(iii) Those who are recommended by head teachers.

(iv) Those who come from the area for which the college was founded.

Administrative documents of the Catholic Education Council 1908-09. As if to stiffen this policy the Catholic Education Council, at the request of the Catholic Hierarchy, published a further reminder to all Principals of Catholic colleges in 1909. They were again reminded of their duty to "Give preference in admitting students to their colleges to Catholic candidates who have been prepared for the teaching profession in England and Wales". Catholic Education Council (1909-10), Annual Report.

The third hypothesis developed by J.E. Turketine in her study of Social Change in Catholic Colleges of Education in the Twentieth Century, concerns this aspect of Catholic policy. She demonstrates that whilst the Catholic authorities responsible for their colleges were anxious to co-operate as closely as possible with developments in teacher training "They nevertheless sought to preserve all those elements of religious life and teaching which were considered essential for their students welfare". TURKETINE, J.E. (1967), Some Aspects of Social Change in Catholic Colleges of Education in the Twentieth Century, University of Leicester, M.Ed.

La Sainte Union, the College of the Holy Union of the Sacred Hearts was opened in Southampton in 1904. While other colleges run by the teaching orders were opened in Salford, Glasgow, Hull and Newcastle, these represent only a tiny fraction of proposals
for founding colleges received by the Catholic Education Council. During the years 1908-09 the Secretary to the Council acknowledged receipt of six such requests.
Catholic Education Council (1908-09), Annual Report.


Catholic Education Council (1909-10), Annual Report.

Catholic Education Council (1904-05), Annual Report.

In March 1907 H.M.I. Barnett wrote to Morant complaining that nuns did not teach in or supervise students in schools other than those run by the Catholic orders. Morant felt that the matter was of "such a delicate nature" that it must not be made the subject of public communication. Although he accepted Morant's orders concerning confidentiality, Barnett replied substantiating his complaints regarding the "ineffectiveness of professional training" in some Catholic colleges.
P.R.O. Ed. 24/490 (1907).

The general attitude of the Board regarding the expansion of Catholic colleges was revealed in 1917 when the President wrote in response to a request from St. Mary's Roman Catholic College, Newcastle, for an increase in their numbers: "As regards the Roman Catholics," he stated, "what we have to guard against is not enlargement of existing fair-sized colleges, but the establishment of small, inefficient colleges, built to gratify the ambitions of particular religious orders".
P.R.O. Ed. 24/1832 (1917).


The Anglican Inspector seems to have been referring to a move initiated by Northern Local Education Authorities to persuade intending candidates for training to attend local municipal colleges, a move condemned by the full Committee of the National Society in 1912.
National Society (1912), Annual Report.

"Your Committee [National Society] cannot suppress a good deal of anxiety at the falling off observable during the last two or three years in the number of candidates for Church training colleges.... Within the last few years there has been a gradual multiplication of undenominational training
colleges, which to a very large extent have been provided by Local Education Authorities who in certain cases exert pressure upon their scholars to resort to the colleges which they have provided. The result is totally unfair competition on the part of the undenominational colleges.... The Executive Committee of the General Council of Church Training Colleges have promised that they would endeavour to rouse Church educationalists throughout the country to a sense of the urgent need for taking all possible steps to counteract the tendencies operating at present in very unjust fashion to the damage of the Church training colleges".

National Society (1912), Annual Report.

117 Frances Stevenson, Lloyd George's secretary and mistress (and therefore not an impartial witness), referred to Davidson as "God's own butler". This slighting remark was prompted by Davidson's "unctuous and deferential manner, denoting his permanent neutrality".


118 P.R.O. Ed. 24/1829 (1912).


121 National Society (1910), Annual Report.


123 In 1912 the Committee of the National Society noted the numbers of Voluntary School Managers "Succumbing to secular pressures" and "handing their schools over to the state". The Committee were bitter regarding the failure of Church authorities "to rouse the Church to a defence of its denominational interests".

National Society (1912), Annual Report.


125 The Committee Chairman was G.R. Wakefield, assisted by Bernard Reynolds and Hugh Hardern. The three-man Committee submitted its findings on 1 December, 1909, and these were published in full in The School Guardian, 12 February, 1910.

126 The School Guardian (1910), 12 February, p. 147.
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127 P.R.O. Ed. 86/26 (1910).


129 The Church Times (1913), 5 June; see also National Society, Annual Report, 1914.


131 Loc. cit.

132 NAYLOR, L. (1953), Culham Church of England Training College for Schoolmasters 1853-1953: Centenary History; pp. 82-97. See also DOBSON, M. (1951), The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby; p. 35.


134 Guild Magazine (1918), Bishop Otter College, Chichester, June, p. 6.


137 The School Guardian (1908), Editorial, 18 July.

138 Methodists were beset by the same dangers. For a long time Westminster had been filled by students on the basis of their academic qualifications, a system profoundly disturbing to many elements of Methodism. PRITCHARD, Op. cit. p. 107.

139 P.R.O. Ed. 24/294 (1909). See in particular evidence of F.H. Dale, Esq., Principal of Borough Road College to R.G. Mayor, Esq., Board of Education.

140 Interview B.

141 National Society (1914), Annual Report.
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The Secretary was expected to gain information concerning the financial state of the Roman Catholic colleges in the course of his visits throughout the country to explain the work and financial needs of the Catholic Education Council and the directions in which the work could be extended if funds permitted.

Catholic Education Council (1912-13), *Annual Report*.


One visitor to the Methodist College at Westminster declared in 1902, "I've no experience of prisons, but anything more like my idea of prison I've never seen!".


National Society (1911), *Annual Report*.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/482 (1911). Memorandum by Miss C.G. Luard, Principal of the Whitelands Training College for Women, on the Defects of the Present System of Training Elementary School Teachers in Training Colleges, with suggestions as to some possible remedies. Prepared at the request of Sir Robert Morant. The last line "Prepared at the request of Sir Robert Morant" gives some indication of the autocratic nature of Morant's final years at the Board. The inspectorate were annoyed when the Permanent Secretary ignored usual channels, furious when he gave precedence, as on this occasion, to selected outsiders.

"You cannot pour more water into a cup than it can hold, but that is what you are trying to do.... The old educational fallacy of the confusion of the acquisition of information with the training of the mind, which the students are warned against as a cardinal point of theory, is in some danger of being illustrated by their practice".

P.R.O. Ed. 24/482 (1911), Luard Memorandum, p. 2.

"It is not strange that studies which begin with the Victorian city end with the twentieth century state".

Miss Luard was one of the Church principals who made no secret of her determination to recruit only the most academically able students. As head of one of the most prestigious London colleges she competed aggressively with local authority and university rivals. In the course of her many contests she won Morant's admiration for her intellectual toughness.
CHAPTER 6

Impacts of War

When war against Germany was declared in August 1914, one hundred and four students of King Alfred's College were taking part in military exercises at Bulford on Salisbury Plain. Being territorials they were mobilized overnight, relinquishing their student roles to enlist as soldiers in College B Company of the 4th Hampshire Battalion Regiment. Rumours of their immediate posting to France circulated freely among the members of the newly formed company and the issue of Lee-Enfield rifles was daily expected. However, orders to move (like the rifles) failed to materialize. For weeks the company remained under canvas at Bulford until, to their own disbelief, they were transported back to King Alfred's College. Unable to find either rifles or training facilities for the new company, War Office officials paid the denominational authorities threepence a night to billet the student soldiers in their old college. Not until December 1914 did the company finally depart for service in India.

This particular episode illustrates Arthur Marwick's contention that the first eight months of the war were characterized by a strange combination of normality and panic. In the first month of the war Winston Churchill coined the phrase 'business as usual' and English society responded to his slogan. This incident supports Marwick's contention, in contradiction to some historians, A.J.P. Taylor for example, that the outbreak of war brought about an immediate sense of national unity which was accompanied by a desire for innovation and reform within English society. Evidence from the training colleges, as will be seen, constitutes an admittedly isolated, but nevertheless
emphatic, denial of such claims.

The social divisions in English society engendered by class and privilege marred the enlistment process. In its Annual Report for the year 1914 the Board of Education noted that it was usual for university training colleges to organize Officers Training Corps. With unintended irony the writer of the report went on to comment that "training colleges not connected with university institutions did not furnish contingents to the Officers Training Corps; in these colleges ... it was the regular practice for the students to become members of the Territorial Force". Having made the distinction between commissioned and non-commissioned recruits, and in so doing socially identified training college institutions, the author of the report goes on to offer valuable evidence concerning the numbers of men enlisting for service. This evidence does not support another of the myths that grew up concerning the early part of the war, namely that 'the best went first', if 'best' is taken as meaning most academically able. Of the nine hundred and thirty-one men studying in university day training colleges at the onset of the war, two hundred and seventy volunteered for service, a low proportion compared with that from seven Anglican colleges. The ten local education authority colleges for men came approximately half-way between the two extremes, one hundred and forty-two out of a total of four hundred and seventy-five students enlisting. The very high proportion of men entering the services from the denominational colleges is an odd tribute to the values of those institutions which had before the war seemed 'old fashioned' to both Board officials and the inspectorate. Anglican colleges in particular had continued to be organized as close-knit families. When war came such family units remained united. At King Alfred's, Winchester, where almost all the students immediately
enlisted, the Principal and a lecturer, Mr. Goddard, continued to lead their students as Captain and Lieutenant respectively of the 4th Hampshire Battalion. The students from the Methodist college at Westminster were reminded of their corporate identity throughout the war by copies of the "War Bulletin and Roll of Honour" sent to them by the Principal, Dr. Workman. University and local education authority colleges, for all their academic virtues, could not engender among their students such feelings of loyalty and identity.

The "fervid intensity of feeling in comradeship, duty and loyalty characteristic of the best residential colleges", was emphasized in the British and Foreign School Society's Annual Report for 1914. If such values commend denominationalism, the rest of the report provides an unpleasant reminder of the uglier features of religious bigotry. The Management Committee of the Society were reluctant to allow old arguments to die because war had broken out. They suggested that some denominationalists (Catholics and Anglo-Catholics) were taking advantage of wartime circumstances to further their own doctrinal policies. "Lord Haldane's exhortations to educationalists of every party to take a higher view of the problems to be solved", they commented, "have not made the situation clearer". Rather, Committee members claimed, "they have even encouraged those whose efforts are directed towards advancing the outposts of privilege to hope that the track of development is to be made to diverge from the broad lines of undenominationalism and representative management". In such circumstances, the Committee served notice to its members that it held itself ready to act in order that "the principles it has advocated consistently for so long should not be weakened". As the tempo of the war in France increased, Committee members of the British and Foreign School Society showed that they were still engaged in fighting
the older war between non-conformity and established religion.

Echoes of entrenched positions and obsessions with old conflicts figure prominently in many denominational papers in 1914. Both Catholics and Anglicans were, in different ways, still intent on warding off the threat presented by the local education authority colleges. The Board of Education at Whitehall seems (like some other authorities) to have been oblivious of the European war and continued during the first year of the war to give priority to purely domestic matters. One Anglican principal attempting to evacuate his college described how, as he was finally departing, a postman delivered to him a long and exceedingly detailed report on the procedures to be adopted for examining "Training college students in Practical Teaching".

Even with the advantages of hindsight, it is difficult to determine how and when these attitudes changed. Marwick suggests that the critical period came when the war was eight months old. "From the Spring of 1915, right through 1915-1916", he writes, "came the beginnings of the big changes associated with the war - new freedoms for women, new status for the labour movement, the first fumbling measures of state intervention". Thereafter, he claims, "1917-1918 were years of much more rigid state control....". Applied to the specific context of denominational training colleges, Marwick's analysis seems both remarkably accurate and relevant.

Denominational authorities in 1915 began to comprehend the magnitude of the changes that had already occurred and braced themselves and their members for further changes. The new mood is frequently reflected in the truncated format of Annual Reports first adopted by the religious societies in 1915. In the National Society's Report of that
year the customary gentle preambulations around Church minutiae are
replaced by a crisp and very direct account of major events, the brevity
in part prompted by the growing paper shortage. In three pages
Anglicans were told of the drastic changes that had befallen their
training colleges. In a paragraph entitled "The Training College Problem
caused by the War", readers learnt that eight of the men's colleges had
lost practically all their students and many of their staff during early mobilization. The very small groups of students unable to enlist were reallocated to other colleges and sometimes were moved again as the War Office abruptly commandeered more of the colleges for temporary wartime occupation. Women's colleges were not exempt from these wholesale changes, St. Gabriel's, Kennington, becoming an emergency hospital and all the resident female students summarily being dispatched to Culham. When suitable temporary accommodation in colleges could not be found, small groups of tutors found themselves allocated to peace time seaside boarding houses, which were invariably cold and where students spent long dispiriting hours looking out on to barbed wire and grey seas.

The Scheme of Concentration, prepared for Anglican colleges by the National Society, served as a model for other denominational authorities similarly affected. When the Methodist college at Westminster was occupied by Australian troops, its students were dispatched to Richmond and there met for the first time the few Catholic students left in residence at St. Mary's College, Strawberry Hill. The details of these movements, important as they are in formulating an accurate documentary record of events, should not obscure their collective significance. Quite simply, mobilization ended forever pre-war patterns of life in the training colleges. In a period of weeks, mobilization brought the colleges and many of their members of staff
into contact with a world which for many years had all too often glided quietly passed ivy covered gates. The shock was particularly apparent in the women's colleges. Nuns from enclosed orders were at short notice called upon to look after students on seemingly interminable wartime train journeys. While they and other female staff often rose to the occasion, "the strain and anxiety" occasioned by the war was added to by their unfamiliarity with life outside, what one student referred to as "a routine of cram and grind". Such comforting, but essentially sterile, routines could not survive the shock of war. Staff and students accustomed to living in isolated communities were brought together in strange environments. Discreet denominational authorities were compelled to negotiate with each other in order to deal with common wartime difficulties. In their several ways the events associated with the initial period of the war served to end the physical isolation which had characterized many denominational colleges since well before the turn of the century.

Although mobilization severed denominational attachments to places, and challenged local autonomy through the claims of national need, it was only an overture to the stronger forces that began to work for the spiritual regeneration of the churches. It is no accident that the National Society Report concerning schemes for concentrating the Anglican colleges was immediately followed by an urgent call for a national rally against the secularization of education. The significance of this call cannot be fully comprehended without reference to other events that were combining to rouse the Anglican Church from the slough of despond into which it had fallen. The first year of the war brought signs of a religious revival; "Churches were unwontedly full. In large numbers people came on weekdays to pray silently and on Sundays to worship in them". Archbishop Randall Davidson responded
vigorously (some felt too vigorously) to such signs of revival by
launching in 1916 a "National Mission of Repentance and Hope". The Mission, designed to be "a witness of the whole Church to the
whole people", was launched at exactly the point in the war described
by Marwick as denoting the period when "the first fumbling measures of
state intervention" first became apparent.

Davidson in a remarkable way sensed and responded to a change in
the national mood. The increasingly interventionist policies pursued
by the new Coalition Government were more than matched by those of
the Archbishop, the National Mission being the prelude to the whole
series of commissions of enquiry instituted by him. Evidence from the
various working parties, separately arrived at, urged the Church of
England to follow the kind of collectivist policies which the Coalition
Government were now adopting.

In 1916 a committee of the churches under the chairmanship of
Edward Talbot, Bishop of Winchester, began an "Enquiry into Religion in
the Army". With uncanny resemblance to a pattern of events that was
to unfold in almost the same sequence during the Second World War, the
members of the Army Commission discovered among soldiers an almost total
ignorance of God and his Church. In a letter to his son, Bishop Talbot
wrote "There is a horrid bulk of evidence that Christianity and the
Churches have failed and are disliked.... How extraordinarily little
is Our Lord understood". While appalled at the indifference to
religion shown by the average soldier, commissioners were angered by
the "sensuality" and "obscenity" which "seemed to lie upon the whole
life of the army". Not surprisingly in the light of such evidence,
the full report was not published until 1919, but its findings were
generally known among Bishops and Church officials by the middle period
of the war. One response, therefore, was the founding of a National Mission.

Fears of secularization, however, were not so much responses to the findings of the Army Commission but rather they were, like such topics as duty and sacrifice, continuing themes. Secularization, in fact, ceased to be a taboo subject. Instead, it began to be seen as the cause of some of the problems revealed by the war. In what may now appear to be reasoning far too naive in its simplicity, the anti-religious state of the army was believed to be a direct outcome of the secularization of the pre-war education system. This belief seemed to confirm earlier warnings. The Bishop of Norwich in an address to students at the Norwich Diocesan Training College made exactly a month before the outbreak of hostilities, had underlined the dangers of a secular system of education. The presence in secondary schools of teachers "incompetent to deal with the highest of subjects" the Bishop said, was a direct result of the prevailing system of education without religion. The "indifference" to religion, stated the Bishop, was attributable to the "vicious circle" of undenominationalism detectable in the cycle of schooling. Spiritually ignorant pupils from secondary schools went to undenominational training colleges where they were prepared "to do little more than to inflict on others the indifference of which they have been the victims, and now would be the cause". The findings of the Army Commission emphatically confirmed the Bishop's analysis. Thus, views which in pre-war society had been the property of minority groups were, owing to the course of the war, suddenly brought into prominence.

If, during the latter part of the war, secularization became notorious among denominationalists as being the cause of many of their
woes, by contrast bureaucratization (under many different titles)
became hugely popular. In a particularly unedifying burst of political
savagery, Asquith was driven from power in December 1916.47 His
successor, Lloyd George, was to promote this bureaucratic trend.
He came to power pledged to the twin policies of a vigorous prosecution
of the war and domestic reform. Few people doubted that a vigorous
prosecution of the war would bring about immediate and far reaching
extensions of state control. The Manchester Guardian welcomed such a
prospect. Entirely deserting its former Liberal policies the paper
expressed the belief that "the new Government in contrast to the old
would not shrink from state control of mines, shipping, and any other
industry vital to the war....".48 With both the Economist and
The Manchester Guardian repudiating free trade and laissez-faire, the
tide of collectivist opinion was rising to flood proportions at the
very inception of the Lloyd George ministry. Significantly, both papers
welcomed the appointment of H.A.L. Fisher, Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield
University, as the first academic to be appointed as President of the
Board of Education.49 Fisher's appointment was generally seen as a
symbol of the new Prime Minister's sincerity of purpose in desiring
domestic reform,50 especially when it became known that Fisher was to
have a seat in the Cabinet with "an undertaking that money would be found
for ambitious educational measures".51

Taking full advantage of the favourable circumstances and urged on
by almost every reform-minded group, Fisher began brilliantly.52
On April 19, 1917, he told the House of Commons of the Government's
intention to provide additional grants totalling almost four million
pounds to secure a substantial general increase in the salaries of
elementary and secondary school teachers.53 Declaring that "all the
problems of public education were being considered in relation to one
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another" Fisher made it clear that the new grants were but the first instalment of the Government's general plan for educational reform. At the conclusion of his speech he left technical matters to one side in order to ask a rhetorical question: "What is it which we desire in a broad way for our people? That they should be good citizens, reverent and dutiful, sound in mind and body, skilled in the practice of their several avocations, and capable of turning their leisure to a rational use". Such sentiments roused both Members of Parliament and denominationalists to new heights of enthusiasm for the cause of educational reform.

In the case of Archbishop Randall Davidson, Fisher was preaching to the converted. Davidson, who was able to view "ecclesiastical matters with something of a layman's eye", relished, along with Lloyd George, the kind of wartime conditions that enabled him to provide firm leadership. Hamstrung in the decade before the war by internal opposition and denominational jealousies, the Archbishop adroitly used Fisher's consultation with denominationalists to forward his own plans for reform. Two of these were to have considerable repercussions on the Anglican colleges. The origins of the first can be traced directly back to fears of secularization which by 1916 Davidson shared with a number of his senior colleagues. The report of the Bishop of Wakefield's Sub-Committee on the Religious Training of Teachers published at the end of 1917, repeatedly warned of "the danger, more than once indicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in recent years, of a gradual secularization of elementary education". This danger, declared the committee, could in part be avoided by action in the teacher training colleges, and it called for "the provision on the part of the state of statutory facilities to give religious teaching in all schools and colleges". This request, made at the height of the war, did not immediately attract
significant opposition. Subsequently, however, it was to be at the centre of bitter arguments between the churches and the unions which were to sour relationships between them throughout the inter-war period.

In 1917 however, all this lay in the future. The conclusion of the report illustrates how in the last two years of the war a widespread fear of secularization on the part of all denominationlists, allied to what may be termed the 'technical impact' of the war, were combining to forward the cause of ecumenical action. "The war", declared the committee, "has revealed deficiencies in the scientific and technical equipment of the nation, and these must be remedied....".63 Instrumental remedies, however, were not to be imposed regardless of values. The Anglican committee in requesting "the co-operation of all friends of religious education" sought assistance in the belief that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom".64 In a conclusion that was designed as a refutation of the secular tendencies of pre-war society, the committee stressed "that the Christian tradition, which has been the priceless heritage of British education" must in the future "be handed down to ... generations of our children with ever increasing reality and power".65

If this somewhat grandiose vision were ever to be brought to fruition a heavy responsibility for its achievement would rest upon the Anglican colleges. Davidson, with memories of pre-war difficulties concerning the management of the colleges still fresh in his mind, was acutely aware in 1916 that the colleges were quite unable to assume any new burdens. As he had done on previous occasions, the Archbishop turned to George Eden, Bishop of Wakefield, to assist him with the task of refurbishing the Church colleges. Ever since Eden had chaired the enquiry into the pre-collegiate religious training of intending teachers
in 1910, he had become recognized as the Church's authority on all aspects of teacher training. Using the "crisis brought about by the war" as his reason, Davidson asked Eden as "a matter of urgency" to lead a Commission of Enquiry to obtain at first hand full and detailed facts (i) as to the training college buildings; (ii) as to their general financial position; (iii) as to their prospects in the matter of future students.

As a major source of "highly detailed information" concerning the Church of England colleges, the Wakefield Report has been curiously neglected by educational historians. This rather strange state of affairs may be regretted not least because the inception and subsequent swift progress of the Commission provide a salutory comment on one impact of the war. Through pleading "the crisis brought on by the war" as making it "absolutely necessary" for the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry, Davidson was able to achieve in months what he had not been able to obtain in a decade before the war. Just as "wartime necessity" was proving under Lloyd George to be "the mother of state control", Davidson used its appeal just as effectively to appoint a handful of chosen experts.

The findings of the commissioners were perturbing. In medical terms, the majority of the colleges proved to be seriously ill and a few were quite clearly at the point of death. This unhappy situation had arisen, stated the Bishop of Wakefield, because "the colleges suffer, as do the Church day schools, from the fact that they were pioneer institutions.... They have to contend today with positive conditions and limitations consequent upon original faults in design...." Mr. Burrows, the consulting architect to the National Society, took up this theme by observing that "the nineteenth century architecture of
the colleges, though imposing, is not always practicable." Burrows substantiated this general observation by detailed references to the deficiencies he detected in the dormitory accommodation and sewerage systems operated by the majority of college authorities. Almost without exception students at Anglican training institutions slept in communal dormitories. These Burrows described as being "formed of wooden partitions about six foot nine inches high arranged on both sides of a central passage and against the outer walls of long dormitories." In such dormitories the arrangements made for heating, lighting and ventilation left much to be desired. At Culham, Burrows noted with concern that "the cubicle windows are very small, giving a glass area of four foot six inches to five square feet, instead of the minimum eight square feet.... Ventilation is not provided except by the windows.... Warming is not provided and is badly needed...." When, as at Culham, the inadequacies of the dormitory accommodation were compounded by deficiencies in sanitation and sewerage, a serious situation became critical. The survey of the Culham site revealed that the well from which the supply of water for the college was drawn was immediately adjacent to "seven unventilated sewerage cesspools situated under the college buildings." The extremely primitive arrangements concerning both accommodation and sanitation at Culham, Carmarthen, Peterborough, Whitelands and Warrington, led the commissioners to state that it was impossible to contemplate their continuation as training colleges after the war unless immediate structural improvements could be undertaken.

The problem, as the committee pointed out, was much larger than remedial action for a handful of colleges. The Bishop of Wakefield candidly admitted that "the dormitory accommodation in nearly all the training colleges is deficient and sometimes seriously deficient in
whole or in part, and in several cases the Board of Education has in fact already intimated that certain of the existing cubicles cannot any longer be recognized. . . . 79 The general replacement and improvement of dormitory accommodation in almost all the Anglican colleges confronted the committee with the problem which had for so long been avoided, namely the provision of finance for major capital works. "In the question of finance", stated the Chairman, "we come undoubtedly to the vital part of the problem which confronts the Church of England in the matter of her training colleges". 80

In attempting to resolve the financial problem, the Wakefield Committee adopted what can now be clearly seen as the bureaucratic option of centralized control:

"It seems clear that the training colleges must more and more be considered as central rather than Diocesan institutions.... Every Diocese should bear an adequate part of the burden of financial support. There should also be thoroughly efficient and well informed central supervision.... In strong and well informed central supervision combined with the full local interest arising from direct local management, probably lies the way of safety for the Church of England colleges....". 81

This strong call for centralized management dominates all the committee's recommendations. Strength and urgency were given to the plea by the commissioners' prediction that the colleges would have difficulty recruiting good students 82 because of their "extremely grave financial position". 83 The Wakefield Report clearly demonstrated that the Anglican colleges were, and had for some time been, under-financed, poorly managed and generally out of date in their methods and practices. In terms of the future the Report left no doubt that the colleges were in no condition physically or intellectually to withstand the pressures of competition which they would again have to confront after the war.
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The completed Report was submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 24 November, 1916. Actually, the timing of the Report rather than its recommendations posed the initial problem. The Church was already reacting strongly to rumours of rampant secularization in state schools and colleges, rumours emanating from the National Society enquiry into the religious training of teachers. Strains from this quarter were added to by unexpected developments following from the National Mission which Davidson had initiated. Under the vigorous leadership of William Temple, the Life and Liberty movement began to press upon the Archbishop and his colleague Cosmo Lang the urgent need for a new relationship between Church and State. These several conflicts were combining to place upon the Archbishop personally, and the Church as a whole, a high degree of stress. An immediate and full publication of the Wakefield Report in such circumstances would have provided further evidence to support Temple’s campaign, a cause which Davidson wished to delay rather than oppose. His Grace’s dilemma was how to use the evidence from the Report to achieve the much needed reformation of the colleges, without too much of the same evidence becoming generally known. Davidson responded in two ways. His first move was to set up a small advisory body, chaired by the Bishop of Wakefield, to advise on the most suitable ways of implementing the recommendations made by the Commission of Enquiry. His second move was, in the prevailing circumstances, extremely astute. He sent private and confidential letters to the chairmen of the governing bodies of Anglican colleges informing them in his own words of the substance of the Wakefield Report. The sting lay in the letter’s concluding paragraph:

"The visitation by the Commission has revealed beyond all possibility of doubt that the position (taking the colleges as a whole) is more serious and indeed
more critical than any of us had supposed....
The colleges should at once become federated under
a small representative Board of Supervision". 99

This final proposition directly challenged the long cherished
pre-war beliefs as to the value and importance of local autonomy in the
management of Anglican colleges. While the weaker institutions were in
no position to resist the Archbishop's initiative, the generally
stronger London-based colleges had little reason to welcome the prospect
of being partly ruled by a centralized, bureaucratic body. In these
circumstances, Fisher, who had struck up a cordial relationship with
Davidson,90 powerfully assisted the Archbishop in his efforts to
centralize the management of the colleges. Fisher was a member of a
cabinet, which as The Manchester Guardian had predicted, "did not shrink
from the state control of any industry vital to the war".91 Living with
the daily evidence of ever increasing collectivism92 and its associated
apparatus of centralized management,93 Fisher could find no reason why
the Church of England colleges should be exempt from such a process.
He therefore let it be known that he would no longer deal with the
Church colleges "as separate institutions"94 and declared at a number of
social occasions where clergy were present that as far as he was
concerned "the Church colleges must be better". Davidson was extremely
grateful for such support and made skilful use of it through correspon-
dence with Fisher, which unlike the Wakefield Report, was immediately
published. "The war", declared the Archbishop in the first of several
letters to Fisher, "has demonstrated in a remarkable and very plain
manner the general advantage accruing to the Church training colleges for
men by the Board of Education arranging to deal with them as one
group....". "Public money", he went on, "has been saved, financial loss
to the members of the college staffs has been averted - and general
efficiency under very adverse conditions has been preserved....".95
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By such an enthusiastic analysis of the benefits accruing to the colleges through the imposition of wartime central management, Davidson made the continuation of such measures appear to be a natural peacetime sequel. On December 4, 1917, representatives from all the Anglican colleges acceded to the Archbishop's wish that "the Church of England training colleges be forthwith federated under a Board of Supervision".96

While the accord achieved by Fisher and Davidson was a factor assisting this positive outcome, it was a minor one compared with the larger financial implications of reorganization. The powers of the newly instituted Board of Supervision were mainly over monetary control and funding,97 the Board having the right to receive all college accounts and estimates in order "that schemes for building should be carried out on well considered lines".98 This latter declaration was vital in securing an acceptance for the scheme. Most delegates voted to relinquish their traditional autonomy because of their financial expectations. Just as Fisher had been promised money for ambitious educational projects, it was confidently expected by college representatives that the Board of Supervision would be the funding body for ambitious schemes of post-war reconstruction. In this manner Fisher and the first members of the new Anglican Board99 became hostages to wartime promises.

However, these latent difficulties were not perceived in 1917. On December 20, Davidson informed Fisher of the inauguration of the Board and sought Board of Education recognition and co-operation.100 The Archbishop's letter was passed to R.G. Mayor of the Board of Education who responded enthusiastically to the prospect of greater Anglican efficiency.101 Fisher therefore found himself in a position where he was able to make a graceful and diplomatic response to
Anglican requests. On the 1 January, 1918, he wrote to Davidson saying, "I have no disposition to underrate the excellence of the work which has been done in the Church of England training colleges, but we know that it has been impaired by the weakness of some of the colleges, and perhaps even the stronger colleges might do better work if they were less isolated...." Ending his letter on an entirely positive note, the President declared, "We shall have no hesitation in entering into working arrangements with the Board of Supervision". 102

Roger Lloyd in his analysis of the role played by the Anglican Church during the First World War makes the comment, "No war is good for religion, and that war was desperately bad for it". 103 In the long term Lloyd's judgment was undoubtedly correct. Anglicans, along with other denominationalists, were to reap a bitter harvest as a result of the disillusionment that came to characterize post-war society. 104 In the short term, however, his judgment may be challenged. Agreements between Davidson and Fisher, reached under the pressures of wartime necessity, saved the Anglican colleges. The same pressures spurred the Church as a whole to re-think its position and to begin a "period of self-examination, self-criticism and ... reform". 105 By the last two years of the war, Anglican authorities were responding to wartime pressures in a positive and constructive fashion. 106

Other denominationalists were less certain in their reactions. This is evident in the uneven pattern of response among non-conformists. Radical dissenters never forgave Asquith for his temporizing attitude to passive resisters, 107 and Methodists, during the course of the war, began to exhibit tendencies that were to become common during the inter-war years. Indeed, wartime Methodist policy could well be summarized by the slogan, 'onward but backward'. Although Wesleyans gave a cordial welcome
to the Fisher proposal, their aspirations were grounded on their vision of a pre-war golden era, which they wished to re-create as quickly as possible. This mood can be seen in the Methodist desire to revive the pupil teacher system rather than to expand their training colleges. In 1917, the Wesleyan Education Committee, looking forward to the end of the war, foretold "a revival on a large scale of the best features of the old pupil teacher system". Such a revival, it hoped, would enable head teachers "to experience again the joy of their predecessors of a past generation, in preparing candidates for the teaching profession". Concluding on a note of nostalgia the members of the committee claimed that "the intimacy that in those days existed between teachers and pupils was in the highest sense beneficial....".

It is possible to discern in this somewhat curious Methodist reaction a number of interrelated factors. The desire to return to pre-war conditions may have been prompted by an awareness on the part of Wesleyans of the decline of non-conformity and liberalism, a decline traced by T. Wilson in his book, *The Downfall of the Liberal Party - 1914-1935*. But the Methodist reaction can also be seen as a decisive rejection of the collectivist policies being imposed by the Lloyd George administration. In a sense Anglicans and Methodists at this time were moving in opposite directions. As Anglicans came to accept the central control and direction of their colleges, Methodists reasserted the need for values and personal contact to be pre-eminent in the preparation of teachers. Such objectives were in danger of being lost in the tide of collectivist opinion that began to flow following Lloyd George's assumption of power, and is one reason why the Prime Minister increasingly alienated elements of non-conformist opinion.

The Methodist desire in the midst of uncertainty to return to fundamental principles, had for a long time been a feature of Catholic
policy. In the turmoil of war the Catholic Hierarchy reasserted traditional Catholic beliefs with, for teacher training, disastrous results. It has often been observed that the only alternative to evolution is revolution. During the First World War the determination of the Hierarchy to maintain a rigid denominational teacher training policy provoked unprecedented outbursts of opposition from sections of the Catholic laity. Difficulties within the colleges became acute in 1917. All were suffering from the sharp rise in the cost of living and the various national shortages.\textsuperscript{113}

Both shortages of food and repressive discipline seem to have contributed to a student revolt at St. Mary's College, Hammersmith. St. Mary's, like many Catholic colleges, recruited a high proportion of its students from Ireland. The Governors were called upon to investigate "allegations that a section of the students had considerable sympathy with the movement which had led up to the disturbances in Ireland, and had shown their sympathy by wearing badges or giving expression to their feelings".\textsuperscript{114} This last phrase euphemistically concealed a local newspaper's allegation that students had been seen throwing desks through college windows.\textsuperscript{115} The Governors flatly denied the allegations and altogether the incident seems to have been a murky affair. In a narrowly technical sense the Governors were right. There had been no overt political demonstration. However, their statement failed to mention student grievances concerning food and discipline within the college.\textsuperscript{116}

Unrest at St. Mary's was a symptom of wider conflicts. A major cause of dissension was the increasing number of Catholic students attending university day training colleges, especially in the London area. There were sharp differences between those Catholics who wished
to come to terms with the reality of the situation and make available religious instruction to such students, and traditionalists, who abhorred their disobedience in attending such places. A full-scale row was provoked by a motion put forward at the Catholic Education Council meeting in 1917 stating that "in view of the impossibility during the war of obtaining any alteration in the Board of Education regulations which prevent the provision of any more places in Catholic training colleges, the Council cannot advise their Lordships the Bishops to refuse to allow religious instruction to be given in undenominational day and residential colleges as a temporary measure." The tabling of the motion led to "an animated discussion ... in the course of which the powers of the Executive in regard to such matters were questioned". The Executive Committee asked to reconsider the resolution, and it was killed stone dead by an announcement from the Hierarchy that they would refuse to consider it if it were presented to them.

By adopting such tactics, Catholic authorities could negate but not entirely stifle unwelcome internal criticism. This position became much more difficult when, as with Fisher's proposals for reform, contentious issues moved on to a national platform and traditional Catholic loyalty to a common policy became a political necessity. Catholic authorities were almost alone in not welcoming Fisher's schemes for post-war educational reconstruction. Their guarded approach to such plans was signified by the appointment of "a watching committee" to follow the 1918 Bill through its various legislative stages. The specific task of the committee was "to propose appropriate amendments" reflecting Catholic policy. Unfortunately, despite his careful consultations with Catholic authorities Fisher never achieved with them the warm and positive relationships which he forged with Anglican leaders. The causes of this mutual coolness were complex in origin,
some of the difficulties arising from issues not immediately related to the passage of the Bill.

Highly centralized in their own management, Catholics did not share the fears of non-conformists and some Anglicans regarding the obvious increase in the bureaucratization of government. Secularization, on the other hand, they viewed as a much more serious evil, but Cardinal Manning had long ago alerted them to its dangers. The evidence of its existence and growth during the war did not strike them with the same novelty and force that it did Anglicans at this time. It therefore appears that a series of small incidents, often personal in origin and cumulative in effect, served to sour relationships between the Board of Education and the Catholic Hierarchy during the period 1917-1922.

The trail of such incidents may be traced back to the time of Fisher's appointment. Well known for his Liberal views and because of his admiration for Asquith, he had hesitated before accepting a post in the Lloyd George administration. Neither his background nor his views, therefore, initially commended him to the Catholic Hierarchy. Smouldering doubts were fanned into resentful flames by Fisher's quick successes in his negotiations with other denominational bodies. Catholic Bishops found it particularly galling to have the example of Anglican good behaviour thrust before them as a model and a pattern.

Selby-Bigge, the Permanent Secretary at the Board of Education, wrote rather tactlessly to Mr. Anderton, Secretary of the Catholic Education Council, on the 29 April, 1919, commending the scheme of federation adopted by the Church of England for its colleges, and going on to say that "The Anglicans are really taking steps to put their training college system in order.... Their difficulties are great and I daresay that yours are greater, but you have got to face them, and a policy of
inaction or delay is bound to bring disaster".  

The last reference was not mere rhetoric. Catholic hostility to Fisher was in part an outcome of what was perceived as a concentrated attack by his officials on the position of the Catholic colleges. In 1919, R.G. Mayor was asked to conduct on behalf of the Board of Education a survey of the Catholic training institutions. A flurry of inspections took place, resulting in a shocked Catholic Hierarchy being informed that the colleges at Hull, Southampton and Birmingham would have to be closed unless there were immediate improvements in staffing and buildings. The brusque approach adopted by the Department was dictated by the dismay felt by its permanent officials at finding out how bad conditions in some Catholic colleges really were. For their part, Catholic sensibilities were wounded by very pointed Board criticism of the work of the nuns and their teaching orders. Although H.M.I.'s reported that most nuns were "interested in their work", they went on to state that "the young sisters are very under-developed ... their minds and natures being like those of children". This was the crux of the problem at La Sainte Union where, stated the inspector, "the whole difficulty is traceable to the powerlessness of the order to produce women of culture, of educational experience and of finely balanced character....". Even the better colleges were, in the estimation of the Department, hampered by enclosed orders of nuns running institutions where the rules imposed "are more appropriate for convents than colleges".

The directness and frequency of official criticism concerning Catholic institutions by exposing internal difficulties within the Catholic body only served to increase the determination of the Hierarchy to hold the line. Harried by Selby-Bigge, Anderton of the Catholic
Education Council confirmed that he was powerless to institute reform in some of the colleges because their teaching orders took their instructions from Rome and not from the Council. When a meeting between the Board of Education and the Council was finally convened on the 15 July, 1919, Mgr. W.F. Brown was forced to concede that the Diocesan organization had broken down.

Continually being forced on to the defensive was not a position welcomed by Catholics and, predictably, in March 1920 all the difficulties and tensions came to a head. Fisher, his own position becoming more difficult as post-war economic problems began to intensify, made a bid for general public support for his efforts to settle finally "the denominational problem in English education. The Times on the 29 March published a statement from the President of the Board outlining his proposals for a religious and educational settlement. The most contentious of these concerned Fisher's desire to see non-sectarian religious instruction given in state schools by qualified teachers. Without actually stating so, the President's insistence on religious instruction falling within the normal duties of a class teacher meant, by implication, that he rejected the idea that such teaching fell within the special province of the priest. Here, with a vengeance, was evidence of incipient secularization and the Catholic Hierarchy published a crushing rejoinder to Fisher's statement. The Tablet on the 22 May, 1920, informed its readers that "If put into effect these alterations in the law would in most cases result in the disappearance from Catholic schools of the definite and systematic religious instruction now given in them by their skilled and trusted teachers....". Just as Anglicans and Wesleyans were moving away from each other over the question of bureaucratization, Catholics and Anglicans at this time were dividing over the issue of secularization. Precisely at the moment
when the Archbishop of Canterbury seriously began to contemplate parting with the Anglican schools, the Catholic Education Council declared, "No settlement of the education question can be achieved by Catholics which takes away from Catholic parents the right to have for their children Catholic schools in which the teachers shall be Catholic and who shall give definite religious instruction under Catholic control". In short, despite all the Board pressure, Catholic policy concerning its schools and colleges had neither been amended nor modified.

Some of the permanent officials at the Board of Education were secretly not displeased at the evident discomfiture of their President at the hands of the Catholic authorities. In preparing his Education Bill, Fisher had sought their opinions as to the form it should take. Their recommendations illustrate a sharp division of opinion on the virtues of collectivist policies administered through increasingly centralized agencies. Selby-Bigge, the Permanent Secretary, was the embodiment of "a tradition of enlightened bureaucracy, many of whose servants, on grounds of efficiency alone, were not adverse to seeing it further extended". The Secretary, who already looked upon the Morant era as something of a golden age, was strongly in favour of the rapid extension of "systematization". Selby-Bigge's views were supported by H.M.I. Barker who declared himself in favour of "a concentration of the various branches of the Board" in order to enable it to play a more "interventionist" role. Barker, in fact, argued that the Fisher proposals did not go far enough. He regretted that the Bill did not envisage the "reform of the training colleges". "The ultimate success of the ideas underlying the Bill", he stated, "to a very large extent depend on the types of teachers the training colleges produce".

Baker's views, when circulated among colleagues, brought critical responses which, in different ways, reveal that wartime collectivism
had come too quickly to be universally admired. H.M.I. Boothroyd told his colleague, "You underestimate the psychological factor of the intense fear of too much bureaucratic control", in a word, "Prussianism". Boothroyd was not so much opposed to interventionist policies as worried by the reaction they were likely to provoke. "The Board must take the initiative", he said, "but it must proceed with stealth".143

In contrast to Boothroyd's pragmatic acceptance of the need for some interventionist policies, H.M.I. Irvine uncompromisingly rejected all aspects of collectivism and its attendant bureaucracies. "The Bill", he declared, "is a German Bill and though we have been fighting for freedom there is little or no trace of the ideal of freedom in it....". Setting his face against compulsions of any kind, Irvine flatly asserted, "Compulsory education in England has been a failure". "If it had been a success", he went on, "continuation schools would not be necessary since every parent would realize the value of school....".144 Perhaps the real significance of Irvine's evidence is the date on which it was submitted - the 5 April, 1917. His evidence, embodying as it does the authentic voice of laissez-faire, suggests that such views were alive and well in some quarters of Government, even at this late stage of the war. Irvine's evidence to Fisher constituted a warning to him and his Secretary, Selby-Bigge, that they could not rely on the whole-hearted support of the inspectorate in carrying out the "enlightened bureaucratic policies"145 which each was so ardently pursuing in 1918. Both ignored the warning and both were subsequently to regret having done so.

Not unnaturally most military accounts of the First World War end with the Armistice. Although the 11 November, 1918, marks the end of the actual fighting, it has little relevance in a study which attempts to analyse the social and economic consequences of the war. As both
John Terraine and Arthur Marwick make clear in their respective accounts, a "war spirit" lingered on for a further two or three years. The immediate manifestations of such a spirit within post-war Britain imposed upon politicians a peculiar context in which they had to set about shaping the future. Initial consequences of demobilization seemed to favour a continuation of wartime plans for domestic reform. Two days before the dissolution of the wartime Parliament, Lloyd George undoubtedly caught the prevailing public mood when, in reply to his own question, "What is our task?", he declaimed: "To make Britain a fit country for heroes to live in".

To fulfil this task, the Prime Minister renounced old party allegiances and decided to fight an immediate election "in concert with his allies in the wartime coalition". Although Lloyd George saw a bi-partisan approach to reform as holding out the prospect of immediate and substantial gains, he miscalculated the strength of antagonism felt in Britain for everything associated with Germany. As the short election campaign progressed, the declaration concerning "better social conditions for the people of Britain" quickly became submerged in a wave of anti-Prussianism in which "hanging the Kaiser" and "making them pay" were the predominant themes. Lloyd George's subsequent overwhelming electoral victory has been described by Marwick as being "the most critical, and certainly in the Parliament it produced, the most unfortunate result in Britain's modern history". In substantiating his claim, Marwick points to the way the 1918 election made the Prime Minister a prisoner of the Conservative majority and imposed that same majority upon Britain throughout the inter-war years.

Having successfully concluded the war and won a decisive victory at the polls, Lloyd George could hardly have felt himself a prisoner in
1918. Yet enlightenment as to his true position was not long in coming. For all his prestige the Prime Minister was a man without a party. Once the excesses of wartime hatred had vented themselves, the overwhelming desire of the people was for normality, which they associated with pre-war conditions and, in many cases, with pre-war policies. The desire for innovation began to ebb. A symptom of the change was the dismissal of Christopher Addison. Addison, like Fisher, was a minister in the coalition government intent on pursuing enlightened bureaucratic policies, many of which had elements of obvious Socialism. As Minister of Health, Addison had proved troublesome because of his insistence on the need for social equality. When the same preoccupations made him objectionable during his leadership of the post-war housing programme, Lloyd George (without a great deal of compunction) offered him as a sacrifice to his Conservative critics.153

Fisher seems not to have heeded the warning clearly evident in Addison's dismissal, namely that conditions were changing. Despite the fact that he was slipping more and more under the influence of his permanent officials, being especially attentive to the advice of his Secretary, Selby-Bigge, the President of the Board of Education was in 1920 still determined to achieve substantial measures of educational reform. H.M.I. Barker's warning to him that "the ultimate success of the ideas underlying" the 1918 Bill, "depend on the types of teachers the training colleges produce" seems to have tugged at his memory. His first inclination was for a full-scale Committee of Enquiry into all aspects of teacher training. Selby-Bigge, who was becoming alarmed at the extent of Labour demands and wished to offer no further hostages to fortune, persuaded him to appoint an office committee on grounds of confidentiality and the elimination of unnecessary expense. Accepting
his Secretary's arguments, Fisher asked R.G. Mayor to lead a small committee\textsuperscript{157} "to consider and advise the Board confidentially as to a scheme or alternative schemes for placing the system of training colleges (whether provided by Local Education Authority or by voluntary bodies or universities) on a sound basis in respect of both finance and organization".\textsuperscript{158}

Mayor was optimistic about the financial prospects of both the universities and the Local Education Authority colleges. The university institutions had prospered under the umbrella of the university grants system and the Local Education Authority colleges could turn to rate support for any substantial expansion. Mayor and his colleagues, however, were as one in agreeing that the voluntary colleges were in the deepest trouble. "The difficulties of the voluntary training colleges", Mayor said, "are the greatest because, first, they are practically all residential colleges and therefore find the rise in the cost of living more difficult to cope with than day training colleges and, secondly, because they have no resources of public money other than the Board's grants on which to draw and they find it difficult to obtain increased funds from any other sources....". Because his evidence was confidential, Mayor allowed himself a degree of frankness which is frequently absent from other H.M.I. reports. Noting that the Local Education Authority colleges were spending, on average, ten per cent more per student per annum than were the voluntary colleges, he declared this resulted from denominational authorities consistently "sacrificing efficiency to economy". "Because they have no further resources to draw upon", he stated, "they have felt themselves compelled to confine themselves to bare necessities, even at the expense of efficiency". In a detailed statistical analysis, Mayor went on to demonstrate that, despite a two hundred per cent rise since 1914 in
Anglican financial support for its colleges, the Church of England was still only just paying half the total cost entailed in the running and maintenance of its colleges. In the case of other denominational training institutions Mayor felt that the sums of money donated for their upkeep was often "derisory" in amount considering "the state has for many years contributed by far the larger part of the cost of maintaining these places and the financial obligations resting on their local governing bodies have been small....".

The problem was easier to state than to solve. However, some solutions had to be forwarded if for no other reason than because Fisher, in shrewdly anticipating the likely difficulties, had particularly requested the committee to advise him as to "the political difficulties of including denominational voluntary colleges in the same system as undenominational training colleges provided by L.E.A.'s". Finned down by such explicit terms of reference, Mayor was at least grateful for the shield of confidentiality which allowed him to explore options which could not otherwise have been openly discussed. One radical solution to the problem not customarily referred to in public statements from the Board was the complete takeover by the state of all the voluntary colleges. Mayor examined this course of action very seriously. Examining "centralized" and "semi-centralized" systems of control, the committee chairman thought that while wartime practice had opened up the possibility of direct rule of the colleges from Whitehall, post-war financial problems were making such a solution impossible. In a candid appraisal of the immediate situation which was ominously prophetic of much that was to follow, Mayor stated that "any solution which would involve the taking over of the entire cost of training by the state would hardly commend itself to the Treasury at the present time". The Treasury veto was, in the opinion of the committee, decisive. Only when
this had been examined did they offer the collective view that in the
light of "public opinion as it is and is likely to be" any "direct control
of the denominational institutions" by the state seemed "out of the
question". The centralized management of all the colleges, a development
which would have been the logical extension of wartime practice, was thus
halted by measures of economic retrenchment reinforced by allegedly
hostile public opinion. It was a solution not to be seriously considered
again by the Board throughout the inter-war years.

Once the radical solution had been shelved, Mayor found himself
faced with fewer options and even more constraints. He wrestled and
agonized over a complex matrix of factors, not the least being the
ambivalence of public attitude to the further bureaucratization of
Government. He stated, "There is the view not uncommonly put forward ...
that the work of the training colleges should be regarded altogether
as a national service and financed entirely from national funds".165

Any solutions along these lines were halted by a stiff memorandum from
the Treasury informing the committee that "Any solution consistent with
the retention of the present system of management" of the training
institutions "should have regard to economy in the expedition of public
funds".166 Following this warning from the Treasury, one committee
member aptly commented that it was clearly now a case of "turning water
into wine [producing] improvements and reform without the pain of
having to pay for them".

The inability of the committee to secure any substantial
Treasury funding led Mayor and his colleagues to indulge in a number of
squalid and rather devious exercises. The first calculation concerned
how little the voluntary colleges could receive and yet survive, a
calculation which included estimating how much money could be squeezed
from the pockets of students and their parents. On the basis that "the better class of person" would be able to pay more, the committee recommended increasing fees to thirty or forty pounds a year. This was the only long-term solution offered by the committee. Mayor confessed, "We have fixed the rates of grant which we recommend at the lowest possible figures which seem to us sufficient to enable the colleges to carry on their work with reasonable efficiency, because we realize the urgent need for economy of public funds at the present moment....". As if to further placate Treasury opinion (which like the Daily Mail seems at this time to have come to rate Fisher as "one of the worst spending ministers") Mayor continued, "We think it desirable to emphasize the fact that the temporary increase of grant proposed is only designed as a provisional measure of assistance pending the increase in fees which we recognize as a permanent policy". As Mayor was honest enough to admit, such parsimony did have its dangers. "A small miscalculation", he estimated, would mean "that many of the training colleges would close altogether" and this, he added, would be serious in the light of the "demand for places already exceeding supply". With this note of warning, the committee members signed the report and forwarded it to Fisher.

The President of the Board immediately passed a copy to his Parliamentary Private Secretary asking in an attached note for his reaction to the report in terms of "purely political considerations". His Secretary wrote back, "Politically I think it is likely to be much less troublesome if the balance of any settlement is in favour of the voluntary colleges than if the balance were in favour of the L.E.A. colleges. A system which made it more difficult for the voluntary colleges to get students than for L.E.A. colleges would lead to a great
outcry..." Fisher agreed. "We cannot possibly do without the voluntary colleges", he wrote, "and the pressure that would be brought to bear upon us to keep them going would be very great". Just as Fisher was preparing to use all his efforts to strain the already meagre recommendations of the report in favour of the voluntary colleges, the National Union of Teachers intervened. Forewarned of likely developments the Executive Committee of the Union wrote to the President to register their strong objection to any policy which placed "public duties at the whim of private interests". Earlier Fisher might have contested such a blatant act of political intimidation. However, under attack from the Treasury, pilloried in the popular press, and beginning to think of resignation, he gave in. His capitulation ended any hopes of achieving a more efficient and equitable system of financing and managing the voluntary colleges.

After repeated pleas from the Anglican authorities for greater financial assistance for their colleges, Fisher was left the unpleasant task of personally informing the Bishop of Wakefield that no such finance would be available. On the 16 March, 1921, Fisher and Mayor met the Bishop of Wakefield and the Secretary of the National Society, R. Holland. The results of the Board's private report on the colleges were made explicit at this meeting. Although eventually there would be "some increase" in Treasury tuition grants, stated Fisher, the Anglican colleges could only hope to improve their financial position through "increasing fees" and "encouraging more donations from old students and their associations". Fisher was left no alternative but to make a plea for self-help, because no other assistance could be offered. In a sense, the wheel had come full circle. Self-help was a pre-war policy now being applied to a post-war problem. The immediate cause of its
resurrection was the mood of disenchantment that was sweeping the country, a mood in which policies associated with collectivism and interventionism perished with disconcerting speed. In such conditions bureaucratization slowed down and made only covert progress while, on the other hand, disillusionment proved to be the perfect medium for the rapid growth of secularism.

In truncated form these judgments indicate the position that had been reached in 1920. A more comprehensive summary of the evidence used in this chapter may be helpful both to substantiate the analysis posited and to underline the extent to which the Great War proved to be a watershed in the development of the voluntary colleges. The very marked spread of secular attitudes throughout all sections of English society proved to be one of the most significant legacies of the war, a legacy resulting from the fusion of a number of factors. During the period 1914-18 a whole generation of political figures, many destined to hold high office during the inter-war years, lost their faith as a result of wartime bereavements. Bonar Law shunned religion after the death in action of his sons during the abortive campaigns of 1917. Neville Chamberlain was so deeply affected by the death of his cousin, Norman, that he deserted formal religion and came close to holding outright pacifist beliefs. As post-war abhorrence of the mud, squalor and brutality of the Western Front grew, Lloyd George suffered a similar revulsion of feeling to that which overcame Chamberlain and Baldwin, an experience which confirmed his already considerable hatred of the military establishment. Even Baldwin, the only inter-war Prime Minister to remain a convinced Christian, was, like the party he led, "no longer certain about the forms and institutions" of religion.

The doubts of inter-war leaders reflected the attitude and mood of the great mass of people they led. Within two years of the Armistice,
a pattern of "widespread religious non-observance" in England and Wales was obvious. This rejection of religion was in part a reaction to faith having become during the war too closely associated with slaughter. Although initially it was customary for many recruits to take Holy Communion before "going over the top", as the war progressed more and more veterans declined to do so. Shortly before he died, one such man wrote home, "Any faith in religion I ever had is most frightfully shaken by the things I've seen". As the Bishop of Winchester found during the course of his enquiry into "the state of religion in the army", widespread indifference on the part of soldiers to the claims of Christianity was hardening by the end of the war into a mood of decided hostility. The English poet, J.C. Squire, caught some of this feeling by encapsulating in a short, and slightly profane, little verse the substance of a much more vulgar trench song:

God heard the embattled nations sing and shout:
'Gott strafe, England' - 'God save the King'
'God this' - 'God that' - and 'God the other thing'
'My God' said God, 'I've got my work cut out'  

Many ordinary soldiers returning to England in 1918 brought with them a good measure of the antipathy to religion portrayed in Squire's poem, although such feelings were often not consciously acknowledged. While their leaders went through well documented crises of intellectual doubt and despair, the enlisted men experienced more down to earth reactions. One wrote, "I hope this bloody war is going to end soon" and when it does there will be an end "to all the bloody fancy things we're supposed to be fighting for". Religious values, along with patriotism, was one of the "fancy things". When such men joined the ranks of the trade unions, they carried their antipathies with them. The widespread indifference to religion was evident in the equally widespread pattern of post-war religious non-observance. Outright
hostility to religion, on the other hand, found its expression in the militantly secularist attitudes and policies adopted by trade unions in the same period.

The National Union of Teachers was only one of the many unions that swiftly assimilated the secular attitudes of many of its returning members. Secularist views had always played a part in the formulation of union policy but, as in so many other things, the war accelerated the progress of such sentiments and gave them a new cutting edge. The National Union of Teacher's warning to Fisher regarding its objection to any policy of "placing public duties at the whim of private interests" was prophetic of the pattern which events were to follow in the ensuing years. Selby-Bigge's fears regarding the ambitions of Labour were realized in the inter-war contest between the Board of Education and the National Union of Teachers and Trades Union Congress. In such a contest, denominationalists found themselves increasingly relegated to the position of an unequal third party, disliked by trade unionists, tolerated but not liked by Board officials. In a nutshell, the denominational colleges, like the churches, found themselves operating in a hostile climate.

Their position might not have been rendered quite so intolerable had it not been for the meteoric rise and fall of policies associated with the bureaucratization of government. In the early war years policies of collectivism and their appropriate bureaucratic control mechanisms hung fire until gradually both became accepted as necessary measures in order to achieve victory. Lloyd George "with his passion for getting things done" after his accession to power in 1916 piled "departments, controllers and committees ... on top of each other". As E. Halévy observed, "Étatsisme" became the spirit of the age.
Such a spirit played a vital part in saving the Anglican colleges and
strengthening the management of other denominational institutions.
The creation of the Board of Supervision, a measure largely brought about
by the skilful co-operation of Davidson and Fisher, finally ended the
debilitating financial and managerial isolation of the Church of England
colleges. Ironically, the phase of bureaucratic enlightenment lasted
just long enough to save the training institutions but not long enough
to bring them positive benefits. Mayor's confidential report shows only
too plainly the post-war fate of interventionism.

It is tempting to offer a relatively simple explanation for the
sudden death of collectivism. Economic retrenchment, the growing
popular desire for a return to normality and Lloyd George's personal
association with such policies, were undoubtedly factors which played
a part in ending the wartime consensus in favour of interventionism.
However, the total explanation is a little more subtle and concerns in
part the Englishman's peculiar reaction to the word "bureaucracy".
In the preface to this study it was stated that an attempt would be made
to distinguish between the pejorative and sociological meanings of the
word 'bureaucracy' and the term 'bureaucratization'. Unfortunately,
during the period described it is peculiarly difficult to distinguish
or disentangle the two. It was the fate of what Marwick describes as
"enlightened bureaucratic policies" to become fatally enmeshed in
what H.M.I. Boothroyd had described as "Prussianism". Once the word
'bureaucracy' became synonymous with 'Prussianism', the degree of anti-
German feeling present in post-war England was bound to kill anything
associated with the word. Paradoxically, therefore, it was the fate of
the voluntary colleges to erect for themselves bureaucratic (in a non-
pejorative sense) systems of control, only to see such systems wither
into bureaucratic (in a pejorative sense) impedimenta. Bereft of the
financial aid promised to them during the war, both the Board of
Supervision and the Board of Education regressed in the immediate post-
war years into conducting narrow bureaucratic activities sadly lacking
enlightenment. Selby-Bigge referred to such policies as
"systematization". Ominously, the members of the Board of Supervision
began to refer to them as "measures of concentration".

The sharp contrast in the relative positions of the voluntary
colleges and their competitors in 1920 is revealed in two small
eamples. At the University of Reading Day Training College it had been
customary up until 1914 to include in the university prospectus the
following clause: "Preference, subject to the maintenance of a due
standard of admission, will be given to candidates who have resided,
or whose parents or guardians have resided, within the administrative
County Borough of Reading". No such clause appeared after the war
because, with the aid of the university grants system, the university was
marching forward to a national as opposed to a local position. Its
Chancellor, W.M. Childs, clearly enunciated this policy declaring,
"In our view an institution doing the work of a university should be
free and independent ... it should be free to develop along its own
lines....".

In contrast, the voluntary colleges had just managed to survive
the war but had won neither academic nor financial freedom. Students
returning to King Alfred's College, Winchester, decided that their first
task was to erect a memorial "to those who made the supreme sacrifice
during the war". The memorial consisted of oak panelling round the
lower portion of the interior walls of the chapel, the names of the
fallen to be incised on the frieze. Neither the students nor the
carpenter appear to have realized the appalling numbers of those who
had died. Extra panels had to be erected and sadly there was not enough money to pay for the carving. Students, staff and the Bishop of Winchester all joined to raise the extra funds required. In retrospect, it is difficult not to believe that such students, and the colleges that they attended, had not deserved a measure of the more generous treatment afforded to their university rivals.
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The Liberal Government fell in the spring of 1915 and was immediately replaced by a Coalition Government of Liberals and Conservatives led by H.H. Asquith. Beaverbrook (like Kekewich) is not always a reliable witness but nevertheless provides a notably dramatic account of the fall of the last Liberal Government, an account which needs to be set against alternative sources.
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In addition to this, Fisher declared himself in favour of increased powers being given to local education authorities. Specifically, he stated that the rights of managers in voluntary schools "to select, appoint, promote and dismiss teachers" should be withdrawn and placed in the hands of the local authorities.
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"There is a danger that the Labour Party may take the opportunity to renew their demands for free secondary education ... involving the state in an expenditure to which it would be hard to put any limits".


The Committee was composed of R.G. Mayor, Chairman, Mr. E.K. Chambers, Mr. E. Salter-Davies, Mr. J.H. Hallam, Mr. J.G. Milne, Mr. R.V. Vernon and the Secretary, Mr. H.E. Mann.
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3. Voluntary denominational colleges, numbering forty-eight in England and Wales, offering two-year teacher training courses. Of these colleges, thirty were owned by the Church of England and came under the management of the Board of Supervision. Eight were owned by the Roman Catholics who entrusted their management to the individual teaching orders and the Catholic Education Council. Four were owned by the British and Foreign School Society and four were undenominational but independent.
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"All the training colleges in the country are finding great difficulty in maintaining their existence. I am told that some of the municipal training colleges have actually closed, but we are making a great effort to maintain the Church training colleges. But that involves a payment of fifteen thousand pounds a year at least from the Central Church Fund. Do not suppose that this is all that is required to keep training colleges on their feet and in a state of efficiency. It merely represents all that the Central Board of Finance can at the moment
possibly afford....".

161 "We have discussed this matter with Mr. Holland, Secretary of the Board of Supervision of the Church of England colleges.... We are informed by him that great efforts have been made during the last two to three years to raise money for these colleges. An annual subsidy of fifteen thousand pounds is now contributed to their support from the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England; and other contributions received from the National Society, from Boards and from private subscribers, amount to about ten thousand pounds annually. The total contributions made to the Church of England colleges by their supporters amounted to twenty-four thousand, eight hundred pounds, or six pounds five shillings per student for 1919-20, as compared with eight thousand two hundred and seventy-seven pounds, or two pounds nineteen shillings per head in 1913-14. This represents an increase of two hundred per cent....".
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On the 9 February, 1921, the Bishop of Wakefield wrote to R.G. Mayor at the Board of Education: "I am desired by the Board of Supervision to press upon your notice the extremely grave financial position in which the Church of England training colleges, in common with other training colleges, find themselves at the present juncture. The broadsheets which I enclose with this letter contain estimates of receipts and expenditure for the current year which ends on the 31 July, 1921... You will observe that all the colleges save two will have serious overdrafts at the end of the current year.... The aggregate of overdrafts at the end of the year as shown on the sheets would not be less than ninety-six thousand pounds. Against this figure there is to be set only the central fund which the Board of Supervision and the National Society will administer, amounting altogether to something like nineteen thousand pounds. The financing of overdrafts, with the consequent heavy charges for interest, are straining the resources of the training colleges to the utmost. I fear that unless relief in the shape of greatly increased grants from the state comes during the current year, it will be impossible for the Board of Supervision to prevent many of the colleges closing down....".
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Perceiving just such a backlash against religion, Davidson had resolutely refused to become too closely associated with what he termed "the jingoistic aspects of the war". EDWARDS, D.L. (1978), Leaders of the Church of England 1828-1978; p. 255. Some of his colleagues, including his successor, Cosmo Lang, were less discreet "and threw themselves whole-heartedly into recruiting campaigns". LOCKHART, Op. cit. p. 248. Cosmo Lang and the Church he was to lead paid a heavy price for such activities in the post-war years.

Selby-Bigge seems to have imposed upon Fisher, to a considerable extent, his own estimation of this situation. Fisher "who had always been readier to consult and discuss with the Labour movement than most of his colleagues" was thereby placed in an impossible position, distrusted by both right and left wing political elements.


"The death of non-conformity and Liberalism, both casualties of the war, fatally weakened the strength of the denominationalist position".


Baldwin's devastating repudiation of Lloyd George at the Carlton Club meeting not only ended the life of the Coalition Government but signalled an end of Conservative support for "the dynamic policies" associated with the wartime Premier.
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Abstract of Thesis

This thesis examines the development of teacher training in England and Wales from 1890 to 1944, with an emphasis upon the evolution of the denominational colleges during this period. The major hypothesis proposed is that attempts by staff working in church-related institutions to achieve academic autonomy, status and recognition failed as a result of the increasing bureaucratization and secularization of English society during the twentieth century. It is argued that in striving for greater instrumental efficiency the denominations bureaucratized their colleges, and in so doing, hastened their secularization. The cumulative effect of these processes upon the denominational colleges undermined their autonomy, thereby preparing the way for their extensive closure and reorganization in 1977 by a government intent on achieving a centralized and accountable system of higher education.

The foregoing represents the theoretical framework of the study. Within this context, chapter one provides a contextual review of the forces promoting the secularization and bureaucratization of English society at the end of the nineteenth century. The study then moves towards a consideration of how both processes were dramatically extended by the revolution in government brought about by the First World War. The second part of the thesis deals with the inter-war period, examining the decline and academic isolation of the denominational colleges during a time of almost continuous economic recession. The final chapter analyses how the denominational colleges, recovering during the Second World War, were then crippled by the rapid secularization, bureaucratization and laïcization of English society during the 1960s. The thesis concludes by examining contemporary difficulties facing denominational authorities, particularly the problem of defining a role and purpose for denominational teacher training institutions within, what is claimed to be, a secular, pluralistic society.
CHAPTER 7

The Nondescript Years

In the aftermath of the war the syncopated rhythms of the Charleston and the Black Bottom swept the country and flappers, symbols of the new decade - the roaring twenties - squealed and kicked. One of the most popular tunes was "Let's Do It" and "doing it" meant to "Dance, Make love, Sing, Laugh, Make money, Lose money, Drink, Fly, Smash something, Spit on the carpet". At first such behaviour was restricted to the young but soon it manifested itself in much wider social circles. In retrospect, it seems clear that the infatuation with parties, dancing and the pursuit of pleasure represented a psychological release from too much acquaintance with death.

Surprisingly, frantic social gaiety went hand in hand with a desire for political tranquillity. In 1922 popular support for the wartime Coalition Government led by Lloyd George began to crumble, largely because of the Prime Minister's pursuit of what Roy Jenkins describes as "a stubbornly adventurous foreign policy in Asia Minor". Bonar Law, the Conservative leader, shrewdly assessing the drift of public opinion, "presented his team to the country under the watchword of tranquillity". Violet Asquith, in one of the few memorable phrases of a dull election campaign, said, "We are asked to choose between one man suffering from sleeping-sickness and another from St. Vitus's dance". The British electorate chose sleeping-sickness, forgetfulness and tranquillity, a choice which they continued to reaffirm during the inter-war years.

Stanley Baldwin (Bonar Law's successor) epitomized the values of passivity, using to disguise his highly complex and sensitive
personality the façade of an English country gentleman. When photographed gently poking pigs with his walking stick, Baldwin presented himself to the electorate as the embodiment of pre-war stability, a stability associated with rural England. Through projecting an image of deceptive simplicity, Baldwin responded to the wishes of the 'silent majority' who profoundly desired political calm. Yet this calm was superficial. Baldwin's extended periods as Prime Minister were accompanied by outbreaks of acute political unrest and aggressive attacks by trade unionists on the very pre-war social standards which he so lovingly preserved.

The churches, like Baldwin, were targets for such attacks because they represented the kind of entrenched influence to which trade unionists objected. Unionists in fact voiced their objections with a strident militancy which would have shocked pre-war English society. This outspokenness is one factor indicating the profound differences between pre-first war and post-first war British society. Such change is reflected in the format of this thesis. In the first part the overriding concern has been to define the concepts of secularization and bureaucratization and analyse their progress in what has been described as "the last years of faith". Although the appropriateness of this latter statement is open to all kinds of criticism, it does identify the feeling that official sentiment at least was still largely favourable to religion and faith in Edwardian England. No such consensus existed in post-war Britain; on the contrary, religious faith was often derided. In his book, The Twenties, Alan Jenkins asks the pointed question, "Where was God?" and notes that the overwhelming response from intellectuals was "that God was dead, indeed all Gods were dead". Bernard Shaw, with typical acerbity, summed up the situation by describing the religious atmosphere of inter-war Britain.
as being, "Atheism tempered by hymns".11

Such a fundamental shift in attitudes (the age of faith giving way to the years of doubt) is one main reason for making a break in the development of this study. It would be misleading to go on examining the dominant themes of secularization and bureaucratization without first noting the decline in the churches' temporal power and their loss of popular support. Both became evident in the twenties and quietly intensified in the thirties.12 This sudden loss of temporal power and spiritual influence left all church leaders in a defensive frame of mind.13 Subjected to doubts and insecurity, their interventions in current affairs often served only to emphasize the minority position of the churches and to reinforce still further their unattractive public image. In particular, religion became essentially negative. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Bourne, denounced everything from contraception to the saxophone which he described as "the instrument of the devil".14 The Anglican vicar of Saint Aidan's Parish Church in Bristol, dwelling on the iniquity of the new dances, declared, "Any lover of the beautiful will die rather than be associated with the Charleston. It is neurotic! It is rotten! It stinks! Phew, open the windows!".15 Such statements only confirmed the image of puritanical joylessness which many young people came to associate with "official religion"16 and tended to alienate students in denominational colleges from the religious bodies controlling them.

The fate of these denominational colleges continues as a major theme in the second part of this study, but it is more muted and less easily identified than in the opening section of the thesis. The denominational colleges in the 1920s were but pale shadows of their 1880 forebears. They were, collectively, rather insignificant parts
of an increasingly beleagured religious enclave. Roger Lloyd, in his account of the role played by the Church of England in twentieth century Britain, sums up the 1918 to 1939 period in the phrase "The Nondescript Years". As far as the development of teacher training is concerned, Lloyd's title applies most appropriately to the decade separating the two great economic crises of 1921 and 1931. These for the denominational colleges were truly the nondescript years during which their fortunes reached their lowest ebb. These years were nondescript not because nothing happened but rather because the imposition of too many contradictory policies brought about a position of stalemate. In 1937 Baldwin, looking back on the immediate post-war years, wrote: "So after the war, when we had packed half a century of political evolution into four years, we had to readjust for a new age.... Unity and stability again had to be sought in the middle of a world falling to pieces".

To an extraordinary degree "the falling pieces" blocked every attempt made by denominational authorities to obtain security and academic independence for their colleges. On occasions they were thwarted in their quest by unforeseen misfortunes such as the economic crisis of 1931 which wrecked Anglican plans for the renovation and expansion of their colleges. On other occasions, the shifting political sands of the inter-war situation defeated them. As B.B. Gilbert has noted in the preface of his book, British Social Policy 1914-1939, "the major political parties were no longer drawn essentially from the same economic and social classes, nor dominated by men holding similar beliefs about the fundamental nature of the society in which they lived.... The homogenity of British politics had disappeared". So too had the homogenity of pre-war religious beliefs. The welter of doubt and self-recrimination that beset the churches in post-1918
England added to the number of "falling pieces" that were blocking the way forward for the denominational colleges. This was particularly evident within the Church of England. Just as Randall Davidson's attempts to reach a settlement for the voluntary schools were repudiated by those in the pews,\(^2\) so his policies for the Anglican colleges increasingly became the subject of divided counsels. The Methodists during this period were similarly afflicted.\(^2\) Only the Roman Catholic Hierarchy continued to present a united front to the world, through adopting, in the case of their training colleges, the simple expedient of cutting them off from contemporary events.

All these complexities and difficulties render the approach to this period a daunting prospect for both reader and researcher. However, it is possible to identify a dominating theme, one which helps towards the formulation of a coherent explanation of many disparate events. The legacies of the war were many and various,\(^3\) but two stand out. The widespread growth of secularism in post-war Britain was analysed in the concluding section of the previous chapter. Yet one feature of this growth bears further examination. Positive secular policies came to prominence between 1921 and 1931 because they were intimately linked to the new status being achieved, during this time, by organized labour. Indeed, the power of organized labour rose as that of the churches declined. Through union advocacy, secular solutions collided with the other prominent legacy of the war, namely the vast increase in the bureaucratization of Government. In the confrontation of secularization and bureaucratization evident in the persistent warfare between the trade unions and the Board of Education is to be found the root cause of the denominational colleges' failure to achieve academic independence.
Trade unionists during the immediate post-war years distrusted any denominational participation in education and wished to be rid of it. Officials at the Board of Education were more pragmatic in their approach. While they were not wedded to a defence of denominationalism, they were nevertheless determined that their bureaucratic control of the colleges was not to be challenged by too much agitation for secular and academic freedom. Denominationalists, therefore, came to be regarded by Board officials as useful counterweights to the increasing strength of trade unionists.

Analysis of these underlying tensions and intrigues provides the framework within which Part II of this study is conceived. In contrast to Part I where it was suggested that secularization and bureaucratization made largely discrete progress (although facilitating fusions have been observed), Part II posits the notion of a clash between the two phenomena. Specifically, the bitter contest between trade unionists and the Board of Education forms the focus of this chapter and opens the way for a wider analysis of the inter-war period.

The voice of organized labour was not slow in making itself heard in post-war Britain. In 1922 the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party jointly published a booklet entitled "The Education and Training of Teachers". Commended in a foreword by the President of the National Union of Teachers, W.G. Cove, the writers of the paper set out clearly and cogently their demands for a complete reformation of the system and process of teacher training. The central issue as defined by the trade unionists was tackled in the opening paragraphs of the booklet. "The problem which confronts teachers as individuals", wrote the editor, G.S.M. Ellis, "is not merely a problem of pay; it is one of social status, and it is bound up inseparably with the question
of their own education and training". Directly echoing earlier pleas for wartime efficiency, the Advisory Committee stated that "in a self-governing profession there is no room for the ill-qualified amateur".

The reference to "a self-governing profession" paved the way for the extent of labour aspirations to be broached. "Teachers", the Committee went on, "demand with increasing insistence a full partnership in the control and administration of education". Here indeed was a new voice.

In contrast to the respectful pre-war yearnings after status, the militant post-war approach adopted by the National Union of Teachers asserted the teachers' right to have a major say in determining teacher training policy. This more abrasive, militant approach was bound to have repercussions, not least because both trade unionists and Labour Party members saw the denominational authorities as hindrances to the legitimate aspirations of teachers.

These new critics of the Left attacked first the system of teacher training and secondly the role played by denominationalists within it. "The most forcible argument adduced against the training college system in its present form", wrote the booklet's editor, "is that at the age of eighteen or so it separates intending teachers from those of their own age who intend to enter other professions. In too many cases we segregate young persons of the same sex and approximately the same age in barrack-like buildings", a phrase which evoked a stinging attack on denominational teacher training. "It is probable that in these respects", stated Ellis, "the denominational colleges are the most unhappy.... Here an attempt is made to segregate not merely those who intend to teach, but those who believe in the tenets of a particular church....". Ellis and his co-authors coupled 'denominational isolationism' with 'unfortunate' systems of discipline adopted in the sectarian colleges. "We have evidence", they wrote, "that at one such
college recently the discussion of political subjects was prohibited as 'it was likely to lead to dissension among the students'". Persistent criticisms by students of the disciplinary measures enforced in denominational institutions, led the Committee to conclude their comments on this topic with a particularly severe remark. At these colleges, they wrote, "the discipline is of the worst possible kind - repressive and foolish".30

Local authority colleges also came under attack. Ellis was critical of the cult of "athleticism" flourishing within such places and of their "overloaded curricula ... organized in a way more suitable for children than for young men and women".31 The "astonishing multiplicity of cultural subjects" could not be adequately dealt with, claimed the Committee, within the confines of a two-year course which had "professional as well as academic objectives".32 Such a course, Ellis asserted, only succeeded in producing teachers possessing "a smattering of precise knowledge". The authors of the report urged the complete abolition of training colleges on the basis of self-evident truths. "For the reasons stated", they declared, "it is impossible for the Labour Party to regard the training college system, even if extended and developed, together with the method of synchronized education and training, as suited either to the pressing needs of the moment or to the imperative demand of the future".33 "We cannot accept", they concluded, "a second-rate compromise when the possibility of better things is presented to us".34

'Better things' quite clearly meant what became known in the inter-war period as "the university connection". The Committee's four-point plan of reform35 hinged upon the takeover of the training colleges by the universities. The consequences of their basic
recommendation "that in future the higher education of the teacher should continue for three years, and that it should normally lead to a university degree".36 were further defined in a broad-sheet entitled "The Supply and Training of Teachers" published by the Executive Committee of the National Union of Teachers in 1923. Here again the new mood of militancy coupled with greatly enhanced expectations can be quickly detected. "Existing normal training colleges", the Executive Committee recommended, "should cease to be centres for academic instruction ... unless they become colleges of a university".37 If this measure of integration were to be adopted, the Executive of the Union looked forward to the time when "the postgraduate year devoted to professional training would be regarded as a fourth year at the university".38 In these and subsequent documents,39 the Labour movement declared its faith in a pattern of training frequently referred to as "three plus one", administered and provided for within the university system. In short, organized Labour looked at the universities to free them from the bondage of what they regarded as an inferior training college system.

Perhaps it is a measure of the changed condition of England brought about by the war, that the publication of the Labour proposals in 1922 did not bring about the kind of denominational counter-attack that could have been confidently predicted in the pre-war era. One reason for denominational diffidence was that college governors were as aware as trade unionists that the university day training colleges were prospering. The Annual Report of the Board of Education for the year 1920 commented that "expansion has been greatest in the case of the university training colleges in which the number of students last year was nearly fifty per cent in excess of the number of students in the year before the war".40 The authors of the report went on to commend,
in suitably sober terms, the work of such colleges, noting in particular the rapid growth and progress of the university training department at Sheffield. In such a context all the denominational authorities could have been forgiven for wondering if the policies advocated by Labour were not those secretly held by the Board of Education.

It appears that initially Board teacher training policy was veering in the direction of some kind of "university solution". R.G. Mayor, speaking on behalf of the Board at the second meeting of the newly instituted Anglican Board of Supervision held on the 1 October, 1918, anticipated in almost every way future Labour demands. He urged members of the denominational committee "to consider seriously" the advantages of "stronger links between colleges and universities". He promoted the idea that Anglican institutions "might in some way make themselves hostels for four-year university students". "During the first three years", he said, "students might take the university course with tutorial assistance from the training college staff, and devote their fourth year to their professional training". As his suggestion was greeted with silence on the part of the Board, he hastily added that, of course, "students undertaking a four-year course would be resident at the training college all the time".

Mayor's comments provide a fascinating glimpse of one of the great 'might have been's of Board policy. His suggestions put forward at the peak of wartime idealism were subjected to unexpectedly sudden examination. The cause for such scrutiny was the almost complete collapse during the immediate post-war years of the British and Foreign School Society. Mayor in his confidential report to Fisher on the state of the voluntary colleges submitted in 1920 had warned that
smaller denominations with "only derisory incomes" could founder completely as a result of small "financial miscalculation". Such a fate soon befell the British and Foreign School Society. The Secretary of the Society, Mr. Evan Spicer, wrote to H.A.L. Fisher on the 10 January, 1921, admitting: "The point has been reached when the Society's income is no longer adequate to allow it to advance the money required to enable the colleges to meet their liabilities at the end of the financial year". The Society, therefore, had "no alternative" but to close their colleges at Borough Road, Stockwell, Darlington and Saffron Walden.

If the threat of immediate closure was a device to gain the full attention of Board officials, it succeeded remarkably well. L.A. Selby-Bigge, the Permanent Secretary, was both dismayed and annoyed at threats of closure, having approached the Society in October, 1919, with a "view to improving the quality of their colleges" and "putting them on a sound financial basis". Fisher had to proceed with caution. In his reply to Spicer he began by making a careful summary of the situation, intended, one suspects, to keep the record straight from a Board point of view if the correspondence were subsequently published. "I understand", wrote the President, "that the Society now derives only a very small income from voluntary contributions and that its income from endowment is largely absorbed in the provision of pensions and the payment of the staff and office expenses, so that the prospect of increasing the expenditure on its training college work is really alarming". Fisher went on to assure the Society that he quite understood why, in such circumstances, there was no possibility of the Society "meeting the financial demands ... of capital expenditure" necessary to upgrade their colleges. While sympathy was no doubt appreciated, it was no substitute for the urgent
action that was obviously required to retrieve a serious situation. As was increasingly the case in the last years of Fisher's Presidency of the Board, he looked to Selby-Bigge to rescue him from his difficulties.

The Permanent Secretary did not hesitate in his attempt to impose an orderly, bureaucratic solution. On the 24 January, 1921, he wrote to Spicer suggesting that while the Society might like to retain "an active interest in the training of teachers and in the conduct of its training colleges" it should consider entering "into co-operation with local education authorities in respect of some, if not all, of its colleges". Although the language was polite, the proposition was that the Society should invite the L.E.A.'s to take over its colleges. While Selby-Bigge softened the blow by saying he was "fully aware that such arrangements would present difficulties", he was nevertheless determined to get the Society to acquiesce. He therefore ended his letter by saying, "I should like to know whether it would be agreeable to your Society if we were to use our good offices with certain local education authorities with a view to promoting arrangements which would be satisfactory to both parties".

One interesting aspect of this case is now clear, namely that Selby-Bigge was reacting in a very individual way to a local crisis. His advice to the British and Foreign School Society to join forces with local authorities was in sharp contradiction to earlier suggestions made by Mayor to the Anglican authorities that they should consider merging their colleges with the universities. The question arises, therefore, as to whether there had been some broad-based policy decision by the Board of Education between 1918 and 1921 which favoured denominational mergers with local authorities. Subsequent unfolding
of the crisis seems to indicate that nothing so grandiose had taken
place. Evan Spicer's reply to Selby-Bigge on behalf of the British and
Foreign School Society was clearly an attempt to stall proceedings in
the interests of gaining a breathing space for that beleaguered body.
"The Council", he wrote, "were of the opinion that it would not be
expedient to discuss co-operation with local authorities until the
immediate financial question had been settled". While this was not
contentious the concluding part of his letter introduced a new element
to the situation. "As you are aware", declared Spicer, "the Society's
colleges have always been national in character, and one of our great
assets has been that we have been able to take students from all over
England, and we now feel to localize the colleges would seriously
detract from their usefulness". This statement paved the way for an
alternative proposition, namely "that it would be better for the
colleges to become Schools of Education under the university umbrella".
Clearly the Society, for very different reasons to those of trade
unionists, nevertheless saw the universities as their natural saviours.

Selby-Bigge seems to have been genuinely surprised by the Society's
preference. He appears to have discounted it earlier believing that
while local authorities were susceptible to Board pressures to merge,
the universities were unlikely to accept any such solution. On this
occasion, therefore, it was Selby-Bigge who delayed negotiations.
Mayor on the 17 March, 1921, was sent to negotiate on behalf of the
Board with the British and Foreign School Society while Selby-Bigge
assigned to himself the difficult task of preparing the way for
consultations with the universities. Mayor's report on his discussions
was revealing. In referring to Spicer's "talking vaguely about
joining up their colleges with universities", he pinpointed the
motivation behind the Society's request. The greatly enhanced "status"
of the universities, he observed, was the major reason why he (Spicer) "would evidently much prefer to join the London colleges with London University rather than with the local education authority". 50

Unfortunately for Spicer and his Society, the universities did not want to be teacher trainers. The University of Reading, for example, at about this time was congratulating itself on having "successfully sloughed off one of the multifarious functions it had inherited from the College.... It was no longer trying to serve as a training college". 51 This comment is indicative of a much wider university reaction and certainly the University of London appears to have been just as eager as Reading to distance itself from teacher training. In such potentially embarrassing circumstances, civilities were preserved by combining public blandness with private candour. While on a surface level the University Registrar referred to "administrative difficulties", in private he offered uncompromising opposition to the incorporation of Borough Road and Stockwell colleges into the university.

The University authorities had little to fear, for the mere delay in negotiations brought the crisis to a head. On the 19 April, 1921, the Society through its Secretary wrote to the Board of Education saying that "my Council asks you definitely to take over our colleges at a valuation, and to assume the responsibility of their maintenance and management". 52

Fisher passed the letter immediately to Selby-Bigge whose discomfiture at the turn of events is indicated by his extensive consultations with R.G. Mayor and E.K. Chambers. 53 The nub of the problem was that no one could be found to look after the orphan colleges. In a private Board minute Selby-Bigge rather wearily
recorded: "If the British and Foreign School Society definitely decide to offer their colleges to the state, I suppose our answer would be that the Board have no power to take them over as proposed". Subsequent Board advice to the Society to continue negotiations with the local education authorities proved equally abortive. At Darlington the local authority made it clear that it was only prepared to take over the local college if it was given "complete managerial control". In such circumstances the British and Foreign School Society had little alternative but to continue, unwillingly, the struggle to keep its colleges alive. Student fees were raised to fifty pounds per annum per student and contributions invited from past students. These measures, combined with timely financial assistances from the Methodist Education Committee, enabled the colleges to limp along through the early twenties.

The crisis in the British and Foreign School Society has been examined in detail because it throws light on important aspects of policy (or the lack of it) emerging within the Board of Education between 1920 and 1922. Although G.L.S. Clark in her study of the influence of the Civil Service on English Educational Policy is properly critical of the limitations of the permanent officials serving the Board, on this occasion it is difficult not to feel sympathy for the Permanent Secretary, L.A. Selby-Bigge. He was faced with the daunting task of formulating policy in response to a crisis. Although, as Clark has observed, he was a prisoner of out-dated social attitudes (a pre-war man in a post-war office), his somewhat outmoded concept of loyalty compelled him to cover the political impotence of H.A.L. Fisher. The President of the Board, drifting with the Coalition Government towards political eclipse in 1922, seems to have abdicated his responsibilities. In these circumstances it is
hardly surprising that Selby-Bigge attempted to find bureaucratic solutions for what was essentially a political problem.

Film producers at Hollywood have a phrase entitled "image stereotyping", the classic example of which is the white-hatted hero of a Western film riding into town while the villain enters wearing a black hat. There is a danger of image stereotyping emerging from a too superficial examination of the preceding incidents, with the immediate result being that the universities are left 'wearing the black hat'. Such an impression hardly does justice to the complex motivations prompting and informing the actions of all parties. Although (as will be demonstrated) the university response was a critical factor in determining future Board of Education policy, the reactions of the University of London were neither unconsidered nor prompted entirely by delusions of grandeur. On the contrary, the London University authorities appear to have rejected the training colleges' bid for association for quite practical reasons. Their estimation was that the two Society colleges at Borough Road and Stockwell were run down to the point of destitution.

Their diplomatically concealed views received powerful support from independently conducted inspectorate surveys carried out shortly after the abortive negotiations. A 1925 inspectorate report of Borough Road College, while carefully steering away from the vexed issue of the colleges' proposed association with London University, showed very clearly why the university did not want to be involved. The opening section of the report dealing with the state of the college buildings noted that they had not received any attention since the war, and that nothing had been done to correct the ravages suffered "by their occupation during the war for military purposes".
The normally flat and factual style of inspectorate reports was on this occasion cast aside in favour of an almost Dickensian description of the condition of the student common room. In this they wrote: "There were a few broken and disused bookcases dimly illuminated by antiquated and unsuitable incandescent gas burners.... Saucepans, boots, horse chestnuts and other impediments were littered about the floor.... A foetid and offensive smell emanating from blocked toilets ... suffused the whole building". The dreariness of the common room the inspectors added, was intensified by "smashed jam jars, broken lockers and wartime slogans scrawled across walls". Such conditions, allied to the most primitive of washing facilities, led to further measured condemnation. "It may be said with no exaggeration that there is no place in the building, except for the small library, where a student can be comfortable, unless he is in bed". A single sentence summed up their views concerning the state of the buildings: "The college premises", they declared, "can only be described as bare and comfortless".

While the candid nature of these revelations undoubtedly owed some of their frankness to the traditional confidentiality of inspectors' reports, the sorry state of the British and Foreign School Society colleges, both material and academic, was fairly widely known. Any visitor to Borough Road College in the 1920s, for example, could hardly fail to notice its dilapidated physical condition. University visitors, because a small number of British and Foreign School Society students enrolled for external London degrees, had plenty of opportunities to judge the depressed state of academic work in the training colleges. On this subject the inspectors made no attempt to conceal their dismay on finding a truly dismal state of affairs. Staff and students both received sharp criticism. Of the Borough Road staff of eight (only two...
of whom were graduates), the inspectorate said, "Such a staff might in some circumstances be considered adequate; it cannot be thought competent either in number or general standard of attainment to deal with such a variety of courses and to such advanced stages as the College at the moment in fact attempts....". But if the staff were inadequate so too were most of the students. "The less intelligent men", the inspectors complained, "seem either to have acquired, or maintained through the College course, a thorough contempt for intellectual cultivation of any sort". The result was Certificate work "of an incredibly bad standard. "Many of the essays written by these men", declared the inspectors, "would be considered markedly inferior to the work of an older child in an elementary school". While these were the most biting comments, even "the more intelligent men" were damned with faint praise. "Conversation with the senior men", stated the inspectors, "seldom led to any conclusion that the College training had done such to stimulate the men's interest in study, in their profession, or indeed in the world about them....". Such students, the report concluded, caught up as they were in 'the games fetish' and 'a routine of cramming', could not be considered university undergraduates.

Such evidence clearly reveals why most universities strenuously opposed any association with the training colleges. The comment of one Vice-Chancellor, made in the context of later negotiations concerning the 1944 settlement, to the effect that the training colleges were "an unlovely lot to ask the universities to take an interest in", was perhaps a crude admission of attitudes that originated in this earlier period. In fairness to the University of London authorities, it is clear that in 1921-22 they were faced with the prospect of taking over two academically suspect colleges in ramshackle condition, whose
improvement would have cost a small fortune. In the circumstances, they thought it wise to jilt the would-be bride. Their decision proved peculiarly critical, setting as it did the pattern for the whole of the inter-war period.

In 1921 there was a concerted move by a number of parties to bring teacher training under university control. Organized Labour was urging such a policy, the British and Foreign School Society were prepared to relinquish their colleges so as to set the vital precedent and the Board of Education was at least neutral. Once the University of London (in concert with other universities) declined to take over the colleges, Board of Education policy ceased to be neutral. Selby-Bigge, having anticipated the university rejection, was able to say, in effect, 'I told you so'. When he retired from the Board in 1926 his successor, Sir Aubrey Symonds was briefed by E.K. Chambers, who with R.G.J. Mayor had witnessed the earlier crisis. By this time the permanent officials had decided there were to be 'no more adventures with the universities'; mergers of denominational colleges 'had to be at the local authority level'.

Such a policy had far reaching effects. It placed the Board of Education in opposition to the National Union of Teachers and the Trades Union Council, both of whom tenaciously pursued the university solution. It also left the denominational colleges in the wilderness. As Michael Hyndman has commented, "the training colleges began to appear as isolated and anomalous institutions in what was developing into a unified and continuous system of secondary and higher education". Lacking "the standing necessary to establish an unquestioned academic identity of their own", the denominational colleges began in 1921 to enter upon a period of austerity and aimlessness. Their increasing
debilitation through lack of financial sustenance increasingly left
them prey, on the one hand, to the coercive bureaucracy of the Board of
Education and, on the other, to the radical secular solutions for
higher education which were now being vociferously espoused.\textsuperscript{74}

At first it seemed to denominational authorities that the
bureaucratic threat was the more dangerous. Extinction of the training
colleges by legislative manoeuvring became a real possibility when
Lord Eustace Percy became President of the Board of Education.
A younger son of the Duke of Northumberland, Percy had briefly served
as Parliamentary Secretary to Edward Wood in the first inter-war
Conservative administration to take office following the break up of
the wartime coalition in October, 1922.

Percy established friendly relations with Wood, relationships
based on affinities of class and aristocratic outlook,\textsuperscript{75} and rapidly
acquired his master's disdain for the work of the permanent officials
at the Board of Education. This work in any case proceeded at a
languid pace under Wood's limp control. The President's undisguised
boredom with education,\textsuperscript{76} which was reflected in his indifferent
handling of Parliamentary questions,\textsuperscript{77} clearly influenced his young
Parliamentary Secretary.

Percy's brief period in a subordinate position at the Board was
not entirely insignificant. He saw at first hand the initial moves
made by Wood to set up the Departmental Committee on the Training of
Teachers for Public Elementary Schools under the Chairmanship of
Viscount Burnham. Before being transferred to the Ministry of Health,
Percy observed with some irritation how both Wood and his permanent
officials consistently and deftly used the slow progress made by the
Departmental Committee as a means of parrying questions concerning
teacher training.\textsuperscript{78} With these experiences fresh in his mind Percy spent the remaining months of the first Baldwin administration watching with admiration Neville Chamberlain's more abrasive style of ministerial leadership.\textsuperscript{79} Given time to reflect upon these experiences during the short period of minority Labour Government in 1924,\textsuperscript{80} Percy, when invited by Baldwin to assume the Presidency of the Board of Education in the Conservative administration formed in the autumn of 1924, came to the post determined to be master of his new political domain.

Percy came in like a lion. "What a chance he has got!" exclaimed Baldwin when told Lord Percy was "very pleased" to go to Education, "he is only thirty-seven".\textsuperscript{81} In a somewhat elderly Cabinet, Percy was the epitome of 'the coming man', and being adept at making speeches up and down the country\textsuperscript{82} was warmly received by party members in his first few months as a Minister. This cordial welcome was not extended to Percy by officials at the Board of Education who, like H.A.L. Fisher, soon found themselves "in a complete fog"\textsuperscript{83} as to their Minister's intentions. Percy's "frigidly combative"\textsuperscript{84} style of leadership came as a profound shock to officials who could remember Fisher's more avuncular touch, a personal approach nicely mediated by L.A. Selby-Bigge.

The newness of Sir Aubrey Symonds to the Department "undercut his credibility",\textsuperscript{85} but Percy was not displeased; he made it clear that he intended to act as "his own permanent secretary".\textsuperscript{86} He initiated policy memoranda and at the same time declined to accept or read customary advisory papers.\textsuperscript{87} This left his staff in something of a quandary as to how they were meant to spend their time, and as Percy was frequently absent, they were left very much to their own devices. So much in the dark were they as to Percy's intentions that part of the
new office routine was a rota of officials designated to go and buy all the daily papers in an effort to glean from them indications of future Government policy. Percy was gratified to hear Whitehall gossip to the effect that his measures were achieving their desired effect. The perceived view of the Civil Service was that "Lord Percy had put his officials firmly in their place".\textsuperscript{88}

Percy's determination "to put his officials in their place" has a greater significance than that of a new minister desiring to wield a new broom. In a succession of undistinguished ministers,\textsuperscript{89} Percy stands out as being young, active\textsuperscript{90} and determined to exert political control over the bureaucratic machine. Within the inter-war period this was in itself almost unique. The following account of Percy's tenure of office is therefore salutary in demonstrating how he first became "educated" by his permanent officials and finally succumbed to their collective wishes, in the process becoming, in Lord Rothermere's contemptuous phrase, "a pink Conservative".\textsuperscript{91} This transformation provides an example of how powerful the bureaucratic machine had become and illustrates how Percy, in losing the bureaucratic battle, paradoxically established his ministry as a bulwark against further secular demands for reform.

Any thoughts of such a conversion were far from Percy's mind at the beginning of November 1925, almost the first anniversary of his assuming office. By adhering to what the Board of Education in its Annual Report for 1925 described as a programme of "general consolidation and steady development",\textsuperscript{92} Percy had succeeded in pleasing both his party and his Prime Minister. This generally favourable response was abruptly shattered on the 25 November, 1925, with the publication by Lord Percy of Circular 1371. It was a bombshell
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of the first magnitude. Far from being a measure designed to assist "the steady development" of education, Circular 1371 was intended to reduce expenditure on elementary education by over a million pounds. A storm of protest greeted the publication of the Circular, not least from Percy's own officials who, along with everyone else, had had no knowledge of the proposal until its publication in the press. Although Sir Aubrey Symonds and R.G. Mayor maintained a diplomatic silence, E.K. Chambers wrote a strongly critical letter to Percy. Thus Percy entered upon what was to be a prolonged political and administrative battle estranged from the permanent officials whose support he now desperately needed.

Professor B. Simon in his book, The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-1940, provides a detailed and absorbing account of the political struggle that finally persuaded both Percy and the Cabinet to amend Circular 1371. This extended conflict vitally effected a similar, but less publicized, contest concerning the future of teacher training. In April 1925 the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools was finally published. The Burnham Report, as it became familiarly known, arrived at a moment when Board affairs were still in a state of relative tranquillity prior to the publication of Circular 1371. The Report had the effect of dragging the topic of teacher training out of its customary obscurity and exposing it to ministerial and press scrutiny. This examination led to a public reappraisal of the traditional dilemma facing the authorities in training colleges, namely whether their primary purpose was the academic or professional preparation of student teachers.

The majority report submitted by the Burnham Commissioners had no doubts regarding proper priorities. In their opinion, training colleges
were vocational institutions which should concentrate their efforts on the professional preparation of intending teachers. "We think", the majority stated, "that the Secondary Schools may fairly be expected, from now on, to take over a large and increasing share of the work for all students of less than degree standard, and that the training colleges should become, pari passu, institutions for vocational education primarily". With this as the major objective and in the light of their terms of reference, particularly the injunction to examine methods of training with regard to "the economy of public funds", a number of Commissioners suggested that professional training could be adequately accomplished within one year. Making much play of the notion that "we cannot afford to disregard the capacities of the average person", the majority of Commissioners went on to reject out of hand the idea of providing degrees for "children of the less well-to-do classes". In short, professional training along the lines of an apprenticeship was acceptable, but a wider introduction of intending teachers to the world of culture and education was not.

Although this was the view of the majority, a Memorandum of Dissent drawn up by E.K. Chambers with the support of three other Commissioners, argued for reforms justified by educational needs rather than measures taken to suit financial stringency. While the dissenting Commissioners were happy to see training colleges continue to provide professional training, they were adamant that such work could only be justified when it followed extensive personal education. One year of professional preparation would only be appropriate if the training colleges were to merge into an overall system of higher education. Indeed, the Memorandum of Dissent was an open invitation to Percy to consider the merits of bringing training colleges within the university system.
Percy wasted little time in rejecting any 'university solution'. Although he masked his intentions behind his chosen style of secretive autocracy, it is not difficult in retrospect to discern the reasons which prompted Percy to support the majority report. Winston Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer, having persuaded his colleagues to return the gold standard in 1925, was intent on achieving further measures of financial retrenchment. Baldwin's administration was, therefore, already seeking economies and any measures that promised hope of saving at this time were politically attractive to the Government and to Percy. In any case (as he makes clear in his memoirs) Percy had little faith in training colleges. Referring sarcastically to "a propensity to civilize children, not to instruct them" which he observed as motivating too much of primary education in the 1920s, Percy was alarmed that such notions were spreading into the training field. "The danger was increased, I thought, by the tendency of this infantile bias to spread upwards into the teachers' training colleges". For this reason he "rather discouraged the building of new colleges".

Personal conviction and political opportunism were therefore powerful factors leading Percy to support the Burnham recommendations for a curtailment of the role played by teacher training colleges. However, Lord Percy cannot be held solely responsible for taking the axe to apparently willing victims. The demoralization of some denominational institutions, as we have seen, by a combination of financial deprivation and their all too obvious secularization, led them to behave at this critical period in a peculiarly inept fashion. The British and Foreign School Society was the worst offender. Having been through the financial crisis described earlier, the Society in 1925 was still the unwilling custodian of colleges which it had failed
to have integrated into the university system. The mood of
disenchantment of the Society's officials led them to publish a series
of articles critical of the state of teacher training. The Educational
Record, the official journal of the Society, printed in November 1924 a
leading article entitled, "Should the Training Colleges be
abolished?". 107 "Yes", responded the anonymous writer, although
qualifying his affirmative by consistently referring to "training
colleges as they are presently organized". This mood of defeatism
continued within the Society and Percy must have been delighted with
the response made by G.L. Bruce on behalf of the Society to the Burnham
recommendations. 108 Accepting the diminished role of the colleges with
remarkable docility, Bruce saved his criticism not for the Government
but rather for the increasingly militant attitudes he detected within
the National Union of Teachers. 109

This Union was indeed in an angry mood, one hardened delegate
showing his contempt for the Burnham Report by methodically turning its
pages into pipe spills. The immediate and hostile response of the
Union Executive to the Report's recommendations, 110 served to point up
the differences between a Government intent on merely tinkering with
existing arrangements and a Union insisting on "a complete reform of
the training college system". 111

Percy, however, was not impressed by Union opposition and passed
the Burnham Report to his officials for comment, having made up his own
mind. With the Permanent Secretary, Symonds, ill, and Chambers
disqualified as the leading signatory of the minority report, the task
of composing a Board minute fell to R.G. Mayor. Very conscious of the
delicate position he was in, Mayor fell back on a tactic beloved by all
Civil Servants in an awkward position: he procrastinated. His paper to
the Minister examined every option, indicating at the same time that any course of action was fraught with danger. "The majority report", wrote Mayor, "effectively represents the practical and the expedient", while the minority report, he continued, "with greater intellectual cogency hankers after a more idealistic solution". Anticipating the hostility of the Roman Catholics to what Mayor described as "further secular interference" in their affairs, his best advice to the Minister was to negotiate and wait.

Percy would not wait. He issued Circular 1377 which stated that students whose level of attainment was limited to the School Certificate would undergo a two-year course at training college, while those who had reached Higher School Certificate level could qualify for admission to a course "wholly consisting of one year's professional training". The publication of the circular meant that there could now be no doubt as to the Minister's intentions and both the National Union of Teachers and the denominational authorities were thoroughly alarmed. While the Lancashire County Teachers' Association castigated Percy for his autocratic style of "Government by Circular", the Church of England Board of Supervision for Church Training Colleges wrote to the Minister expressing its "very grave concern". Secretary Holland on behalf of the Board informed Percy that "proposals by the Board of Education to certificate teachers after a course of one year in a training college could only result in a lowering of the standard of teachers so trained". In the same detailed way, Holland made clear the Church of England's displeasure at the arbitrary curtailment by the Board of third year courses.

Anglican criticism, quietly stated and yet very much to the point, caused Percy far more anxiety than the noisier demonstrations by
organized Labour. By now embroiled in the spectacular conflicts following from the publication of Circular 1371 and experiencing as he described it in his memoirs "the new sensitiveness of the enlarged post-war electorate",119 Percy was not in a position to antagonize areas of traditional Government support. Just as in earlier times Fisher had looked to Selby-Bigge to extricate him from difficulties, Percy, in the midst of political troubles (largely of his own making), was forced to seek the kind of Civil Service support which he had previously spurned. He turned for help to R.G. Mayor. Mayor was the most experienced officer serving the Board and being due for retirement was considered by Percy to be devoid of the kind of ambition which he detected in Chambers and, to a lesser extent, in the Permanent Secretary, Symonds.

The dialogue between Percy and Mayor began awkwardly, with the Minister in a markedly defensive frame of mind querulously demanding to know why the training colleges could not be allowed to sink or swim according to their merits. Having considered the question carefully Mayor replied that he felt it would be taking a great risk to place complete powers in the hands of the training college authorities because he believed that apart from a handful "they are not up to it".120 The extensive powers of control over the colleges which Percy was referring to,121 and which he was willing to dispense with, were administratively expensive. He therefore pressed Mayor for a more explicit explanation. Against the background of the General Strike and in the then contemporary parlance of the Civil Service, Mayor proceeded to play 'the red card'. "I can never forget" said Mayor, "what I regard as a great danger to education - the openly expressed desire of the teachers in both England and Scotland to control the entrance to the profession". "This claim", he continued, "was put
before the Departmental Committee by the National Union of Teachers and I fear that if we let the reins slip out of our hands the universities and training colleges may find it difficult to resist the pressure which undoubtedly will be brought upon them". Any withdrawal of the very extensive bureaucratic powers possessed by the Board over the training colleges would, warned Mayor, "create a vacuum for the unions to exploit".

In the light of this warning Percy hastily dropped all plans for devolving power to the colleges. Indeed, he responded to the situation as outlined by Mayor with all the zeal of a late convert. Those who had not detected the sudden conversion were placed in an awkward position. W.E. Guinness, who had written to Percy suggesting that the denominational colleges would gain considerable financial autonomy if half their costs were placed on the rates, received an agitated reply from the Minister. "The Treasury proposal" wrote Percy, "is based upon the principle that we should throw upon the rates one half of the cost of the denominational training colleges". "I hardly need point out to you" he continued, "that it would be impossible to raise the denominational issue, which the Cabinet are so anxious to avoid, in a more acute form than this, and the proposal therefore seems pure political madness".

Having retreated from the course of "pure political madness" on the advice of Mayor, Percy was glad, "After the flurry of 1926 ... to get on with my work in the comparative obscurity to which political journalists tended to consign me for the next three years". The obscurity which Percy refers to was indeed useful in covering both the extent and nature of his retreat. In conceding the bureaucratic demands of his permanent officials, Percy seems to have been oblivious as to
how much he would now be dependent upon them. Mayor in particular wielded great influence, persuading Percy to see the secular reforms advocated by the National Union of Teachers as constituting the great danger. Yet these reforms were attractive, being both widely advertised and cogently argued, and holding out to all teachers the prospect of obtaining "a degree at one of the recognized universities into which the training colleges should ultimately become absorbed". Such was the general desire among teachers for some kind of university link that Mayor and Percy began to consider ways and means of meeting their wishes. Mayor drew the President's notice to Recommendation 38 of the Burnham Report which seemed to offer a way forward. This suggested, "That the establishment of examining boards should be encouraged, representative of universities and the governing bodies of training colleges, to examine the students of a college or of a group of colleges for the purpose of the recognition of the students by the Board as Certificated Teachers".

Percy responded enthusiastically to what became known as "the joint board compromise". Part of his enthusiasm was political in origin. Having united both secular and denominational authorities in opposition to his proposals for the teacher training colleges, Percy let it be known that these plans would be referred for "final decision" to the new boards. Seeing in the boards a way out of his political problems, the Minister set about their creation with all his customary enthusiasm and drive. Well briefed by his Board officials, he found the right words to disarm the suspicions of the denominational if not the university authorities. Addressing a conference of denominational representatives, Percy stressed that in seeking "closer co-operation between the training colleges and the universities, when he spoke of co-operation he meant that the two should be associated as equals and
that no attempt would be made to subordinate the training colleges to the universities".¹³⁰ Such promises soothed the ruffled feelings of denominationalists and brought about their acquiescence, if not their enthusiasm,¹³¹ for the proposed arrangements. Having, as he thought, done all that was necessary to prepare the ground, Percy abruptly withdrew from the negotiations and left them in the hands of his trusted aide, R.G. Mayor.

It was not a wise decision. However experienced and administratively capable he might have been, Mayor was a civil servant and not a politician. G.L.S. Clark in her thesis examining "The Influence of the Civil Service on English Educational Policy", observes that although the civil servants possessed great abilities they had "little appreciation for larger, more strategic issues".¹³² Mayor's handling of the joint board negotiations confirms this judgment. Although excellent in his role as Chairman of "The Committee on Universities and Training Colleges",¹³³ Mayor was nevertheless imprisoned within the perspectives of his own experiences. Recalling only too vividly the problems encountered by Selby-Bigge in seeking university relationships with the training colleges, Mayor was sensitive to any suggestion of university displeasure. The early refusal by Oxford and Cambridge to have anything to do with the joint board scheme,¹³⁴ served to confirm Mayor's worst suspicions. Terrified lest this withdrawal might precipitate a mass boycott of the scheme by other universities, Mayor fell back on traditional Board responses and ploys. Gross flattery of the universities was accompanied by coercion of the colleges by bureaucratic means, measures Percy justified on the ground that they were designed to stem secular demands for reform.
Having committed himself to this policy Percy pressed forward with reckless haste. Mayor, constantly bombarded with notes from the President of the Board urging greater speed in the negotiations, was finally provoked into announcing his retirement. Although persuaded to continue as Chairman of the Working Party, he was too harassed to have a comprehensive view of the situation. Percy therefore intervened belatedly and too late with predictably unhappy consequences. Constantly trumpeting his new found slogan 'more education, less administration', Percy dealt with the denominational authorities with the same degree of secrecy that he had formerly reserved for his civil servants. The Minister's continual evasions aroused all the latent suspicions of both denominational and university authorities. The normally equitable Bishop of Wakefield, Chairman of the Anglican Board of Supervision, declared: "I cannot learn, even on broad lines, the kind of proposal the President thinks of making". "If only", he went on, "he would instruct the training college folk on his staff to take me into their confidence, as has so often been done in the past, we could help one another to some effect". Percy declined to take Wakefield into his confidence, thereby provoking the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, to write expressing alarm "that the whole cost of the new examining system might be thrown upon our training colleges while the grants are being diminished at the same time". Percy, knowing the financial weakness of the Anglican colleges, wrote a reply that was both conciliatory and yet firm. After assuring the Archbishop that the Church training colleges were not threatened, he went on to add that he was nevertheless determined "to see an end of the Board of Education acting as Examining Body for the Certificate in Education at the earliest possible time".
While Percy could afford to handle the Archbishop of Canterbury with a degree of firmness, he was not able to approach the universities in any other posture than that of suppliant. As Mayor had candidly warned him, the majority of universities might be persuaded to join the joint boards, "perhaps from a sense of public duty than from a feeling that they had anything to gain from such co-operation". Understandably, negotiations with the universities proved difficult. Professor G. Wallas, the University of London representative on the Committee of Universities and Training Colleges, struck a dangerous note when he argued that if a university were to be expected to declare that a teacher had satisfactorily completed a course of training and passed a Final Examination, it must have some measure of control over the course of training. While the Professor's logic was impeccable, his declaration undermined Percy's protestations that there was to be no subordination of the colleges to the universities. Thus, while some universities managed to introduce the new examining scheme with a degree of good grace and goodwill towards their regional colleges, the majority went along with the scheme perceiving it for what it was, a manoeuvre designed "to enhance the academic respectability of the Certificate without entangling the universities in a direct relationship with the training colleges". Perhaps the saddest epitaph of what became of the joint board scheme was provided by Percy himself. Having left politics to become Chancellor of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he comments in his memoirs, "Though the scheme seemed important at the time ... I cannot say I found it very effective when, during the last half of its life, I came to operate it from the university end".

Having, when he wrote this latter comment, adopted the role of elder statesman, Lord Percy can be forgiven for forgetting that the
joint board scheme was introduced for more than academic purposes. The new examining boards finally rejected Percy's proposals for the training colleges, thereby saving them from becoming institutions providing one and two year courses of professional training. The President's retreat was covered by a series of opaquely-worded Board Circulars,¹⁴⁶ which were both so dull and so technical that they attracted no press coverage at all. Just as Percy felt himself consigned to obscurity in his latter years as a Minister, so the training colleges returned to their customary isolation after the brief excitement generated by the Burnham Report.

Isolation, with its attendant evil inertia, had for some time been causing alarm to Board officials responsible for the denominational training colleges. Mayor's blunt comment to Percy that the colleges "were not up" to the task of handling their own freedom was prompted by his knowledge of a series of severely critical inspection reports.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, inspectorate evidence paints a sombre portrait of the denominational colleges as they were in the 1920s. "Inadequate"¹⁴⁸ and "restricted"¹⁴⁹ buildings (characteristic of such institutions at this period) housed, in the opinion of the inspectors, inadequate staff¹⁵⁰ and restricted students.¹⁵¹ Conditions in some of the Northern denominational colleges were so bad that the inspectorate seriously considered demanding closures.¹⁵²

The root cause of all these problems was lack of money. The slump in temporal support for organized religion (referred to at the beginning of this chapter) reduced both church attendances and church finances. In fact the churches were over extended, attempting to maintain a pre-war presence that no longer enjoyed popular support. The marked progress of secularization within inter-war English society
was just one of "the falling pieces"\textsuperscript{153} mentioned by Baldwin which prevented the Government from attempting to remedy this situation. When Percy confessed that the Cabinet were "acutely anxious ... to avoid the denominational issue"\textsuperscript{154} he was obliquely acknowledging the new power of labour.\textsuperscript{155} In the strained atmosphere inherited from the 1926 General Strike,\textsuperscript{156} Lord Percy was aware that any moves to help the churches constituted "pure political madness".\textsuperscript{157}

Yet if the secular programmes advocated by the unions succeeded in keeping both Government and churches in a defensive posture, organized labour was itself severely checked by the continued growth of bureaucracy in central government. Much of this chapter has attempted to illustrate how Percy was defeated in his attempt to impose political controls on an increasingly powerful bureaucratic machine. Percy's defeat had strange repercussions. Not only did it consolidate power in the hands of the permanent officials, but it also checked plans for secular reforms. In the field of teacher training Mayor, with Percy's active support, pitted all the powers of the Board of Education against attempts by the National Union of Teachers and the Trades Union Congress to gain control of the training colleges. The whole of the joint board examining scheme can be viewed as providing a sop to union aspirations, while real powers were circumspectly retained where they had been for some time, in the hands of the permanent officials at the Board of Education.

These officials at the end of 'the roaring twenties' began, rather hypocritically, to complain about a state of affairs for which they were indirectly responsible, namely the destitution of the denominational colleges. Widespread inspectorate criticism of these institutions (especially Anglican ones)\textsuperscript{158} contributed to the growing
demoralization of all denominational bodies. The "nondescript years" had brought the colleges full circle back, in fact, to nowhere. Percy had failed to assert the view taken by the majority of Commissioners on the Burnham Report that the primary function of the training colleges was to provide nothing but professional training. His permanent officials were as adamant as the universities themselves that the colleges could not be integrated into their system of higher education.\textsuperscript{159} The colleges thus found themselves, in the biblical phrase, 'despised and rejected' - uncertain both as to their role and their future.

When Percy left the Board of Education in 1929 this future was bleak. A decline, however gentle and apparently imperceptible, cannot go on forever. As the 'roaring twenties' finally gave way to 'the nervous thirties',\textsuperscript{160} many of the denominational institutions were in such a precarious financial state that any sudden shock was likely to bring about their closure. Britain was, in Mowat's words, reaching "The Turning Point", teetering on the brink of the "financial holocaust" of 1931.\textsuperscript{161} The repercussions of this financial collapse on the denominational colleges provides a starting point for the following chapter, and to these events we now turn.
"In London the Charleston was introduced, in July 1925, to sixty teachers of ballroom dancing at a special tea dance organized by The Dancing Times at the Carnival Club, Dean Street, Soho, but it was considered 'vulgar' until the Prince of Wales learned it and performed it very skilfully'.


Extravagant parties of all types were in, "historical parties, Mozart parties and a great deal of fancy dress". At one of the latter the Prince of Wales arrived dressed as a Chinese coolie and Winston Churchill as Nero.


Baldwin having observed the success of his sick leader was careful to project himself as a simple country gentleman. Photographs depicted him gently poking pigs with his walking stick and engaging in other rural pursuits. His carefully nurtured image of passivity and security consistently defeated all Lloyd George's attempts to return to an era of dynamic policies.


One example of the power of the "religious consensus" in Edwardian England can be observed from the period of the "Liberal ascendancy". At the height of the controversy between the Liberal Government and denominationalists concerning amendments to the 1902 Education Act, one factor persuading Asquith not to press too strongly for the dissolution of the House of Lords was his reluctance to offend the Anglican Bishops. He specifically wished to avoid appearing to be "the enemy of religion, established or otherwise".

Ibid. p. 17. Not all the Anglican clergy accepted this position. The Bishop of Coventry openly stated that he liked the Charleston and received a flood of abusive letters from outraged parishioners. The young Victor Silvester, son of the Vicar of Wembley, learnt to dance "only because the Bishop of London held an annual ball at Lambeth Palace for the sons of the clergy".


Newspapers tended to concentrate on "all those bishops blessing guns and tanks during the war".


25. Members of the Trades Union Advisory Committee on Education, Editor, G.S.M. Ellis.

26. Ibid. p. 3.

27. "It appears that nearly thirty per cent of teachers at present practising in primary schools have no professional certificate. This condition of affairs, disastrous alike to the national well-being and to the interests of the teachers themselves, should not be permitted to continue". Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party (1922), The Education and Training of Teachers; pp. 3-4.

28. Ibid. p. 3.

29. Ibid. p. 11.

30. Ibid. p. 11.

31. Ibid. p. 12.

32. For further evidence of this issue see TIBBLE, J.W. (1957), "The Training Colleges and the Three Year Course", British Journal of Educational Studies; Vol. vi, pp. 3-12.

33. Ibid. p. 13.

34. Loc. cit.

35. 1. That intending teachers from different parts of the country shall be associated together while they are being educated.

2. That similarly they shall be associated with those young people who are studying for other professions.

3. That sectarian tests shall disappear absolutely.

4. That every teacher shall be brought into contact with a really broad culture".

36. Ibid. p. 13.

37. National Union of Teachers (1923), The Supply and Training of Teachers; Form Ed. 14.
"In the autumn of 1919 the Sheffield University Training Department with our approval accepted fifty men for a period of two years training, and a smaller number have also been received for autumn 1920. Most of the men at Sheffield were already Uncertificated Teachers". The significance of this and similar remarks concerning London University lies in the fact that the Board of Education were choosing in the immediate post-war period to expand the training potential of the university colleges rather than the denominational colleges. 

Ibid. pp. 61-62.

The letter went on to make the following candid confession: "The expenses of the colleges are a burden on the Society which it
cannot any longer bear". Letter from Evan Spicer, Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society to the President of the Board of Education, 19 April, 1921. P.R.O. Ed. 86/57.

53 Although R.J.G. Mayor was the more senior his age prevented him from succeeding Selby-Bigge as Permanent Secretary. On the other hand, the younger E.K. Chambers was shortly to become the Second Secretary at the Board of Education.

54 Private Board Minute from L.A. Selby-Bigge to R.J.G. Mayor and E.K. Chambers, undated; P.R.O. Ed. 86/57.

55 British and Foreign School Society (1921), The Educational Record, pp. 81-84, 'The Outlook', Vol. XX, New Series No. 61, April.

56 Fee increases combined with "a levy on past students" became standard remedies offered by the Board of Education to denominationalists suffering financial difficulties regarding the upkeep of their training institutions. See P.R.O. Ed. 86/57 and P.R.O. Ed. 86/55.

57 "Although they showed great tactical abilities the civil servants revealed little appreciation for larger, more strategic issues". CLARK, G.L.S. (1977), The Exercise of Power: The Influence of the Civil Service on English Educational Policy, 1919 to 1939; University of Texas, Ph.D., p. 113.

58 "Selby-Bigge, anxious to preserve the special character of the Board of Education, strenuously resisted the introduction of open competition for the recruitment of the Board's administrative staff". CLARK, Op. cit. p. 185.

59 "The report is concerned with the premises, the general quality of the staff and the work of the students. It does not include any attempt to advise upon the future of the college, especially in relation to university work or attachment". P.R.O. Ed. 115/64 (1925), Inspectorate Report on the Borough Road College, Isleworth.

60 "The first duty of the Committee, it seemed to the inspectors, is to make the existing building more suitable for the occupation of one hundred and forty young men pursuing a course of study and training. The premises suffered a good deal by their occupation during the war for military purposes. Since the college was reopened ... the condition of the fabric has been left unaltered and no attempt has been made to introduce amenities to which students in training colleges are entitled". P.R.O. Ed. 115/65 (1925).
61 "No bathrooms of the normal type are available for the use of the men, but only four cellar like rooms with concrete floors, in which there are two cold showers and a few iron buckets in which water can be drawn from the taps". P.R.O. Ed. 115/65 (1925).

62 It did not escape the attention of the inspectors that the Library, seating only fifteen people, was intended to service the needs of one hundred and forty students.

63 In 1924, fourteen students from Borough Road College sat for the external B.Sc. degree offered by the University of London. Only three students were successful.

64 This section of the report went on to state, "The whole question of staffing will need careful determination in the light of whatever educational policy may be adopted to guide future development in the college work". Such a statement is significant in revealing the fact that no such policy actually existed in 1925, a state of affairs equally relevant to the national as well as the local context. P.R.O. Ed. 115/65 (1925).

65 "The students look upon the lecture as a means of saving them the trouble of reading books.... It is hardly unfair to say that seventy-five per cent of men who are supposed to be studying History have never glanced at the titles of the books contained in the history section of the library". P.R.O. Ed. 115/65 (1925).


68 P.R.O. Ed. 86/57.


"You have sent the schoolmaster abroad, but before sending him you allow priests and potters to ruin his intellect, to lower his manhood, to deny him almost all humanizing culture, to deprive him of the polish that makes social intercourse graceful and charming.... Get rid of priestly interference; affiliate all colleges to the great universities; give the teachers a fair chance; and in twenty years the British artisans will have reason to be proud of themselves". James Runciman's trenchant words published in 1887 perfectly encapsulate the sentiments and demands of organized labour in the 1920s.


Edward Wood, educated at Eton and Oxford was made Viceroy of India by Baldwin and in the process became Baron Irwin. On his return to England he was further ennobled, becoming Viscount Halifax. A close friend of the Royal Family, he eventually became Foreign Secretary in Winston Churchill's wartime administration. As well as staying at each other's ducal homes, Percy and Wood enjoyed favoured places within Baldwin's 'inner Cabinet' and thus frequently met each other at week-end home parties arranged by the Prime Minister at Chequers.

MONTGOMERY HYDE, H. (1973), Baldwin: The Unexpected Prime Minister; p. 287.

R. Jenkins in his succinct but incisive portrait of Halifax uses the evidence provided by Lord Birkenhead's biography to expose his subject's lack of enthusiasm for education. Birkenhead shrewdly observed: "That Edward's imagination was not stirred by the subject of public education; that his heart was never in it, and this lack of interest can be measured by the fact that he makes no reference in his autobiography to either of his periods of office at the Board. He had little, if any, interest in educational problems, past or present.... Sometimes he would begin a conversation with his civil servants with a display of interest in some aspect of education, but it would quickly evaporate".


Wood disliked answering Parliamentary questions and particularly dreaded supplementary questions which might expose his lack of knowledge. On the 15 March, 1923, Mr. Short tabled a question "To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the total grants made to denominational training colleges and training colleges provided by local authorities, respectively, during 1922". Wood anxiously consulted with Selby-Bigge as to the purpose of the question and read the prepared answer several times before giving it in Parliament: "During the financial year ending the 31 March, 1922, grants amounting in all to £398,083 were made to the thirty-nine denominational, Church of England, Roman Catholic and Wesleyan training colleges, in receipt of grant. During the same year substantive grants amounting to £105,415 were
made to nine training colleges provided by local education authorities." Wood and his permanent officials were relieved that no supplementary questions were tabled concerning disparity in the allocation of grants made to denominational or local authority colleges.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/37 (1923), Questions and Answers in the House: Finance, Thursday, 15 March.

Even when the Report was finally published permanent officials still found it a useful device for urging all concerned to proceed with extreme caution. The Board of Supervision for Church of England training colleges wrote to the Board of Education in January 1926 requesting the early release of funds recommended by the Burnham Report for the improvement of training colleges. They received the following reply from E.K. Chambers:

Sir,
I am directed to state that pending the conclusion of the discussions now proceeding with local authorities in regard to Finance of Education for the year 1926/27, the Board will be unable to announce their decision with regard to the recommendation of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers as to the future of the special grant of £70,000 now made to authorities maintaining training colleges.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
E.K. Chambers

Through this letter Chambers succeeded in halting the distribution to denominational bodies of both existing and recommended grants. In short, denominational colleges continued to be starved of funds. Church of England, Board of Supervision (1926), Minutes, Vol. 1, p. 211.


Baldwin asked Thomas Jones, Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet, for his advice concerning a new "man for education". "What I want from you is a Minister of Education; have we any man in the Party who takes any interest in education?". Percy apparently did take an interest and was put forward by Jones as "the best candidate". "Eustace Percy is very pleased to go to education", Baldwin confided to Jones a few days after the offer had been made, "What a chance he has got! He is only thirty-seven". Jones, T. (1926), Whitehall Diary, 1916-1925; pp. 301-304, in Simon, Op. cit. p. 84.

Fisher's comment was made in response to a particularly confusing Parliamentary answer offered by Percy:

"Lord Percy: 'I do not want to be misunderstood on this question. I understand that the right honourable gentleman's difficulty now is whether I propose to abolish the principle of fifty-fifty sharing between taxes and rates? No. Without prejudging any questions that may come up in future, and generally speaking, I think that the fifty-fifty principle is a principle which will have to be maintained to a certain extent'.

Mr. Fisher: 'Then I am in a complete fog'."

As a contemporary author declared, people could "neither understand nor forgive the frigid, intellectual combativeness of Lord Percy, particularly as behind it they are unable to detect any depth of feeling or conviction".


In Charles Loch Mowat's eloquent phrase, "An ageing second team remained on the field", governing Britain throughout the inter-war period, unworthy successors to "a lost generation".
LOCH MOWAT, C. (1955), Britain Between the Wars, 1918-1940; p. 9.

Professor Simon, in a generally critical account of Percy, concedes that as President of the Board he acted with "considerable energy". SIMON, Op. cit. p. 66.

"The fact is that Lord Percy belongs to the Socialist or 'pink' wing of the Cabinet. And he is always thinking of 'pink' measures in the vain hope that he will please the 'Reds'." Lord Rothermer, Daily Mail, 23 June, in SIMON, Op. cit. p. 134.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/1198.
For a detailed account of these events see "Circular 1371 and its Reception" in SIMON, Op. cit. pp. 97-103.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1198.


The Right Honourable Viscount Burnham, C.H. was Chairman of the Committee.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814. Officers at the Board of Education on the 16 June, 1925, made a survey of thirty-nine press cuttings concerning the Departmental Committee's Report on the Training of Teachers. They were generally dismissive of the press response, although R.H. Tawney and the Manchester Guardian received an honourable mention:

"There are thirty-nine press cuttings to date. Nine of these are practically negligible - as being notices of publication, summaries etc. The remainder, thirty in all, are not a rich crop. The subject is no doubt too difficult and technical to have much news value in the ordinary way, though the Manchester Guardian has printed four articles".


Ibid. p. 9.

Ibid. p. 34.

As M. Hyndman has observed, although the proposals of the Burnham Committee appear at first sight innocuous, and indeed in some respects professionally sound, "the implication of these suggestions was that training colleges should become low-grade replicas of the existing postgraduate university departments of education". HYNDMAN, Op. cit. p. 178.

Memorandum of Dissent by Mr. E.K. Chambers, Miss E.R. Conway, Mr. F. Roscoe and Mr. E.J. Sainsbury, pp. 177-183.

National Union of Teachers (1926), Memorandum of the Executive of the National Union of Teachers on the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, January, Form Ed. 24, pp. 1-16.

P.R.O. Ed. 2/1814, Board of Education, Response to the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, R.G. Mayor.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814.


Ibid. p. 178.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1815, Government Circular:

Sir,

I beg to draw public attention to the growing development of the policy of government by circular and departmental committees adopted by the Board of Education. The action of the Board is profoundly disquieting.

Herbert Leather
Hon. Press Secretary
Lancashire County Teachers' Association
"Article Ten of the Regulations, while providing for supplementary refresher Third-Year Courses appears definitely to discourage a continuous Third-Year Course. We feel that the colleges can show conclusively the great value of the continuous Third-Year Course. To discourage such courses in the future would clearly be to diminish the value of the services which training colleges are able to offer".
Ibid. p. 247.


Mayor reminded his Minister that the Board of Education had powers to control the following:
1. The provision, constitution and composition of training college governing bodies.
2. Detailed regulations as to the premises, playing fields, residence of students and student lodgings.
3. Qualifications and appointment of staff, especially Principals.
4. Age and admission of students, the length of their courses and the curricula to be followed.
5. Dismissal at any point of the course of unsuitable students.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814. Letter from Lord Percy, President of the Board of Education to the Right Honourable Walter E. Guinness, 21 October, 1925.


National Union of Teachers (1926), Memorandum of the Executive of the National Union of Teachers on the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, p. 1.

Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, p. 163.
President's Conference with the Church of England Board of Supervision for Church Training Colleges, the Catholic Education Council, the Wesleyan Education Committee and the British and Foreign School Society held at the Board of Education, 1926.

Denominational doubts could not be entirely dispelled as a result of a single meeting. Dr. H.B. Workman, speaking on behalf of the Wesleyan Education Committee, demonstrated their continued misgivings when he declared, "That the Government, in pursuit of an ideal, was making the position of the colleges very difficult". "It was all very well", he said, "to talk of uniting the training colleges with the universities, but the pursuit of that ideal meant the scrapping of some of the machinery for the examining of teachers". "To link up colleges which succeed in taking students through an Honours Course", he continued, "with colleges which devote themselves to cookery is, from the university standpoint, the height of absurdity".

The thirty-seven page "Report of the Committee on Universities and Training Colleges", compiled and drafted by Mayor, illustrates the virtues of English Civil Service papers. Written under pressure of time and containing diverse sources of evidence, the document is nevertheless detailed, lucid and comprehensive in its administrative arrangements.

Although relinquishing his post of Principal Assistant Secretary in the Universities and Training of Teachers Branch of the Board of Education, Mayor continued to act as Chairman of the Committee on Universities and Training Colleges.

Archbishop of Canterbury to Eustace Percy, President of the Board of Education, November 4, 1925:
"I am a good deal perturbed by a report which I find to be current that you think of drastic changes in the arrangements for our Church training colleges and the examination of their students. I have long understood that it might be decided that the Board of Education Examination for Certificate should come to an end and, if so, we should have to meet the conditions. But what alarms me is the thought that perhaps the whole cost of these examinations might be thrown upon our training colleges, while the grants are being diminished at the same time. This would, so far as I can see, be almost fatal to us.... I am sure that you do not want to smash our voluntary training colleges".

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1928.

139 Letter from Lord Percy, President of the Board of Education, to His Grace The Archbishop of Canterbury, November 5, 1925.
P.R.O. Ed. 24/1928.

140 P.R.O. Ed. 24/1818.

141 P.R.O. Ed. 86/14.

142 The University of Reading set up its joint examining board with a good deal of tact and after much consultation, the University Committee having had frequent meetings with training college representatives. See University of Reading and Associated Training Colleges, Report 1927-28, pp. 1-6, University of Reading, Archives.

143 The regional scheme for joint examining was embodied in the final report of The Committee on Universities and Training Colleges. For example the Southern Counties were divided between the University of Reading and Southampton University College (as it then was). Thus the University of Reading became responsible for examining six colleges: the Diocesan Training College, Brighton; the Municipal Training College, Brighton; Bishop Otter College, Chichester; Culham College, Abingdon; the Training College, Portsmouth; and the Diocesan Training College, Salisbury. For details of regional grouping see Appendix IX, and P.R.O. Ed. 86/18.


146 See Board of Education (1926) Circular 1377: Revision of the Regulations for the Training of Teachers; Circular 1383: Confirmation of the Revised Regulations for the Training of Teachers and P.R.O. Ed. 86/14.
For a representative sample of such reports compiled by the inspectorate between 1924 and 1930, see the following:

P.R.O. Ed. 115/9, P.R.O. Ed. 115/82, P.R.O. Ed. 115/62, P.R.O. Ed. 115/10, P.R.O. Ed. 115/24, P.R.O. Ed. 115/27 and P.R.O. Ed. 78/67.

P.R.O. Ed. 115/10 (1926), Inspection Report on the Bede Training College, Durham.


P.R.O. Ed. 115/24 (1926), Inspection Report on King Alfred's College, Winchester.

P.R.O. Ed. 115/10.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814.

See P.R.O. Ed. 86/37, P.R.O. Ed. 86/13, P.R.O. Ed. 86/14 and particularly P.R.O. Ed. 24/1814. In the latter private office file R.G. Mayor complained of the difficulty in moving denominational authorities away from "their attachment to small paternalistic units". Ominously for the future of small, rural denominational colleges, the Board of Education was in 1925-26 already talking of "economies of size" achieved by bringing such institutions together on single campus sites. For a full discussion of these issues see P.R.O. Ed. 24/1815, Board of Education (1927), Response to the Committee on the Training of Rural Teachers.

"As the committee itself (Burnham) bluntly pointed out, there could be no question of the universities amalgamating with the colleges; to give all student teachers a full four-year course
would almost double the numbers and radically change the character of the universities".
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The financial crash of 1931 came with such speed and ferocity that it brought down the Government, Ramsay MacDonald's minority Labour administration finally collapsing on August 23.\(^1\) Lord Ponsonby, a participant observer, vividly described shortly afterwards the mood of unrestrained hysteria that settled on departing ministers:

Headlines, crowds, police, hectic movements, day and night meetings, with the door of Downing Street loosened on its hinges by the constant passage of leading figures of all three parties as they hurried by the ever present battery of photographers.\(^2\)

This frenzied activity gave the clearest indication that what Mowat has called 'the turning point of the inter-war period' had been reached.

The first part of this chapter examines the significance of the 1931 crisis, showing how the national financial collapse provoked a further crisis among denominational training colleges in 1933. The links between the two events are described so as to demonstrate how financial stringency brought about a narrowly conceived model of centralized government based on Whitehall. This centralization allied to the deepening secularization of English society, it is argued, were the two major factors promoting the crisis of confidence discernible among denominational bodies in 1933.

The far reaching consequences of the 1931 financial crisis were not evident to Ramsay MacDonald as he chaired the final Cabinet meeting of the Labour administration on Sunday, 23 August. As the evening discussions grew more heated, MacDonald sat absent-mindedly doodling on a blotter, "waiting wearily for the end".\(^3\) Having received the
resignations of his ministers, the Prime Minister departed shortly after
ten o'clock for what all concerned thought was to be his final meeting
with the King.

It proved to be far from a final meeting. At noon next day
MacDonald informed his former Cabinet, "to its utter stupefaction, that
though it was out, he was in". He had agreed to head a national
government composed of individuals rather than parties, as a 'temporary
expedient' for the sole purpose of settling the financial crisis. This
'temporary expedient' was to enjoy a remarkable longevity because, in
Robert Boothby's derisive words, "the Boys of the Old Brigade climbed
onto the bandwagon" and governed the country for the rest of the decade
"until they had brought the British Empire to the verge of destruction".

As if to underline Boothby's point, in July 1932 the familiar
figure of E.P.L. Wood (about to become Viscount Halifax) re-emerged
once again to take up the Presidency of the Board of Education. The
appointment was not a wise one. Halifax fresh from his triumphs as
Viceroy of India, appeared as bored with education as he had in his
earlier tenure of office. Indeed, after the absolute authority he had
enjoyed in India, Halifax displayed an obvious "disenchantment with
middle-rank departmental office, even under a Prime Minister who
commanded his full loyalty and approval".

Halifax was the last of a bewildering succession of Presidents of
the Board of Education, who, from a distance, seem to have been playing
musical chairs. When Eustace Percy left office in June 1929 following
the defeat of the Conservative Government, he was replaced by
Sir Charles Trevelyan. Trevelyan, an ex-Liberal who thought himself in
sympathy with Ramsay MacDonald's mild brand of socialism, aimed to raise,
at the earliest opportunity, the school leaving age. When MacDonald's
socialism proved so mild that this measure fell by the legislative wayside, Trevelyan resigned in March 1931. During the last period of the minority Labour administration, Trevelyan was replaced by H.B. Lees-Smith, an unfortunate minister who, after only four months, found himself out of office, replaced by another refugee Liberal, Sir Donald Maclean. Maclean became President of the Board in MacDonald's second national government formed in November 1931. Maclean's death in July 1932 brought about a Cabinet reshuffle and the return of Halifax. Whatever his shortcomings, Halifax at least brought to his post a welcome sense of continuity and stability after a period of turmoil.

Before Halifax restored the state of stagnant equilibrium so characteristic of inter-war politics, the future direction of the denominational colleges had been decided. In an atmosphere of looming financial disaster, with short-term governments implementing contradictory policies, the denominational colleges saw any hopes of their financial rescue (and with it academic freedom) lost through the national government's insistence upon retrenchment. Indeed, the 'doctors mandate' demanded by MacDonald proved conducive to a widespread growth of Civil Service powers. An increase in these kinds of powers could not have been achieved without the state of political dislocation evident between 1931 and 1933 and therefore the constant shuffling of political figure-heads recently referred to has a significance not immediately apparent. A lack of political oversight enabled permanent officials to influence, indeed to dictate, policies which (as will be demonstrated) were narrowly conceived. The subordinate status of the denominational training colleges was an aspect of Board of Education policy confirmed by the increasingly secular temper of
English society. It is therefore argued that a cautious brand of instrumental bureaucracy found a natural compliment in the wider progress of secularization, secularization which sapped the will and energies of the churches, leaving them too weak to resist bureaucratic coercion.

Cosmo Gordon Lang, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by Baldwin in August 1928, \(^{13}\) did not sense that the Church of England was threatened by secularization, mainly because the new Archbishop was preoccupied with domestic Anglican problems. As an Anglo-Catholic leading the Church from right of centre, Cosmo Lang was perturbed by William Temple's elevation to York. \(^{14}\) The two natural leaders of the Church of England were divided in their political views and consequently Cosmo Lang was acutely aware of the danger of Anglicans dividing into left and right wing factions. Until these difficulties were resolved, Cosmo Lang and Temple both appeared introspective in their appreciation of affairs. In contrast, and because he did not share his leaders preoccupations, the spokesman for the old 'broad Church' tradition, Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, \(^{15}\) had a more perceptive appreciation of the immediate dangers of secularization. Referring in his 1930 Gifford Lectures to the apparent ability of the state 'to deliver the goods', \(^{16}\) Henson went on to argue that the process of secularization was being forwarded by all those who believed that Christianity could be achieved through the imposition of a socialist state. The significance of Henson's analysis lay in his attack upon Temple's interpretation of Christian Socialism. \(^{17}\) Believing all men to be individuals \(^{18}\) Henson vigorously attacked the "submerging of individuals into impersonal categories". \(^{19}\) Temple, he believed, through his uncritical enthusiasm for state-initiated activity, \(^{20}\) was
pursuing the dangerous course of 'riding the tiger', the tiger being the state. For the state in Henson's estimation was neither neutral nor benevolent; its growing powers led him to champion the cause of disestablishment. In short, Henson perceived the state as an enemy rather than an ally. Everything it touched, in his opinion, it secularized.

Henson's bleak, and therefore unpopular analysis, was far closer to the truth than either Temple in his optimism or Lang in his arrogance would concede. The Bishop of Durham's persistence in drawing attention to the link between secularization and socialism was caused by the dismay he felt at the slump in temporal support for the churches. This religious decline he argued, resulted from the growth of a welfare state engaging the energies of working and middle class people in a crusade for equality and social justice. The trouble was that such a crusade was godless. In Henson's opinion, it left the churches in an isolated and redundant condition and it was to these dangers that Henson attempted to alert his colleagues. Any withdrawal on the part of the Church of England from its primary spiritual mission in exchange for state-initiated Christian Socialism, he believed, could only end with the secularization of the Church. In any case, evidence of rampant secularization both within and beyond the churches was in 1930 only too apparent. Christianity, as Henson observed in his 1935 Gifford Lectures, had had within the last decade to fight for its place within an increasingly eclectic cultural environment. In the future, Henson warned, Christianity would have to survive the shock of cultural pluralism.

Cultural pluralism was a far cry from the Christian pre-eminence of the Victorian era and the explosion of various forms of cult worship, evident during the thirties, threatened the churches by diminishing their
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authority. Indeed, spiritual goods, which had previously been their exclusive possession, were now available from alternative sources. Spiritualism, under the vigorous leadership of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle,\(^{30}\) promised contact with the dead and gained converts from the thousands yearning for reunion with loved ones killed in the war.\(^{31}\) Young graduates at Oxford and Cambridge were assiduously cultivated by believers in moral rearmament,\(^{32}\) while the remarkable Dr. Coué assured a far wider audience that "day by day, in every way, everything is getting better and better".\(^{33}\) Coué's book, *Self Mastery Through Auto-Suggestion*, became widely and wildly read on both sides of the Atlantic, and was serialized in the popular press.\(^{34}\) Extravagant headlines such as "Coué makes palsied man run" and "Two cripples walk", touched the raw nerve of Christian sensitivity. Dr. Benson, speaking in the Broadway Tabernacle, made a new kind of headline when he was reported as saying, "The issue is now Christ or Coué, the Antichrist!".\(^{35}\)

While this incident clearly illustrates the difficulties encountered by the churches in coming to terms with alternative religions, it does not reveal the extent to which they were also being infiltrated by contemporary obsessions. Pacifism, rather than Couéism, was becoming a religion in itself.\(^{36}\) In October 1934, Canon Dick Sheppard wrote to the national newspapers inviting all men who were willing to reject violence as a solution to disputes to send him a postcard declaring: "We renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will we support or sanction another".\(^{37}\) Sheppard received a hundred thousand replies and promptly founded the Peace Pledge Union. Temple, with characteristic generosity, applauded Sheppard's initiative. Henson, however, viewed the Peace Union as constituting yet another cuckoo in the Christian nest. Noting that many of those taking the 'peace pledge' were far from Christian,\(^{38}\) Henson maintained that pacifism,
like Christian Science\textsuperscript{39} and Christian Communism,\textsuperscript{40} was another example of contemporary aberration.

In the midst of all this confusion the Roman Catholic Church, with its long tradition of firm adherence to a well defined body of truth, was perhaps best placed to resist the fears of secularization. Indeed, the Catholic Church in England benefited from the publicity when Evelyn Waugh and Frank Pakenham became Catholics.\textsuperscript{41} More than this, however, it derived strength from its long tradition of being a persecuted religious minority in Britain. Such a legacy made Catholics wary of too much reliance upon the goodwill of the state and mindful of their spiritual priorities. If this is a correct interpretation of the Catholic position, it is somewhat at odds with the views offered by J.E. Turketine in her study of Catholic Colleges of Education in the twentieth century. Turketine claims that such institutions have consistently endeavoured to fit into the developing pattern of teacher training with Catholic authorities welcoming "the changes leading to improved academic standards and professional co-operation with the universities".\textsuperscript{42} Turketine modifies this position when she later declares that the same Catholic authorities "nevertheless sought to preserve all those elements of religious life and teaching which were considered essential for their students' welfare".\textsuperscript{43} In the context of the present study, this latter emphasis seems to be much closer to the inter-war Catholic position than the earlier interpretation.

Catholic authorities during the first decade of the inter-war period certainly did not welcome the changes Turketine referred to. Indeed, throughout the twenties relationships between the Board of Education and the Catholic Education Council were distant and formal, the primary cause of this mutual lack of warmth being the persistent
criticism by the inspectorate of work undertaken by nuns in enclosed orders. "The nuns are interested in their work", wrote one inspector, "but they do not possess either a broad outlook or a deep understanding.... They are like children in their desire to please and work rather for the standard of others than for a standard which they have set themselves." Other inspectors were more cutting in their observations. "The young sisters are very undeveloped" commented a senior official, "The majority have shown little talent in teaching and in nearly every case their educational background has been very slight". Condemnation by the inspectorate, filtering back to the Catholic Education Council and the Hierarchy from the enraged teaching orders, was one bar to constructive relationships. Another was the air of secrecy within which the teaching orders went about their work. Board of Education officials were frequently perplexed and irritated by what seemed to them a deliberate policy of non-co-operation on the part of some enclosed orders. The withholding of information concerning the amount and nature of an order's financial income left the inspectorate and the Catholic Education Council equally ignorant as to the financial viability of many training institutions. When, as at Hull, more than one teaching order was responsible for running a college, the fog of confusion regarding its organization settled even more deeply.

In this climate, a kind of wary coolness descended during the late twenties upon relationships between the Board of Education and Catholic authorities. Mutual suspicion was particularly evident during 1928-29 as Catholics responded cautiously to Percy's demands for regional examining boards dominated by the universities. Catholics had no reason to be fond of the English universities, having for so long been excluded from them and many ardent church members still hankered...
after Manning's dream of a separate and denominationally pure university of their own. Therefore, the Catholic Education Council was as critical of the imposition of regional examining as was its Wesleyan counterpart, and sought at every point in the negotiations to safeguard Catholic interests, which it did very effectively. When, for example, the Catholic college at Selly Oak, Birmingham, joined other training colleges in the West Midland group of institutions examined by the University of Birmingham, the Council insisted that "the religious side of the training college should be quite apart from the scheme". It further circumscribed the powers of what it considered a secular body by limiting the numbers of university governors entitled to join the Board of the Catholic college and reducing their rights of inspection. The type of concessions won by the Catholic Education Council at Selly Oak rapidly became incorporated into subsequent agreements negotiated by the Council on behalf of other colleges joining new regional examining schemes.

This watchfulness on the part of the Council naturally slowed down the implementation of these schemes and the delays irritated both Percy and his permanent officials. However, Council members, prompted by the Hierarchy, were not to be hurried, even by pleas for greater haste from their own principals. Painstaking, centrally organized negotiation by the Council on behalf of individual Catholic colleges, succeeded in limiting the powers of university authorities, and on occasions excluded local authority representation on regional examining boards altogether. The vigilance shown by the Council in defending their colleges' autonomy meant that university and local authority representatives soon found themselves as powerless as the inspectorate to influence the internal organization of these institutions. Overall, it may be concluded that this policy of safeguarding the Catholic
colleges' rights to autonomy, was perfectly suited to deflect the kind of disasters which were to fall on other training colleges as a result of inconsistent central policy-making. Catholic authorities did not 'place their trust in princes' and during the 1930s were to have reason to be grateful that they had not done so.

In contrast, Methodists, because of their waning influence, were rebuffed whenever they aspired to close relationships with Government during the inter-war period. Like other non-conformist sects, Methodists suffered severely from the long drawn out eclipse of the Liberal party. When Liberal party workers and Members of Parliament reluctantly began to accept that Lloyd George was their only possible leader following the death of Asquith in 1928, it appeared that a genuine Liberal revival might be in the offing. Lloyd George clearly believed that it was. Gathering together a small and high powered Liberal policy-making group to plan for a Liberal revival, the former Prime Minister published in February 1928 a booklet entitled Britain's Industrial Future. Popularly known as the Yellow Book it presented to the public "radical alternatives to traditional policies" including, in the field of education, the raising of the school leaving age to sixteen and compulsory part-time education for all to eighteen.

Labour promptly stole the Liberal clothes. As Professor Simon has observed, Labour could claim the Liberal programme as essentially its own and, possessed of a constituency organization the Liberals lacked, reaped the benefit and in terms of seats in Parliament, the benefit was considerable. In the spring election of 1929, two hundred and eighty-seven Labour members were returned as opposed to only fifty-nine Liberals. The long anticipated Liberal revival had not occurred, and such a meagre return after so much effort lowered morale both within
the party and among its many non-conformist supporters. In fact, Methodists began to splinter, those remaining loyal to Wesleyan principles turning in upon themselves, while many more began to accept the secular solutions offered by the Labour party. Uncertainty on the part of non-conformists concerning their beliefs and political identity was increased at this time by the widespread growth of pacifism and while Donald Soper found it possible to reconcile religious and pacifist principles, other non-conformists were apprehensive that pacifist programmes were beginning to subvert the very foundations of their faith.

Surrounded by so many distracting arguments and faced with continuous changes in Government policy during the late twenties, the members of the Wesleyan Education Committee had an unenviable task. Understandably, they vented the frustration felt by all Methodists disturbed by Percy's proposals for a regional examining scheme. "It is plain to all except the Board of Education" they declared, "that under this scheme there will no longer be a uniform standard of certification". Further, the Committee were quick to point out to the laity how reluctant universities were to enter into the scheme and as Westminster College was now well on its way to becoming a university college, Committee members found good reason to join with the University of London in condemning Board of Education policy. Actually, even before its attachment to King's College and the London School of Economics, Westminster had been the jewel in the Methodist crown. Shutting its doors to all but exceptionally well qualified students, it was arguably the only training college between the wars to enjoy a national reputation, but this was "an exceptional case and recognized as such". In fact Methodist preoccupation with a single college was unhealthy; a symptom of the narrowing non-conformist
vision discernible during the late twenties and early thirties. Consequently, when the 1929 Methodist Conference decided to redefine Methodist education policy, divisions among conference delegates proved so sharp that the old policy stayed because no other could be agreed upon.  

Such an obvious acceptance of the status quo began to damage all levels of Methodist policy-making, including Wesleyan aspirations for their teacher training colleges. Once Westminster had achieved university college status in 1930 and Southlands had by the same year moved to its new premises at Wimbledon, Methodist interest in teacher training waned. This loss of interest was partly caused by Board of Education officials indicating to the Wesleyan Education Committee that two colleges, however excellent, hardly constituted a large stake in the training enterprise. Deputations from the Methodist Education Council wanting to see ministers who were busy interviewing Anglican and Catholic representatives often had a long and humiliating wait. The decline of the Liberal party meant that there was now no political redress for such slights and one immediate consequence was that after 1930 Methodist policy for its training colleges was increasingly conceived within narrow denominational perspectives. Non-conformity, like Liberalism during the thirties, was in retreat.

The Church of England during the same period was not so much in retreat as under stress. Randall Davidson's last years as Archbishop of Canterbury had been neither happy nor particularly constructive. Having achieved so much during the war under a system of centralized decision making, the Archbishop not unnaturally continued with similar methods during the post-war era. At first this centralism seemed to be accepted by church members, most notably through widespread lay support.
for the founding of the Church Assembly in 1920. Unfortunately for Davidson, such enthusiasm proved short lived, partly because increasing numbers of Anglicans began to distrust their leader's autocratic inclinations. When, therefore, the Archbishop attempted to end the problems of maintaining the dual system by reaching a national agreement with Fisher, his followers repudiated the terms offered. Thus, church schools continued to exist despite the obvious disinclination of Davidson and officials at the Board of Education to accept the expense entailed in supporting them.

Distrust by Anglicans of a centralized, bureaucratic administration and evidence of increasing secularization played their part in bringing about the Archbishop's defeat. Indeed, many of the internal discords within the Church during the post-war decade may be traced to the uncertainties felt by Anglicans as to the proper direction of their Church. Davidson, sensing the decline of the Church of England's temporal position, wished the laity to develop a sense of responsibility for its financial support and management. Moreover, feeling the burden of leadership becoming heavier, he also wished to mobilize lay support in defending the Church against mounting secular criticism; factors which led him to campaign for the fullest involvement of the Anglican laity in the management of the Church, through the Church Assembly. While Randall Davidson's intentions were admirable, they in fact led him to offer a highly instrumental view of the Church's function. To be efficient, he believed, it needed rapidly to improve its ability to organize and assimilate new techniques of communication and budgetary control. Such preoccupations inevitably led to a shift in power away from the parish and towards what some described as "the new papacy at Church House". As a result, parish priests, sensing their autonomy slipping away, became increasingly suspicious of the powers
being vested in a central executive because, to many clergy, it seemed
as if the Archbishop, by stressing efficiency, was actually assuming
dictatorial powers.

From Durham, Hensley Henson spoke for those who rejected Davidson's
model of a Church gaining influence and power through efficiency and
temporal concern. Henson asserted the older vision of an autonomist
Anglican Church, one concerned with values, prepared to defend its
primarily spiritual role and willing to embrace disestablishment as a
means of achieving this. Disestablishment, however, was anathema to
Davidson and he therefore resisted every attempt to achieve it.79
Yet his defence of the constitutional link between church and state
was fatally weakened by the row which broke out in 1927 between
Anglicans and Parliament over the revision of the Prayer Book.80 When
Parliament rejected the revised version, it seemed to confirm all
Henson's suspicions of excessive interference by the state in spiritual
matters. Thus, when the Archbishop retired in 1928, the Church of
England did not present to a largely indifferent society the unity which
Davidson had striven hard to achieve. Defeated in Parliament over the
Prayer Book issue, its members were deeply divided as to whether their
Church should be pursuing instrumental or autonomist policies.

Any inclination by Anglicans to accept autonomist solutions to the
current crisis was highly threatening to members of the Board of
Supervision, responsible for the management of the Church's training
colleges. Founded by Davidson to implement the recommendations of the
Wakefield Commission in 1918, the Board took its place amid the array
of specialized committees set up by the Church Assembly in 1920.
Instead of reporting directly to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York,
it made its recommendations to the Assembly through the Central Board of
Finance. In short, it was an instrumental body, its effectiveness depending upon the acceptance by Anglicans of their new system of bureaucratic administration.

In 1929 this acceptance did not seem in doubt. The Board of Supervision had achieved something of a coup by obtaining the services of R.G. Mayor on his retirement from the Board of Education in 1927. Although this led to a renewal of gossip among Catholics and Methodists as to the possibility of a special relationship existing between the Church of England and the Conservative Government, Anglicans ignored the mutterings and set Mayor to work. On the 10 July, 1929, he submitted to the Central Board of Finance his report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers. Generally, the lengthy report made pleasant reading for Anglicans and in this respect it contrasted markedly with Mayor's earlier, highly critical, survey of training institutions. Partly because of genuine improvements and partly because of loss of Civil Service independence and confidentiality, Mayor couched his criticisms in a muted and subdued way. Indeed, as the poet Pope had earlier remarked in a different context, Mayor proved adept at "hinting a fault but hesitating dislike". In fact, the faults alluded to in his report mainly concerned deficiencies in the buildings and standards of accommodation offered by Anglican colleges. However, while Mayor called for "substantial improvements" in these areas, the thrust of his criticism was entirely lost in his concluding assurance. "There is no sufficient reason at present," he wrote, "for suggesting any further measure of concentration or the closing of any college."

Mayor was too optimistic, but his sanguine outlook was almost universal in 1929. A Labour government was in office, pledged to the raising of the school leaving age at the earliest opportunity.
Thus on the 22 July, 1929, all training college principals received a letter from the Board of Education "sanctioning the admission in September 1929 of as many additional two-year students as can be properly accommodated".\textsuperscript{87} As the Education Committee of the National Society told its members, "vastly increased numbers of teachers \(\backslash\text{will} \) be needed\(\backslash\text{as a result of the raising of the school leaving age and the development in school organization}\).\textsuperscript{88} Nor were these improvements to be merely temporary adjustments. The Board of Education fearing a half-hearted response from the denominational authorities went out of its way to assure them that, "While this invitation is primarily concerned with the provision of temporary additional accommodation for the period 1930-32, the Board are ... prepared to consider proposals which involve recognition for a more extended period".\textsuperscript{89} In the light of these assurances the Anglican response was far from half-hearted. The Board of Education eagerly accepted plans, presented to them by the Board of Supervision, for three hundred and fifty-three additional students to be accommodated during 1929-30 and a further one hundred and sixty-six in 1930-31.\textsuperscript{90} This total of five hundred and nineteen additional student places was put forward on the basis "of its forming the 'spear-head' of an ambitious and widespread scheme of general modernization of all the Church's training colleges".\textsuperscript{91} 'Scheme two', as it became known, was designed to extend and improve twenty-three Church colleges, with the majority of them having, for the first time, the provision of single study bedrooms which was now commonplace among their local authority rivals.\textsuperscript{92}

Such a costly scheme was not easily accepted by the Church Assembly. Government assurances and intimations of the "closest co-operation presently existing between the Board of Supervision and the Board of Education" had been cited as reasons why Assembly members
should support the resolution providing for "the improvement and enlargement of Church colleges". This evidence, and the way it was presented, indicates that the subsequent unanimous vote on behalf of the resolution was not as unanimous as it appeared. In a Church suffering from all the problems caused by shrinking resources, substantial financial support for teacher training was liable to beggar other parts of the system. "The Church of England" said the Bishop, "is having to perform the very difficult military performance of shortening its front and the obvious first step is to put as speedy an end as possible to the costly and futile conflict which gathers about the phrase 'the maintenance of the dual system'". "For my part" he declared, "I steadily resist proposals for spending large sums of money in a desperate effort to continue the maintenance of schools which are either inefficient or are doomed to an early extinction".

Such plain speaking aroused dangerous passions. Canon Thicknesse sitting with other Assembly delegates was immediately on his feet, waving his order paper so as to gain the right to reply. "The Bishop of Durham" he thundered, "has used the opportunity to say things that seem damaging to the defenders of the Church schools, allegations which must be answered". Claiming that it was wholly unfair to contrast the claims of the training colleges with those of Church schools, Thicknesse concluded his dramatic intervention by flatly asserting that "training colleges cannot be equipped at the expense of the schools".

Cosmo Lang agreed. Attempting to end an increasingly bad-tempered debate, the Archbishop enunciated a policy which many members knew to be unrealistic. "I hope" said Cosmo Lang, "that no one has in his mind the idea of putting the maintenance and extension of their training colleges in competition with the maintenance of their schools, because both are essential". Fulminating at what he described as yet
another "sonorous platitude" from the Archbishop, Henson briskly pointed out to his friends that the Church simply did not possess the financial resources to sustain both schools and colleges and in his estimation it had to choose one or the other.

In fact, although Cosmo Lang was loath to admit it, the Church Assembly, by voting to improve and sustain its colleges, had made a choice. The financial resources subsequently allocated to Church schools dwindled, and in a phrase which was to be used with relish by Board of Education officials, they were 'left to wither on the vine'. A clear priority for Church training colleges was not an ignoble policy in the light of the Church of England's increasing financial impoverishment. However, contemporary events were not to make a mockery of the efforts made by the Church to improve its training institutions. Mowat succinctly describes how the proposal to raise the school leaving age to fifteen came to nothing:

The Labour Government announced in July 1929 that the deed (raising the school leaving age) would be done in April 1931 and later introduced a Bill for the purpose, coupled with increased grants to L.S.A.'s and the provision of maintenance allowances for the children affected. The churches said that they could not meet the cost of enlarging or rebuilding the voluntary schools which this would necessitate; the Government went ahead with the Bill without making any provision to give it. A Labour member, John Scurr, a Roman Catholic, therefore moved to amend the Bill by delaying its operation until building grants for voluntary schools were authorized. This passed rendering the Bill nugatory; and the Lord's rejected it altogether.

Trevelyan promptly resigned and within a matter of months the Labour administration collapsed.

In retrospect, it is clear that the fall of the Labour Government was precipitated by the publication on the 31 July, 1931, of the Report of the Committee on National Expenditure. Appointed by Phillip Snowden, the Labour Chancellor, in order to quieten fears as to the strength of
the British economy, the Committee's final report achieved precisely the opposite result. Declaring that "Public spending, like educational estimates, could be said to have run away", the May Report achieved the dubious distinction of provoking a massive run on sterling. Snowden left office, only to return within a week to pursue his self-appointed role of iron chancellor within the National Government. The May Report awaited him, providing evidence to support his policy of imposing immediate and swingeing cuts. In fact, although they never received the same degree of publicity, the May proposals were only marginally less drastic than those proposed by the notorious Geddes Committee in 1922. Where Geddes had called for a thirty per cent cut in Government expenditure, May recommended reductions that marginally exceeded twenty-seven per cent. "Profligate expenditure" on education was singled out by the Committee for censure and demanding educational economies totalling £13,600,000 and May urged significant cuts in grants "paid to universities and training colleges".

The Board of Education lost no time in responding to the national cry for retrenchment. Pleading the national economic crisis as its reason, the Board informed all denominational authorities that, "building improvements in colleges financed by loans should cease to be implemented from the 1 October, 1931". Fearing an over-production of approximately one thousand teachers, the Board imposed for the academic year 1932-33 a ten per cent reduction in the numbers of teachers to be trained, which effectively reduced the numbers of students in denominational colleges from 4,076 to 3,655. Even before these measures had taken effect, the Board announced a further eight per cent reduction of teachers in training as from September 1934. The significance of all this legislative activity was that within a six month period the Board of Education had entirely reversed its policies. Those connected with
teacher training watched helplessly as all the indicators went abruptly from go to stop.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and members of the Board of Supervision felt that this was all terribly unfair but other Anglicans were not so sure. Did the tangled skein of events, they wondered, reveal their Lord's anger at a church obsessed with secular affairs? Was the current crisis just retribution for too much attention paid to mechanistic planning? In this mood of self-searching Henson found himself a prophet whose warnings were suddenly heeded and his decisive views were now taken seriously, not least by George Bell, Bishop of Chichester. In a remark that was to reverberate through the Church, Bell let it be known that he intensely disliked the Church of England being "organized too much as a business firm". This single observation opened the floodgates of criticism concerning the Church Assembly, particularly of the role played by its specialist committees: a point swiftly seized upon by the Bishop of Exeter. Complaining that it was foolish to attempt to govern different people in different conditions by one rule, he went on to say:

I think some of us are asking whether a movement, which was good in inception, has not overrun the line of wisdom, and whether the latest developments are not robbing the parishes of some of their interest and rightful powers and endangering the new life of the Church by creating a bureaucratic government - bureaucracy is the certain result of an exaggerated centralization of government.

The Bishop did not stop here. In what became an extended and blistering attack on the Church Assembly, he accused it of harshness and insensitivity in its attempts to govern, inability to initiate or tolerate experiment and "financial extravagance, rigidity and lack of enterprise". Although the Chairman of the Board of Finance attempted to counter these arguments by claiming that the Church was pursuing
"a practical, sensible, middle path", his claims went unregarded in the highly charged atmosphere that now began to characterize Assembly debates.

The waspish and volatile mood of the Assembly could be sensed throughout the whole field of teacher training in 1931. In words that encapsulate the experience of all the colleges during the inter-war period, the Executive Committee of the National Society bitterly informed its members that "during the last few years the training colleges have been the very playthings of circumstances". In fact, circumstances, or more precisely the vagaries of Government policy, fell with unequal force upon the various denominational authorities. Catholics refused to implement any cuts in the number of students recruited to their colleges and so these institutions went forward in an atmosphere of relative calm. Similarly fortunate was the Wesleyan college at Westminster. Firmly integrated into the structure of the University of London, this college had achieved by 1930 an enviably secure status. Thus, although members of the Wesleyan Education Committee, particularly Dr. Workman, were angry with the Government, the only Methodist college seriously affected by the cuts was Southlands. Remorselessly, however, events now conspired to threaten the Anglican colleges.

At first members of the Board of Supervision felt confident that they could escape the severity of the cuts. Their hopes were firmly pinned on Lord Irwin (Viscount Halifax) who, in July 1932, had accepted for a second time the Presidency of the Board of Education. Halifax's personal commitment to the Anglican faith was well-known, as was his close personal friendship with Cosmo Lang. The Chairman of the Board of Finance, Lord Grey, and the new Chairman of the Board of Supervision, Walter Buchanan Riddell, were both personal friends of Halifax and
with so many Anglican affiliations and friendships in evidence, Board members asked each other with a mixture of hope and anxiety whether Lord Edward (as they called Halifax) would stretch forth his hand and rescue the Church colleges. Lord Edward would not. Not perhaps because he did not wish to, but rather because he found himself as firmly constrained by his permanent officials as had Eustace Percy. When he returned to the Board in July 1932, Halifax found no familiar faces among his civil servants because the old guard had moved sideways - L.A. Selby-Bigge\textsuperscript{121} to the East Sussex Education Committee and R.G. Mayor to the Board of Supervision. Sir Aubrey Symonds, who, because of persistent ill health, had never been a particularly effective Permanent Secretary, was now dead. In his place Halifax found E.H. Pelham, assisted by M.G. Holmes\textsuperscript{122} and S.H. Wood. During the bewildering succession of Presidents who had preceded Halifax, this triumvirate had consolidated the powerful position bequeathed to them by Selby-Bigge and Mayor. They now used their power to block any attempts by Halifax to rescue the Anglican colleges.

The political education of the returning President was achieved by the use of familiar Civil Service tactics. Shortly after he resumed office, Halifax received a letter from the Board of Supervision and the Church of England Central Board of Finance requesting restoration of some of the student places allocated to church colleges in order to stave off their imminent closure. The letter, while keeping closely to the facts, was couched in such a way as to convey to his Lordship the Church's resentment of Board actions. "In 1930 the number of grant-earning places was fixed by the Board on what was understood to be a permanent basis", stated Grey and Riddell, "but subsequently it has been found necessary to make reductions in these numbers.... The effect of these reductions" they went on, "is to render impossible the continued existence of some
Halifax was perturbed. Passing the letter to his officials he asked whether the position as outlined by the Church was accurate and, if so, whether anything could be done. Officials quickly conceded that the statement was indeed true because "the ten per cent cut in the number will severely embarrass the Church colleges as they are financed entirely out of grants and fees, the income amounting to £90-£100 per student". Halifax's second question was politically sensitive and the Civil Service response to it illuminates the kind of power struggle evident at this time. 'Therefore, although aspects of the incident may appear trivial, they are described because details on this occasion prove to have an overall significance.

Little of significance seemed apparent in the first reply made by Pelham and Holmes to their Minister. Avoiding any reference to positive measures which could be implemented to assist denominational colleges, the two secretaries merely reiterated Government policy noting that such institutions "should do everything they can to help themselves, both by raising fees and making all reasonable economies". The matter would have probably ended there had Pelham not heard that Lord Grey, on behalf of the Church of England, had arranged a private meeting with Halifax to plead the case of the Anglican colleges. The Permanent Secretary made this useful discovery because in addition to using his staff to make arrangements for his hair to be cut, Halifax also employed them to read train time-tables and make seat reservations. The junior official so employed was rewarded by hearing Halifax complain of "the tiresome necessity of having to get together like this with Grey", and Pelham was thus given prior warning of an 'unofficial meeting'.

Pelham was alarmed because he sensed that his Minister might be about to concede more than Treasury policy would allow. Halifax's
dilatory habits (his long week-ends began on a Thursday morning) provided Pelham with the opportunity to secure the departmental position. Recalling his initial private minutes (P.R.O. 86/80) Pelham added to it a more severe appraisal of the situation. Reminding Halifax of the additional eight per cent cut due in 1934 he asserted, "The outlook for most of the colleges after 1933-34 is bankruptcy and the possibility of closing one or two small colleges should be explored". 128

The delivery of the amended minutes was, from a Civil Service point of view, carefully timed. Halifax invariably returned from the North on a Monday morning train and was not usually at his desk until after lunch. The private minute from Pelham and Holmes was awaiting him on Monday, 2 August. On Tuesday, 3 August, the President was due to receive an official deputation from the Church of England. With barely enough time to read his papers, let alone to discuss them, Halifax was, as always, predisposed to accept the considered advice of his officials. Thus, when members of the deputation arrived, 129 the President, although treating them with his invariable courtesy, 130 stuck firmly to the prepared statement. "There is" he said, "no question of extra financial aid being made available, and in the circumstances the only alternative is college closures". Pelham could not have said it better.

Halifax's sombre appraisal caused dismay among members of the Anglican deputation, Lord Grey revealing the major cause of their discomfort when he said, "If we were to take the initiative in selecting colleges for closure, we would be laying up trouble for ourselves in the Church Assembly". 131 No doubt realizing the personal and political odium he would incur if forced to select colleges for closure, Halifax, refusing to be drawn any further, ignored a suggestion by Canon Partridge that the Board of Education should insist on concentration thereby
"providing the Board of Supervision with the excuse of acting under compulsion". The meeting broke up with matters unresolved, but with Halifax having demonstrated that when his political reputation was in question he was capable of showing remarkable indifference to the pleas of his Church.

This, however, is not the only significant factor to emerge from the incident because while Halifax could be active in defence of his political reputation, he was normally the pliant tool of his permanent officials. On this occasion, Pelham and Holmes had little difficulty in persuading him totally to support their own interpretation of events, both showing a greater regard for the good opinion of their Civil Service colleagues (particularly those in the Treasury) than the wishes of their Minister. Indeed, Civil Service 'neutrality' once again comes into question. In their response to Halifax regarding the plight of the denominational colleges, Pelham and Holmes could have offered positive solutions. Why, therefore, did they choose only to repeat the blank negatives of existing policy? While their fear of what was then referred to as the 'Treasury veto' is undoubtedly one factor, another concerns the 'hidden curriculum' of Civil Service values and assumptions. Permanent officials working at the Board of Education lived with an inherited oral tradition, a tradition which suggested that training colleges were useful but inferior to the universities. Thus, one factor explaining Civil Service action in this case would be that neither Pelham nor Holmes saw any reason why training colleges should receive special treatment liable to increase their status. In fact, it may be concluded that they were happy to select from established policy those parts which confirmed their own beliefs in the subordinate status of the training colleges.
Such considerations were of little consolation to the disappointed members of the Anglican delegation leaving Whitehall after their meeting with Halifax. Collectively, they began to recognize that the Anglican colleges were in disarray. One of their more experienced officials, Edmund Phipps, recognized "the horrible situation" they would shortly be in and, writing on behalf of the Board to the Permanent Secretary, E.H. Pelham, he was candid about "the imminent dangers". "The Chester people and the Bishop of Gloucester" he warned, "may raise a good deal of misunderstanding and anger against the Board of Education and the Board of Supervision on the ground that individual colleges have been kept too much in the dark.... Our leaders acted for the best, but they are under suspicion as being too bureaucratic and centralizing".  

Pelham sympathized, but continued to press the Board of Supervision to supply the names of at least three colleges selected for immediate closure. After a flurry of correspondence, the Board of Education pursued a policy of inactivity, clearly hoping that the worsening financial situation would force the Church to announce closures on its own responsibility. This it stubbornly refused to do, and after a lapse of five months Halifax reluctantly grasped the nettle. On the 2 December, 1932, he announced that the Board of Education would have to accept, "the ultimate responsibility for closing individual colleges". These closures would be accompanied by the withdrawal and curtailment of some of the grants paid to the survivors, Halifax ruefully admitting to his permanent officials, "these are autocratic measures which will no doubt be unpopular with individual colleges, but we have had, in the last twelve months, to do many autocratic things".

The storm of protest which greeted Halifax's statement provided the Board of Supervision with ample reason for continuing to temporize.
Like Mr. Micawber, its members were desperately hoping that something might turn up. An article in the Daily Mail suggested that something possibly had. Referring to a scheme organized by the National Council for Social Services for a large extension of ameliorative work among the unemployed, the paper's editor concluded by indicating his awareness of "the Government's determination to secure substantial workshop facilities for this undertaking". Secretary R. Holland, on behalf of the Board of Supervision, immediately wrote to Halifax asking if the colleges schedules for closure could be used by the National Council as workshops for the unemployed. In his official response to Holland, Halifax spoke vaguely that "administrative difficulties prevent the Government from accepting the Church's offer". However, in a supplementary letter to Buchanan Riddell, the President revealed the cosmetic nature of the Government's unemployment plans:

My Dear Walter,

I hope the enclosed letter (official reply to Secretary Holland) will satisfy your members. As Pelham told you there is nothing in the suggestion (National Council Retraining Scheme). I am glad to hear that your people have agreed to go on with the scheme (closure of colleges) in spite of having clutched at this straw-hat - perhaps that is a tactless metaphor.

Yours ever,

Irwin

This letter punctured any lingering hopes of reprieve and consequently the lethargy of the Board of Supervision was now abruptly replaced by a furious and largely misplaced energy. Secretary Holland and Canon Partridge immediately dispatched to the principals of Fishponds, Lincoln, and Chester colleges telegrams informing them of their institutions suspension and temporary closure. Although rumours had abounded, the telegrams announcing suspension came as a
complete surprise. Neither the Church Assembly nor the Council of Church Training Colleges\textsuperscript{139} had sanctioned the peremptory course of action pursued by the Board of Supervision. The explanation for such hasty and ill-considered actions (as disgruntled college principals were quick to detect) was that the Board had succumbed to pressure from the Board of Education "to deliver the goods\textsuperscript{140}"

Once committed, the Board of Supervision pressed on with increasing desperation and having listened to the aggrieved pleas of the college deputations, its members issued a joint statement on the 30 November, 1932, confirming college closures.\textsuperscript{141} Having recovered from their initial shock, the principals and governing bodies of the threatened colleges refused to accept their suspension and instead took their case to the Church Assembly. The Assembly debate which opened on the 9 February, 1933, was the culmination of weeks and months of uninhibited oral and written warfare among the contending parties. On the 27 January, 1933, members of the Board of Supervision had issued to all Assembly delegates a toughly worded statement defending their action. They denied allegations of unfair, high-handed and precipitate behaviour on their part, and claimed instead that their policy was wholly dictated "by the present climate of financial stringency\textsuperscript{142}". Three days later members of the Assembly received an Appeal from Canon Thomas, Principal of Chester College,\textsuperscript{143} questioning both the policy of concentration and the truthfulness of the Board of Supervision's latest statement.

Pointing to the fact that the Board of Supervision had failed to consult with any of the threatened colleges, Thomas angrily concluded that "its method of action must appear to others as it appears to its victims, callous and autocratic\textsuperscript{144}"

These bitter accusations, in addition to gaining wide publicity through their publication in \textit{The Times},\textsuperscript{145} were in the hands of all
delegates when Lord Grey and Sir Walter Buchanan Riddell made long opening statements justifying the policies adopted by the Board of Supervision. Buchanan Riddell's combative verbal style proved the more effective. Castigating the perfidy of Government policy regarding teaching training, he stressed that the Board of Education had presented the Church with two choices: a general reduction in student numbers, or selective closures of colleges for a limited period. Ignoring remarks from some delegates that temporary closure in this case meant permanent closure, Buchanan Riddell insisted that a general reduction in student numbers would "enfeeble all the colleges and put at risk their expansion programmes". "Twenty-three good colleges" he concluded, "are preferable to twenty-six weak ones". 146

Delegates remained sceptical. Many of them had been present at an earlier debate when 'claims of the closest co-operation existing between the Board of Supervision and the Board of Education' had been used to achieve a unanimous vote in support of training college modernization. Now instead of modernization they were suddenly being asked to support a policy of concentration and, understandably, their bewilderment turned to anger. During discussion over coffee, the Bishop of Chichester, a persistent critic of the Board of Supervision, remarked that it was "a compliant body which seldom met" and Mr. Harrison, an Assembly delegate, took up this theme in the post-coffee debate. In an aggressive attack on the Board, Harrison claimed that it had been supine in its duties and compliant in accepting misconceived Government policies. "On the first important point of policy which has arisen" claimed Harrison, "the colleges are complaining that they have been unfairly treated by the very body appointed to help them". 147

Canon Thicknesse of Liverpool was determined to exploit the openings made for him by the Bishop of Chichester and Harrison.
A friend of Canon Thomas, Principal of the threatened Chester College, Thicknesse came to the Assembly well briefed regarding the sins committed by the Board of Supervision. Additionally, as the leading advocate of church schools, Thicknesse had some old scores to settle with enthusiasts of teacher training. His pithy, sententious debating style delighted and aroused Assembly members. "It really is no good" declared Thicknesse, "for the Board to try and paint as educationally advantageous what is a policy of retreat" and with the majority of delegates clearly rallying behind him, he proposed:

That the Board of Supervision of the Church training colleges be urged by the Church Assembly to take immediately whatever steps may be necessary to postpone for twelve months the closing of any Church training colleges with a view to reconsidering deliberately in the meantime, with the responsible authorities of the colleges, its policy of concentration and to explore with them all possible alternatives to the same.\textsuperscript{148}

This motion was carried by a large majority and, by inference, constituted a vote of no confidence in the Board's handling of affairs.

Members of the Board, sitting in the main body of the hall, now had to suffer in silence as the attack was pushed home. Defeated mainly because they had appeared too bureaucratic and too compliant with Government policies, they now received the backlash of resentment felt by members at the too obvious secularization of the colleges. The Bishop of Bradford, Dr. Alfred Blunt, declared that he had for some time been profoundly uneasy as to the teaching of religious knowledge in Church colleges. He was the first of many speakers to express dissatisfaction, the shared view of such critical delegates being that the colleges had subverted doctrine in the interests of teaching cultural pluralism. Tempers were obviously rising and in the circumstances the best means of clearing the air was the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry and Cosmo Lang hastily sanctioned one,\textsuperscript{149} hoping that the time taken to make
detailed enquiries would allow inflamed feelings to subside. As the Commission began its task, a far from contrite Board of Supervision was more concerned with its loss of face at the Board of Education than with its defeat in the Assembly. For their part, delegates went home well satisfied that they had struck a blow against too much bureaucracy in Church government, and too many secular attitudes in Church colleges.

The strength of the blow actually struck by Assembly delegates was demonstrated by the reaction it provoked from members of the Commission of Enquiry. They made no attempt to gloss over "the recent criticisms of the Church training colleges made in the Church Assembly and elsewhere that in some serious degree the colleges were failing to fulfil the purpose of their foundation, namely that of sending out teachers well instructed in religion and able to implant its teachings in the minds of the children attending primary schools". "So grave an accusation" declared the Commissioners, "touching the very essence of the Church colleges, must obviously be investigated before the Church can be assured that it is right or profitable to expend money and effort on maintaining these colleges." This indeed was the nub of the problem, although it was rare in Church affairs for domestic issues to be aired with such candour. While the Commission's terms of reference included directions stipulating a review of colleges, buildings and finance, Church members were primarily interested in knowing whether their training institutions were fulfilling essential religious purposes. In short, the ordinary church member wanted to know if rumours concerning the rampant secularization of the Church's colleges were true or false.

The question remained unanswered. Although Commissioners began on a frank note, they failed to sustain it as they became influenced by
the politics of their own group. In particular, the Bishop of Peterborough began to exert a decisive influence. Appointed to succeed the Bishop of Wakefield as Chairman of the Board of Supervision, he assumed the leadership of the enquiry by virtue of his office. Well known for his progressive liberal views concerning the teaching of religious knowledge, and having strongly supported a policy of concentration in the Assembly debates, the Bishop was hardly suited for a role as a neutral and dispassionate chairman. In fact he made little attempt to assume such a role, preferring to argue his own case during Commission meetings. At these gatherings, his liberal views received strong support from R.G. Mayor. Entrusted with the task of compiling questionnaires and arranging meetings with college representatives, Mayor did so, aware that his former colleagues at the Board of Education were strongly critical of the antiquated buildings and teaching methods of the Church colleges.

Slowly but surely the opinions held by these two men began to shape the progress of the Commission. Increasingly, its members' views came to represent a liberal, progressive response to what they perceived as 'backwoods' clerical opinion given too much prominence in the Church Assembly. Having conducted extensive enquiries into the place and purpose of religious education in the colleges, Commissioners responded tartly to demands for specific doctrinal and denominational teaching. Their views reveal a clear, liberal-reformist standpoint. "Much of the criticism directed against those who are responsible for the religious teaching in the colleges" they observed, "is a criticism not of religious belief or aim but of educational method.... Those who contend that young men and women at the age of eighteen should be set once more to commit to memory the words of the Church Catechism, are ill acquainted with the application of psychological principles to the
educational process". Such a firm rejection of conservative opinion was hardly calculated to win the Commission friends or influence among lay members who identified themselves with the evangelical wing of the Church.

If Commissioners were rash in offering advanced solutions to long standing problems, they were at least consistent in their policies. Over the question of the compulsory attendance of students at religious services in colleges, the Bishop of Peterborough won another victory for the liberal cause. Knowing the reservations held by many Church members, the majority of the Commissioners were not prepared to adopt their Chairman's outright 'voluntaryist' principles. However, they went far enough along that road to indicate where their sympathies lay. "Freedom in thought and action" they declared, "is the most potent factor in inducing a sense of responsibility.... Compulsion may even produce an undesirable reaction against religion itself".

Abolition of formal methods of doctrinal teaching and greater freedom in chapel attendance were the two major measures advocated by the Commission as appropriate responses to what they termed "the special tendencies of the age". This phrase was merely a euphemism for the word secularization, evidence of which was obvious. Commissioners, though, were reluctant to admit that it was. Although prepared to be very tough on incipient bureaucracy, their comments concerning evidence of secularization in the colleges were remarkably bland. "The religious work of the college is handicapped" they declared, "by students coming to Anglican colleges with no background of personal faith and having received a bare minimum of religious instruction in their elementary and secondary schools". Compressed into a single paragraph, these observations revealed a pattern of non-belief in the majority of homes.
and additionally drew attention to the kind of lip service paid to religious ideals in the schools. Perhaps because such a picture was so disheartening for believers, Commissioners hurried on to other things.\textsuperscript{162} Instead of confronting the secularization issue, they avoided it.

When the Report of the Committee of Enquiry was presented to members of the Board of Supervision on December 16, 1937, its recommendations\textsuperscript{163} provoked little comment among Church members. While the Bishop of Saint Albans was later to ascribe this passivity to the extraordinary lack of interest shown by the laity in the cause of religious education,\textsuperscript{164} there was, on this occasion, an alternative explanation. The Commissioners' recommendations were not controversial. They had halted the suspension and temporary closure of the colleges. They had been tough on bureaucracy and soft on secularization. On the whole, therefore, the report said all the things which lay members were disposed to accept. After the recent tensions and anger in the Church Assembly, most of its members were inclined to forgive and forget, in the process ignoring radical proposals buried in the fine print.\textsuperscript{165} The generally perceived view among churchmen was that the report, although a little too progressive in parts, was the product of the type of enlightened liberalism represented by the Bishop of Peterborough. As the years went by, the majority of Assembly delegates (especially Bishops) became proud of what soon came to be regarded as a forward-looking document.

Fresh evidence, long shrouded in confidentiality, now suggests that this contemporary view of the Commission needs scrutiny. Although the final report of the enquiry was published with commendable speed, the evidence submitted by individual colleges was never revealed. If it had been, Church members would have had reason to be disturbed. Examination
of the representations made by twenty-six Anglican institutions,\textsuperscript{166} strongly suggests that the pace and extent of secularization within them was far more serious and widespread than was actually reported by the Commission. For example, representatives of Saint Mark and Saint John's College, Chelsea, made no attempt to conceal their anxiety regarding the secularization of their college when interviewed by Commissioners on July 8, 1933. The Principal, Mr. J.H. Simpson, began by admitting that he found no desire on the part of students to attend chapel. His subsequent explanation of this statement provides a detailed and dispassionate account of the factors contributing to the secularization of the Anglican colleges during the 1930s.

Membership of the Church of England, argued Simpson, meant nothing to students. Confirmation by itself was a ritual, and in his opinion Anglican clergy deluded themselves when they argued that confirmation plus occasional attendance at church represented a committed Christian student.\textsuperscript{167} The bulk of such students arriving at the college distanced themselves from their religious background as speedily as possible, because having 'crammed' in order to pass the religious examination,\textsuperscript{168} Simpson believed they resented spending time on any work associated with religious instruction. This was a serious assertion and Simpson was at pains to substantiate it. "The practice has been put before every student that the chief object of their endeavours is the obtaining of a university degree". This priority, he argued, "makes them grudge the time given to religious instruction because they are constantly comparing their work and position with that of students in university training departments, where this is no religious examination". Such comparisons, in Simpson's estimation, exposed the limitations of the Anglican colleges, especially their lack of freedom and lack of concern for proper
intellectual standards. Life in such colleges, he concluded, needed to be made more interesting, happier, more vital and more concerned with promoting individual freedom. 169

Saint Mark and Saint John's was not typical of the majority of Anglican colleges, nor was J.H. Simpson a typical principal. Unlike most of his counterparts he was not a priest, and his college, because of its situation in London, was one of the few Anglican institutions able to offer its students the opportunity of studying for a London University external degree. In contrast to Saint Mark and Saint John's, the majority of Church of England colleges were situated in rural environments and were concerned only with preparing students for a two-year teacher's certificate. Yet when all these factors are taken into account, there are good reasons for believing that Simpson's evidence was more representative of the actual extent of secularization in the colleges than Commissioners were inclined to believe. 170

Many factors combined to allow Simpson a freedom to say what other principals were reluctant to admit. Not being in holy orders meant that he did not have a vested interest in maintaining that all was well regarding the spiritual state of his college. While other principals offered strong support of his view that students came to Anglican institutions lacking proper religious instruction, 171 many of them declared that this regrettable situation was soon rectified once students were placed in their care. Principals of the Anglican colleges were not fools. Despite their customary isolation, they knew only too well the suspicions held by lay people of the alleged secularization of their colleges. Self-survival therefore dictated that they should minimise the extent of secular tendencies within their institutions. Thus, while they were prepared to admit evidence of secularization in the schools
and in society, they had to assert that the colleges were acting as bulwarks against this evil. Members of the Commission, for the same reasons, were disposed to believe them. This double process discreetly filtered out evidence of overt secularization in the Church colleges. In training college circles, secularization, like homosexuality, became a taboo subject.

If it is not a contradiction in terms, there is the suspicion of 'a liberal conspiracy' hanging over the 1933 Commission of Enquiry. Because of the dangers of exposing too many secular trends in the colleges, the Commissioners offered remedies without a diagnosis and, on occasions, evidence from the colleges may even have been strained in favour of pre-determined remedies. An example of this tendency can be observed following the meeting of Commissioners with Miss T. Bazeley, Principal of Bishop Otter College, Chichester.\(^*\) Since the 1890s\(^*\) this institution had established a reputation as one of the most liberal and innovative of all the Anglican provincial colleges. Questioning by Commissioners provided Miss Bazeley with a splendid opportunity to defend the liberal ethos of her college. Voluntary attendance at chapel, she declared, was coupled with non-compulsory attendance by students at informal small group meetings where religious issues were examined in the context of their relevance to contemporary social issues. Such methods, she claimed, enjoyed the support of the Chaplain, Canon R.J. Campbell, and of her entire staff. Free discussion, she believed, was the key factor in promoting "a healthy and spontaneous religious atmosphere".\(^*\) The Bishop of Peterborough, Chairman of the Commission of Enquiry, was delighted because Miss Bazeley had very effectively championed his own cause. In subsequent discussions the Bishop argued that if such methods could be successfully used at Bishop Otter College, they could, and should, be introduced into other...
Anglican training institutions. Thus, while principals who maintained that a compulsory system of attendance at chapel was still necessary found their views greeted with silent disapproval, the Commission went out of its way to applaud Miss Bazeley. In summing up, Commissioners wrote, "The College is exercising a good spiritual influence on the students along free and stimulating lines ... the educational tone of the College is admirable".

Unfortunately (from a liberal standpoint) Miss Bazeley's views and methods were certainly not shared by the majority of fellow principals. Therefore, the response of the Commissioners to them is intriguing, and generates at least two conflicting hypotheses. It can be argued that, having discovered secular attitudes spreading in Anglican colleges, Commissioners, influenced by the Bishop of Peterborough, seized upon evidence of good practice as a solution to the problem. Freedom, rather than compulsion, was, they perhaps felt, the appropriate answer to evidence of increasing secularization. There is, however, a more melancholy interpretation of events. By imposing advanced solutions upon conservative institutions, it could be said that Commissioners actually became the unwitting agents of accelerated secularization. For over a century the attendance of all members of a church college at daily chapel services had been the visible evidence of such an institution's religious purpose. Although the Commission refrained from actually saying that compulsory attendance at chapel was harmful, it strained every nerve to commend voluntary attendance.

Such actions, however well intentioned, were resented by many college principals and therefore proved counter productive. Morale in the majority of denominational colleges was low. Culham, for instance, was not alone in having been near to closure on a number of occasions.
All the denominational training institutions for over a decade had been working in an atmosphere of financial uncertainty and the 1933 Commission of Enquiry was the third investigation into their affairs held within a space of six years. In the midst of so many difficulties, some college principals were quick to perceive reform as threatening.

The Reverend H. Walker, Principal of the York Diocesan College, reacted to evidence from the Commission with particular violence. Tossing the report into his waste paper basket, he dismissed it as the work of a reformist clique. "To abolish compulsory attendance at chapel", he informed senior colleagues, "is to deny the whole purpose and meaning of a Church college". He rejected the Commission's findings on the grounds that from the outset its members had attempted to provide soft answers to hard problems. In pursuing this point, Walker claimed that Commissioners had consistently been 'soft on secularism'.

Despite his reactionary tone, Walker had a point. Commission members were far more open to the secular influences of contemporary society than were the staff of isolated training institutions. Were the Commissioners' recommendations therefore prompted, in part, by their acquiescence in and acceptance of secular values? Did they, like the Board of Supervision, panic, and through their advocacy of liberal reforms, help forward the secularizing process which they thought they were combating? In some cases it seems as if this was so. When Walker and other principals refused to accede to the demand for voluntary chapel attendance, they did so from mixed motives. However, what they did share in common was a view that the Commission had pursued a policy of appeasement in the face of rampant secularization.

Whether these accusations were true or false, one point stands out clearly. While the financial crisis and the return of National
Government had marked a national 'turning point', the 1933 Commission of Enquiry marks a watershed in the history of the Anglican colleges. This chapter has attempted to show how the denominational crisis of 1933 was rooted in the financial collapse of 1931. If the expansionist plans of the 1929 Labour Government had gone ahead, the denominational training colleges might have achieved the financial security and academic autonomy that they were searching for. "Reversing the engines" on this occasion ended all such hopes, hopes which were not to be revived under a National Government holding office for the last years of the inter-war period.

Throughout this study an attempt has been made to illustrate how the progress of bureaucratization and secularization shaped the development of the denominational colleges. In this context, evidence presented in the present chapter is particularly significant because it illustrates how the two phenomena blocked the progress of these institutions at a crucial point. During the period 1928-1933, it has been argued, civil servants at the Board of Education found it a relatively simple task to consolidate their power under a succession of short-term Presidents. This consolidation reinforced bureaucratic methods of government, methods proceeding along the legal-rational axiom predicted by Weber. Such policies brought a response from Randall Davidson and some groups within the Anglican Church, whose members began to consider temporal efficiency more important than the spiritual primacy asserted by the autonomists. An emphasis on temporal, as opposed to spiritual, concerns, opened the door for secular values to make headway both in the Church and in its colleges.

At the national 'turning point' (the financial crisis of 1931) it is suggested that legal-rational principles broke down. Plans for
expansion were clearly reversed by officials of the Board of Education in a manner that was neither rational nor sensible. This, it is contended, provoked a revulsion among Anglicans against the bureaucratization of their own Church, a response which included lay resentment of bureaucratization acting as a Trojan horse for secularization. While discontent among lay Church members was soon eased by Cosmo Lang's appointment of a Commission of Enquiry, it is argued that Commissioners, although willing to denounce bureaucratization, were, for all kinds of denominational reasons, loathe to admit to the secularization of the Anglican colleges. Discretion on the part of Commissioners, while it may have saved the Anglican colleges, nevertheless still left these institutions in a state of academic isolation. Indeed, trade unionists and some Board of Education officials, felt that the denominational colleges were insufficiently secular in terms of contemporary standards of efficiency and curricula. On the other hand, many Wesleyans and Anglicans felt that the pursuit of efficiency in their colleges had led to an abandonment of their denominational obligations.

In this confused context, two major trends can be identified. First, the bureaucratic policies pursued by Board of Education officials did not include any plans to integrate the denominational colleges into a unified system of higher education. Eustace Percy's Regional Examining Scheme had been a half-hearted attempt to achieve this; under Halifax's weak leadership the impetus all but died. Secondly, the weakness of the denominations became obvious after years of almost imperceptible decline. Such weakness, it has been argued, resulted from the secularization of both English society and the churches. Only the Roman Catholics, by distancing themselves and their institutions from society, could claim to have successfully weathered the secular storms of the thirties.
In contrast, Anglicans were divided and non-conformists a waning
influence "in an age when idealism died".184

Retreat from power and influence rarely occurs without bitterness
and acrimony. The Anglican and Wesleyan withdrawal during the inter-war
period was no exception, with both denominations bitterly attacking
successive governments for their clumsy handling of the training college
issue. Yet each denomination conveniently overlooked the fact that the
related crisis which arose over the failure to raise the school leaving
age, was rooted in denominational inability to fund improvements in
schools which would have fallen upon them immediately the measures had
been passed. In a nutshell, the churches were over extended and by
'robbing Peter to pay Paul' they faced a crisis in the training college
field which could quite easily have confronted them over church schools.
As Baldwin had confessed on the issue of defence, "The time is past when
we can be strong everywhere".185

By 1933 the denominational position, like the British defence
system, was not strong. Churches during the period 1928-1933, judged by
temporal criteria, were getting progressively weaker. It was, as
Alan Jenkins has observed, "a bad time for bishops". In fact it was
a bad time for all believers, who now found themselves part of a
dwindling minority.187 An overall secularization of thought188 allied
to a hedonistic determination by many people to eat, drink and be
merry189 were combining to make religious beliefs appear anachronistic
nonsense. Trade union leaders lost no time in pointing this out to
their members, adding that socialist measures could conquer contemporary
problems. In the eyes of many socialists, the question of what to do
with the denominational colleges was now the problem. During the last
years of the inter-war period they set out to solve it. The weakness
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of the denominational position, they believed, had been intimated.

Now the time had come to confirm it.
1 MOWAT, C.L. (1955), *Britain Between the Wars*, 1918-1940; p. 390.


5 "It was no 'National' government. It was simply a get-together on the part of the Boys of the Old Brigade, who climbed on to the bandwagon and sat there, rain or shine, until they had brought the British Empire to the verge of destruction", BOOTHBY, R., *I fight to Live*, p. 93, in MOWAT, Op. cit. p. 400.

6 JENKINS, R. (1974), *Nine Men of Power*; pp. 147-148. E.F.L. Wood inherited his father's title in 1925, becoming Lord Irwin, and in 1933 was further enobled as the 'third Viscount and first Earl of Halifax'.

7 Ibid. pp. 141-147.

8 Ibid. p. 140.

9 Baldwin, who was admired and respected by Halifax, became Prime Minister for the third time in June 1935, on this occasion as leader of the National Government, following MacDonald's retirement.

10 Percy found life on the Opposition benches sterile and unattractive. Moving, along with Harold MacMillan, towards a belief in a more active Conservatism, he became unpopular with his former colleagues and drifted out of politics.


13 The resignation of Archbishop Randall Davidson was made public on July 26, 1928. On the same day Baldwin told Lang that he wished to see him. At Lambeth Palace in the evening of the 26, Baldwin
informed Lang that "He proposed to recommend me to the
King as the next Archbishop of Canterbury". Lang asked for time
"To consider his proposal". Baldwin, after a peremptory puff of
his pipe replied, "No, it is inevitable. I won't hear any refusal.
You are the only man. Your one and only duty is to say 'Yes' at
once, and before I leave".


pp. 268-299.

16 Henson went on to argue: "A new Erastianism is emerging in a
Christendom borne, not of individual timidity and ambition, nor
yet of low-toned policies of hierarchical self-interest, but of
a short-sighted and impatient, but not ungenerous, desire to
Christianize society as quickly as possible".
HENSON, H.H., Christian Morality, Natural Developing, Final
p. 328.

17 "Christian Socialism seemed to be just a contradiction in terms ...
to Henson it was sentimental". NORMAN, Op. cit. p. 328.


19 HENSON, H.H. (1943), Retrospect of an Unimportant Life; Vol. II,
p. 115.


21 "I admire his industry" Henson wrote of Temple, "but I distrust
his judgment, dislike his company and dissent from his reading of


"surrounding each 'sonorous platitude' from Archbishop Lang".

24 CURRIE, R., et al (1977), Churches and Churchgoers: Patterns of

25 Ibid. "One of the problems considered is the extent to which a
church is able to generate its own growth, for example, by
recruitment and church building programmes; and we conclude, from
the available data, that church policy is on the whole of less
significance than external influences such as secularization,
industrialization, urbanization, trade fluctuations, political
changes and war”.


27 The analysis offered by Currie strikingly complements the views
of Stephen Yeo. See YEO, S. (1976), Religion and Voluntary
Organisations in Crisis; pp. 291-331.

28 Bishop Charles Gore, knowing Lang’s tendency towards worldliness,
wrote to him before his enthronement begging him to "Keep loyal


30 HIGHAM, C. (1976), The Adventures of Conan Doyle: The Life of the
Creator of Sherlock Holmes; pp. 277-312.


32 Moral rearmament was the child of Frank Buchman, lecturer in
personal evangelism at Hartford Seminary, Connecticut. Having been
asked to leave Princeton in 1921, Buchman came to England in the
same year, going first to Cambridge and then to Oxford.
Alan Jenkins describes his encounter with believers in moral
rearmament:

Only the Buchmanites seemed to know exactly where
they were going. I had them on my staircase at
Oxford. Did I realize that I had unsuspected
qualities of leadership in me? Had I experienced
impurity at school? Well, never mind, it was all
right as long as I shared.... Last vacation they
had made new converts among the top Nazis - old
Heinrich (Himmler) wasn't a bad chap really, he had
to be tough with some people.... Our class had to
take advantage of its privileges and work together;
we couldn't tackle the workers yet....

The Thirties; p. 208.


34 The New York Evening Mail "scooped its rivals" by obtaining
exclusive rights to Couë’s work, but other papers, such as the
New York Evening World, retaliated by publishing pirated versions.
"Later Dr. Benson suggested that the whole thing could be smoothed over if only Coué could say, 'Every day, with God's blessing, I am improving....'". JENKINS, Op. cit. p. 210.

JENKINS, A. (1976), The Thirties; p. 208.


Aldous Huxley, Eric Gill and George Lansbury were among those who joined the Peace Pledge Union. Huxley, who was drifting towards eastern mysticism, edited An Encyclopedia of Pacifism in 1937. The encyclopedia covered fifty-five subjects, many of which were concerned with the types of non-violence advocated by Gandhi.


The 'Red Dean' the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson shocked the faithful of Canterbury with his vision of a Communist Christ, while Middleton Murray in the New Adelphi gave literary prominence to his unorthodox views.


Loc. cit.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/56.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/56.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/32.

Endsleigh Training College at Hull was noted for the wide variety of staff it attracted and the many differing types of 'religious' who attended it for training. In 1934, out of a total of eighty-five students in their first year, sixteen were nuns. Of these, two were Visitation Nuns, three Immaculate Conception Sisters, two Franciscan Missionary Sisters, two Marists, two Dominicans, two Sisters of Saint Mary of Namur, one Sister of Saint John of God and the remainder Sisters of Mercy. Catholic Education Council (1934), Annual Report.


P.R.O. Ed. 24/1818.

The West Midlands Group of Colleges, apart from Selly Oak, comprised Saltley, Dudley, Hereford and Peterborough training institutions, all under the overall control of the University of Birmingham. P.R.O. Ed. 86/13.

Catholic Education Council (1928-29), Annual Report.

Catholic Education Council (1928-29), Annual Report.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/13.

Sister Mary of the Incarnation wrote to the Council in 1927 expressing concern at the slow progress achieved in setting up a regional examining board for Lancashire and Cheshire. Catholic Education Council (1928), Annual Report.

Sister Mary, Principal of Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, wrote that in her regional scheme, "The Local Education Authorities are endeavouring to secure a position for themselves on the Examining Board". "This movement" she continued, "on the part of the Local Authorities does not generally commend itself to the universities and training colleges, hence the delay". Sister Mary's comments draw attention to the long held suspicions of Catholics concerning local education authorities. The secular inclinations of such bodies had been a source of friction, especially in Lancashire, since their very inception in 1903. At Bury, Rochdale and Heywood, local authorities had endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to exclude Catholic representation. In the negotiations concerning the setting up of the Lancashire and Cheshire Examining Board (Calder, Edge Hill, Mount Pleasant and Manchester training colleges), Catholics succeeded in excluding local authority representation. See Catholic Education Council (1928-29), Annual Reports and P.R.O. Ed. 86/13.

Asquith died on the evening of February 15, 1928. His death made possible a re-unification of the Liberal party, which had, since the war, split into factions under himself and his rival, Lloyd George. JENKINS, R. (1964), Asquith; p. 519.

59 Ibid. p 151.

60 The Liberal Party (1928), Britain's Industrial Future; pp. 379-403.


62 Baldwin went to the country on May 30, 1929, with disastrous results for his party: Conservatives gained only two hundred and sixty seats and attracted fewer than thirty-nine per cent of the total votes cast.

63 JENKINS, A. (1976), The Thirties; p. 209.

64 Wesleyan Education Committee (1926-27), Annual Report, Universities and Training Colleges, p. 16.

65 The Methodist Education Committee flatly asserted that, "The universities are unwilling partners in this matter". Ibid. p. 16.


67 Ibid. p. 17.


70 Wesleyan Education Committee (1929-30), Annual Report, Declaration of Methodist Education Policy, pp. 8-10.

71 Wesleyan Education Committee (1927-29), Annual Reports, Southlands College: Reports of the Principal, pp. 40-42 and 51-52.


73 Ibid. pp. 42-63.
74 At the Annual General Meeting of the National Society held on the 30 May, 1923, Davidson's settlement of the "Church school issue" was rejected by delegates. Prebendary Thicknesse, moving an unannounced amendment, persuaded the Society to support a motion in his name declaring:

That the National Society considers that it is urgently necessary that the authorities of the Church should be respectfully invited to abandon the policy of negotiation for the surrender of Church schools, and aid the Society by putting forth a strong appeal to all Church people to maintain Church schools and training colleges in a condition of the greatest possible efficiency while pressing for the definite teaching of the elements of the Christian faith to Christian children in all schools.

Thicknesse's motion was carried by forty-seven votes to thirty-seven, and the Archbishop saw four years of patient negotiations rejected.


75 By July 1931, it was obvious to even the most conservative Board of Education officials that the dual system could not continue. Selby-Bigge, retired and therefore able to offer independent views, spoke for many of his serving colleagues when he wrote:

There can be no doubt that some modification of the 'dual system' as established by the Act of 1902 is essential and urgent both in the interests of the children and in the interests of economy.


76 Kenneth Boulding in his book The Organizational Revolution argues that Davidson was facing problems confronting all denominational leaders in the twentieth century. Boulding suggests that religious leaders had to prepare their organizations to face:

1) Demographic changes, urbanization and the problems of maintaining social order in the towns.
2) Increasing competition between rival religious bodies in a 'market' which was tending to regard all religious bodies as entitled to equal status.
3) Political changes which undermined the financial dependence of the Church on the state.
4) The need for the Church to develop a sense of responsibility in its laity (especially middle class laymen) for its financial support and management.

BOULDING, K.E. (1953), The Organizational Revolution.

77 Weber had predicted such a consequence. "The need for financial and monetary efficiency" he wrote, "will create a Gesellschaft, associational, centralized Church, as opposed to the older Gemeinschaft, communal Church". WEBER, M., Theory of Social and Economic Organizations, pp. 335-339.
Kenneth Thompson in his book, *Bureaucracy and Church Reform*, draws attention to the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church Finance, 1911. This report, he argues, by paving the way for a centralized salary structure for the clergy, was an important measure promoting central control and thus undermining the traditional autonomy of the parish priest. He goes on to offer the following hypothesis:

The history of the administration and financial organization of the Church of England reflect a persistent tension between instrumental efficiency, achieved through the agency of a small executive body of professional administrators ... and the reasserting [by the clergy] of the Church's distinctive values and its own intrinsic authority.


Such a relationship, if it existed, was not in good working order during Eustace Percy's tenure of office at the Board of Education. The Bishop of Wakefield, Chairman of the Board of Supervision, complained bitterly of the President's secretive and autocratic methods.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1928.

Fifty-one pages covering every aspect of the colleges' work, from a review of their place in the educational system to an estimate of their future prospects.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1926.

When Mayor made his survey in 1929, Scheme I, which included the amalgamation of St. John's and St. Mark's Colleges to form a single college, and the rebuilding of Warrington and Whitelands Colleges, was well under way. The scheme was finally completed in 1931 at a cost of £390,403.


"In order to meet the urgent demand for qualified teachers which will arise in 1931 as a result of the decision of the Government in regard to the raising of the school age as well as of the development in school organization, the Board are prepared to sanction the admission in September 1929 of as many additional two-year students as can be properly accommodated".

P.R.O. Ed. 22/164.

"While this invitation is primarily concerned with the provision of temporary additional accommodation for the period 1930-33, the Board are aware that in some cases the training college authorities may not feel themselves justified in securing staff, accommodation, etc. with the expectation of so limited a period of recognition. The Board are, therefore, prepared to consider proposals which involve recognition for a more extended period".


90 Loc. cit.

91 P.R.O. Ed. 21/1929.

92 P.R.O. Ed. 115/82.

93 "That having regard to the pressing needs of the Church training colleges for improvements and enlargements, and to the great opportunity at the present moment before them, the Central Board of Finance be instructed to deal with the question as one of urgency". Church Assembly (1929), Interim Report of the Central Board of Finance (C.A.F. 77), p. 512.

94 The Bishop of Durham went on to add that personally he would "transfer from the cause which had drawn to itself so much money in recent years (maintenance of Church schools) money which would really make effective the training of the teachers". Ibid. p. 517.

95 "The natural place and atmosphere in which teachers trained in the Church colleges would do their best work", asserted Canon Thicknesse, "is in Church schools which hold the tradition of their faith". Ibid. p. 518.

96 Ibid. p. 519.

The National Society gave its own version of events in its one hundred and twentieth Annual Report, providing Anglicans with the actual text of "The Scurr Amendment":

To leave out from the word 'shall' to the end of the clause, and to insert instead thereof the words:

not come into operation until an Act has been passed authorizing expenditure out of public funds, upon such contributions as are necessary to meet the cost to be incurred by the managers of non-provided schools in meeting the requirements of the provisions of this Act, but that in no event shall this Act come into operation earlier than the first day of September, nineteen hundred and thirty-two.


The Committee on National Expenditure was popularly known as the May Committee, after the title of its Chairman, Sir George May, Secretary of the Prudential Assurance Company. MOWAT, Op. cit. p. 379.

The Committee suggested a ten per cent reduction in the proposed grant for 1931 paid to universities and training colleges. As this grant only stood at two hundred and fifty thousand pounds, it is difficult to see how "significant" savings could have resulted from reduction of this grant alone.

Ibid. p. 172.
The Bishop's views were supported by F.A. Iremonger in his biography of William Temple. Describing the inception of the Church Assembly, Iremonger wrote:

"Generally it may be said that at the outset there was a sharp and fateful struggle between two groups in the National Church Assembly who differed widely in their conception of its policy and its purpose and may be called, roughly, the legalists and the moralists. The struggle was a brief one. The legalists - of whom Sir Lewis Dibdin, the trusted adviser of Randall Davidson, will be remembered as the leader - were soon in control; the voice of the Assembly is now the voice of the Administrator, not of the Prophet."


The Church of England in this, as in other matters, has maintained a practical and sensible middle path between the precipice of autocratic centralization on the one hand, and the abyss of unco-ordinated differentiations on the other.... The Church of England has avoided alike the Roman autocracy in organism and the Protestant isolation of unit". The Church Assembly News (1924-25), Vol. 1, No. 6, June.

The Catholic colleges weathered the storm because higher fees, increased voluntary funding and economy achieved by employing nuns, enabled the Catholic Education Council to continue its policy of minding its own business, and its own interests. The Hierarchy and the Catholic Education Council convinced the laity of the benefits of distancing their Church from central government. Catholic Education Council (1929-30), Annual Report, The Hierarchy and Catholic Principles on Education.


Wesleyan Education Committee (1933-34), Annual Report, pp. 18-30.

R.B. Lockhart, gossip columnist for the Beaverbrook press, wrote in his personal diary on the 8 June, 1931:

Irwin suffers from religious mania and is an Anglo-Catholic of a very advanced and ardent type. Before
seeing Gandhi he went into meditation and retreat, consulting and confessing to his favourite priest.


In his autobiography, Fulness of Days, Halifax provides a vivid description of Cosmo Lang and William Temple, whom he came to know intimately during their frequent week-end visits to his ancestral home at Garrowby. Despite sharing Cosmo Lang's Anglo-Catholic leanings, Halifax seems to have found Temple the stronger personality:

Of the two men I would judge Temple to have been by far the simpler character. Unlike Lang, who might seem to see himself as a player of an important part on a large stage under the gaze of critical eyes, Temple was so vigorously alive through his own touch with life and his own enjoyment of it, that he gave little sign of being concerned with anything else. In a discussion, Lang would be interested in the effect his argument would create; Temple would be so wholly absorbed in the intellectual analysis of the matter under debate as to have no other thought.


The Bishop of Wakefield, George Rodney Eden, for so long the Chairman of the Church of England Board of Supervision, retired in 1931.


SIMON, Op. cit. p. 160. Members of the East Sussex Education Committee did not find Selby-Bigge an easy colleague. One member complained of his speaking to him, "in a manner which denoted his obvious irritation at having to converse with a half-witted layman". Another member more charitably concluded, "He [Selby-Bigge] was clearly a big frog in too small a pond".

Holmes was to succeed Pelham as Permanent Secretary in 1937, while Wood as Principal Private Secretary to Presidents of the Board was to have great influence over R.A. Butler in the matter of the McNair Report.


P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/80. Private Minute to the President of the Board of Education.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.
The Anglican deputation to see Halifax on the 3 August, 1932, included Earl Grey, Canon Partridge, Sir Walter Buchanan Riddell, R. Holland and R.G. Mayor. P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.

Rumours that the Board of Education were seeking the closure of "five or six Anglican colleges" had leaked out in August 1932. The rumours were substantially correct. The number of colleges to close was reduced to three because Halifax feared that more would make him and the National Government "far too unpopular". P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.

At its meeting on November 24, 1932, the Council of Church Training Colleges had been asked by the Bishop of Peterborough to support the resolution standing in his name:

That in the highest interest of the Church of England colleges this council approves and will support the policy of concentration.
An acrimonious meeting refused to endorse this resolution. After many alternative motions had been tabled, the Council finally voted by twenty-two votes to twenty-one to support the amendment proposed by Canon Thomas of Chester:

That this council requests the Board of Supervision to consider with a view to recommending to the Board of Education the possibility of approximating the numbers of students in colleges, for the purpose of avoiding if possible the closing of any college.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.

140 P.R.O. Ed. 24/1934.

141 P.R.O. Ed. 86/60.

142 Church of England Training Colleges (1933), Concentration to Meet Cut in Numbers of Students, Statement by the Board of Supervision, pp. 1-10.

143 The Principal of Chester College, Canon R.A. Thomas.


145 The Times (1933), 30 January.

146 Church Assembly (1933), Minutes of Proceedings, p. 24.

147 Ibid. p. 24.


150 Cosmo Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to Lord Irwin /Halifax/, President of the Board of Education, on the 12 February, 1933, informing him of the Church Assembly's decision not to proceed with
the suspension of the three colleges. Secretary Holland of the Board of Supervision was immediately summoned to the Board of Education by the Permanent Secretary, E.H. Pelham. His reception was far from cordial. He wrote:

I am bound to say that the impression left upon my mind during my interview with Pelham was that he and probably his colleagues feel very considerable annoyance at the awkward position in which the Board of Education and the President in particular have been placed.... I quite realize that the Board of Supervision has not proved able on this occasion to 'deliver the goods' and was not surprised to hear from Pelham that the amount of attention to our recommendations in training college matters in future will depend on our proved ability beforehand to 'deliver the goods'.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1934.

151 See Appendix X, List of members appointed by the Archbishops and the Church Assembly to serve on the Committee of Enquiry: Church of England Training Colleges, 1933.


153 Ibid. p. 9.

154 Commissioners slightly amended the terms of reference presented to them by the Church Assembly to read:

1. To consider the general standard of efficiency of the group of Church of England training colleges.

2. To review for every college -
   a) the financial stability;
   b) the need for a scheme of development and its cost.

3. To advise whether efficiency can be adequately secured without a policy of temporary concentration.

4. To report to the Board of Supervision.

Ibid. p. 5.

155 Claude Petriburg - official signature of the Bishop of Peterborough. Ibid. p. 69.

156 Ibid. Method of Investigation, pp. 10-11.

157 In investigating the place of religious education in the training colleges, Commissioners obtained evidence on the following points:

a) The character of the religious instruction given in the ordinary curriculum of the college;
b) The nature of the chapel services;
c) The character of the attendance at these services, whether compulsory or voluntary;
d) The position of the Principal, and the amount of leisure which the onerous character of the administrative work left for personal contact with the students;
e) The work of the Chaplain, both as spiritual adviser and as lecturer;
f) The religious activities initiated and carried on by the students themselves;
g) The nature of the doctrinal teaching;
h) The religious influence in the schools of the students when appointed to posts;
i) The testimony of old students as to the value of their religious training at college;
j) The general religious atmosphere of the college.

Ibid. pp. 15-16.

158 Ibid. p. 22.

159 Ibid. p. 19.

160 Over the issue of centralized funding and financial control of all Anglican colleges, the Commission rejected the solution and in any case recognized the impossibility of achieving it:

It may perhaps be unfortunate that the surpluses realized by some colleges cannot be set against the deficiencies of others. Modern civil organization would set out to remedy the present difficulties by the work of a central supervising authority; this process, however, would involve a centralization which the conservatism of the Church would reject. It might also conduce to local irresponsibility and require an autocracy of control which could never be conceded.

Ibid. p. 41.

161 "The religious teaching given in the secondary schools is often by no means satisfactory, and in some schools is almost non-existent.... In the elementary schools, where religious instruction is usually given at the opening of the educational day ... it is interrupted by the delivery of notices".

Ibid. pp. 24-25.

162 The major preoccupation of Commissioners concerned the financial difficulties of the Anglican colleges. Rejecting economies achieved by cutting staff and salary levels, they put forward a six-point plan to arrest what they described as "The landslide
toward bankruptcy":

1. All fees to be raised to £30 per student per annum.
2. Re-negotiation with the Board of Education regarding the payment of grants.
3. Exploration of the possibility of increasing the £30,000 Parochial Quota devoted to training colleges.
4. Efforts between colleges to co-operate in purchasing basic commodities.
5. The establishment of a central financial pool out of surplus fees for the benefit of the weakest colleges.
6. Reinvestment of stocks and shares allied to efforts to raise the level of voluntary contributions.

Ibid. pp. 39-64.

"For some extraordinary reason the Church was not really passionately interested in the cause of religious education". Church Assembly (1936), Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVII, No. 3, p. 474. Comment made by Dr. M.B. Purse, Bishop of Saint Albans.

The qualifications and reservations of the majority of Commissioners regarding proposals for voluntary attendance at chapel effectively created a degree of ambiguity on this issue which served to muffle violent criticism.

See Appendix XI Representations made by Church of England training colleges to the Board of Supervision Committee of Enquiry.

Church of England (1933), Board of Supervision for Church Training Colleges, Committee of Enquiry, Interview with representatives of St. Mark and St. John's College, Chelsea, 8 July, p. 7.

In the published report, Simpson's evidence was brushed aside as being unrepresentative:

In one or two of the colleges there were indications at the moment (slight in themselves) of an unsatisfactory religious tone ... but having in mind the wide range of spiritual and intellectual capacity represented by twenty-six individual colleges, churchmen must rejoice at the high level of effort even while they may hope for a still greater measure of achievement.

Ibid. p. 24.
The Reverend W.E. Beck, Principal of St. Paul's College, Cheltenham, told Commissioners that the majority of students came from the newer type of secondary school which did not give a very prominent place to the study of religious things. Those who had been confirmed did not appear to differ very much from the others. Canon R.A. Thomas, Principal of Chester, said that he found that there was a great deal of ignorance among his students in religious matters.

Church of England (1933), Board of Supervision for Church Training Colleges, Committee of Enquiry, Interview with representatives of St. Paul's College, Cheltenham, p. 5 and representatives of the Training College, Chester, p. 7.

The Committee of Enquiry met representatives of Bishop Otter College, Chichester, on October 4, 1933.


Church of England (1933), Board of Supervision for Church Training Colleges, Committee of Enquiry, Interview with representatives of Bishop Otter College, Chichester, pp. 4-5.

Ibid. Interview with representatives of Fishpond's Training College, Bristol, pp. 6-7.

Ibid. Interview with representatives of Bishop Otter College, Chichester, p. 5.


The sequence began with investigations made by the Burnham Committee in 1926-27, enquiries followed by R.G. Mayor in 1928, and probed further by the Commission of Enquiry, 1933.

Ibid. Interview with representatives of York Diocesan Training College and minutes of staff meeting at York Diocesan College, January 3, 1933, p. vi.

Other principals who supported Walker's views were -

The Reverend W.E. Beck, Principal of St. Paul's College
The Reverend A. Guillaume, Principal of Culham
The Reverend E.F. Braley, Principal of Bede College.
"In the half-century following August 1914 the Conservatives held office continually, with only one major interruption — the Labour Government of 1945-51. In part this was a consequence of the decline of the left. The left parties suffered from the loss of buoyancy and self-confidence which followed from Britain's decline as a world power and the experiences of the First World War, as well as from the twin phenomena of economic growth and economic crisis which ran parallel after 1914. The resultant urge to play safe proved largely to the advantage of the Conservatives. So did the decline in 'idealism'. This was partly a result of the circumstances just mentioned. But other forces helped to cause it: among them the concession of votes to women, the emergence of Bolshevism as a world force (despite its basic irrelevance to British politics) and the decline in religious belief — for contrary to a popular view, periods of religious vigour are likely to be periods of political radicalism, and periods of religious quiescence periods of political conservatism".

CHAPTER 9

Holding the Fort

The differences and increasing tensions between trade unions and denominational bodies were very clear by 1933. From their apparently crushing defeat during the 1926 General Strike, unionists under Ernest Bevin's autocratic leadership had by the early thirties dramatically extended the limits of their power and influence. In fact, 1926 marked the end of an era. Reliance by trade unions upon massive and frequent industrial action was, in the light of the 1926 confrontation, generally recognized by both Bevin and the Trades Union Congress as not worth while.

Bevin's new policy of conciliation rather than confrontation proved fruitful, providing trade union leaders with a new found aura of respectability. Having defeated the unions during the General Strike, Baldwin during its aftermath wisely sought to strengthen the hands of moderate labour leaders. Thus, somewhat to their surprise, T.U.C. leaders found themselves being called to Downing Street to discuss international crises as well as labour disputes. In contrast to 1926, during the thirties Bevin frequently found himself entering 10 Downing Street in front of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Although this is an apparently trivial observation, taken in conjunction with the evidence of earlier chapters, it highlights a new pattern of power emerging within British society during the 1930s. The first part of this chapter examines the new power structure, concentrating upon the re-formation of a secularist-unionist alliance as perceived by R.H. Tawney. Tawney argued that during the early thirties a re-alignment of British politics took place. One facet of
this re-alignment, he believed, was a resurgent unionist movement attempting to undermine still further faltering denominational bodies. This chapter argues that Tawney's hypothesis is confirmed, in part, by what happened to the denominational colleges in the decade before the war. College closures, the policy of 'concentration' agreed upon by denominationalists and officials at the Board of Education (events described in detail during the second part of this chapter), were, it is claimed, a consequence of the new powers achieved by unionists and secularists during the last part of the inter-war period.

The bitter arguments between unionists, denominationalists and Board officials concerning the place of religious instruction in the curricula of both Church schools and colleges, are examined in the final part of this chapter. The persistence, heat and outcome of these disagreements illustrate how far denominationalists had by the outbreak of war in 1939 become helpless spectators in a battle between the Board of Education and the trade union movement.

Tawney, as an historian, searched for the origins of this battle. In the case of the denominational colleges, the roots of their inter-war crisis could be traced back to 1902. The Education Act of that year, by creating local authority colleges and confirming the role and status of university colleges, prepared the way for the eventual decline of denominational institutions. By the 1930s, what had been sown in 1902 was clearly being reaped, namely that denominationalists and their training colleges were collectively becoming an impoverished third party in a training system dominated by the universities and the local education authorities. The loss of power and influence experienced by denominationalists during the period 1930 to 1939 is thus the central issue now explored.
The crux of the problem, in R.H. Tawney's estimation, was the demise in Britain of the Christian tradition. "The vacant throne of religious authority" wrote Tawney in 1932, "is being occupied by totalitarian power theories and the secular messiahs who incarnate them".6 The alternative to religion, he observed, was not irreligion but counter-religion.7 In developing this hypothesis, Tawney described how religion had lost its influence over social norms and institutions because new gods were waiting in the wings. "The apostasies waiting to succeed are legion but the most popular claimants to the political throne have commonly been two, the worship of riches and the worship of power". The consequence of the first he saw as privilege, of the second, tyranny.8 In other words, the National Government during the thirties was worshipping riches9 while the unions found power more attractive. This model, however, breaks down on questions of detail. While unions may have begun to worship power, they did not always possess it. On the other hand, ministers of the National Government were not always as venal in their motivation as has sometimes been suggested.10

Nevertheless, Tawney's analysis and the pivotal position he assumed at this time help provide insights into the re-alignment of political pressure groups during the 1930s. In an atmosphere of apparent "economic recovery and political apathy",11 secularists re-defined their aims and objectives. Many diverse groups had always been attracted to what can loosely be called secularist principles but in the thirties they went further, seeking to translate their beliefs into a programme of political action. In particular, the political cutting edge of secular reform came to be identified with the aspirations of working class people in the trade union movement. While this was not a new phenomenon, being rather a process which had been evolving gradually since the 1890s, what was different was the newly won power obtained
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by the trade union movement, enabling it to implement, rather than merely approve, secularist programmes. The use of such power, for overt political purposes, began to frighten away traditional allies and attract to the unionist cause new pressure groups.

In the first part of this thesis a secular alliance was identified, an alliance of doctrinaire secularists, trade unionists and non-conformists who, under a secularist manifesto, found common cause for challenging the Anglican hegemony. By the beginning of 1930 it was clear that this alleged hegemony was collapsing, taking with it the cement which for so long had bound together so many disparate allies. In particular, the withdrawal of the Anglican threat caused non-conformists to view with increasing suspicion the political objectives of a 'new' generation of trade union leaders.

Ernest Bevin typified the new breed. Having achieved power, Bevin lost no time in putting his chapel origins behind him. In contrast, George Lansbury, a lonely representative of the older tradition of socialism and non-conformity inspiring each other, came to be regarded by his colleagues as a quaint anachronism. While Bevin adjusted to new priorities, particularly the exercise of power, Lansbury did not. Partly because of habit and partly through conviction, Lansbury could not accept what Bevin and his colleagues found inevitable; the break up of the 'non-conformist tradition'.

During the thirties all dissenting religious sects suffered severely because old certainties were challenged and generally found wanting. As Martin Ceadel in his book, Pacifism in Britain, points out, the old 'non-conformist tradition' was first infiltrated and then overwhelmed by a combination of socialists and humanitarians intent upon enrolling dissenters under new banners. These new banners were
not of the Sunday school but of the trade union movement, Christ, salvation and temperance being replaced by pacifism, equality and enhanced standards of living. The pacifist movement, although it had Christian affiliations, rapidly became dominated by "absolute pacifists who were not of Christian inspiration".

The politization of the pacifist movement (which served to draw it into the secularist sphere of influence) typified the increasingly secular temper of English society in the 1930s. By 1932 non attendance at church was so widespread that secularists were openly contemptuous about what they termed 'the religious cult' and because it was fashionable to despise belief, religious credibility was eroded. The erosion of belief was assisted by the access gained by working people, and their children, to new sources of information and entertainment. Although, as Professor Simon has demonstrated, changes in educational opportunities during the thirties were not far reaching, it was a different story in the field of entertainment. Baldwin was the first Prime Minister to make himself master of 'the fire-side chat' and soon '2LO calling' was heard in homes across Britain. While the first Director-General of the British Broadcasting Company, John Reith, attempted to maintain a Christian ethos within the company, wireless rapidly became another factor promoting the secularization of English society, although this occurred by chance rather than by intention. Wireless programmes dealing with current affairs at many levels and containing varied viewpoints, helped to foster the state of cultural pluralism which had been anticipated by the Bishop of Durham.

The Catholic Hierarchy were not slow to recognize the danger. Much of their success in maintaining the denominational integrity of the Catholic colleges had resulted from their policy of shielding them
from contemporary events. Wireless programmes reached across closed
gates and forbidden literature.\textsuperscript{20} One student who attended Strawberry
Hill College from 1934 to 1935, described how, despite rules to the
contrary, groups of students gathered secretly to enjoy the music of
the Savoy Orpheans and the Havana Band.\textsuperscript{21} While this was innocent
enough, he admitted that it was tempting to leave the wireless on for
news and other current affairs programmes. This was precisely the
aspect of radio communication about which the Hierarchy had grave
reservations.\textsuperscript{22}

R.H. Tawney did not share the anxieties of the Catholic Hierarchy,
but in surveying English society at this time he touched upon equally
profound and universal issues. Tawney sensed the secular drift of
society and, unlike many of his colleagues, did not rejoice. As an
advocate of socialism as fellowship\textsuperscript{23} he was not impressed by
"anarchism or schemes for implementing socialism through model
communities in pristine isolation from the levers of state power".\textsuperscript{24}
The increasing power of the state alarmed Tawney in the same way it
perturbed Henson. Having witnessed the anarchist and syndicalist
versions of socialism swept aside (Leninism and Fabian collectivism),
Tawney watched apprehensively as a new generation of socialists lauded
the imposition of the strong state as the proper vehicle for socialism.
Contemptuous of the notion that the socialist millenium would be
achieved by bureaucratic coercion, Tawney argued the alternative case.
"How state management deadens spiritual life" he wrote, "is evidenced
by the Church of England".\textsuperscript{25} In examining the state of this and other
churches, Tawney ruefully considered the contending forces which were
eroding the principles of his own liberalism.\textsuperscript{26} In fact Tawney felt
himself "trapped between the two streams of Bolshevism and Fascism ...
totalitarian ideologies expressing the supreme autonomy of politics".\textsuperscript{27}
In asserting this autonomy he believed that Fascism, in particular, embraced both secularization and bureaucratization as the means of obtaining squalid ends. Indeed, Tawney considered that secular ideologies (such as Fascism) prospered because they were opposed by enfeebled churches of shrunkken vision and narrowing influence. Such weakness dissuaded Tawney from pursuing the Christian alternative. Attempting to pour the new wine of socialism into the existing bottles of Christian conscience, Tawney encountered strong opposition from the majority of Anglican bishops and thereafter became "an active exponent of Fabian methods in the outer orbit of the Church of England". Such a peripheral vantage point enabled him to analyze, with a degree of coolness and objectivity, the internal difficulties of his church. In the course of giving an address on the topic of Christianity and Social Order, he challenged Anglicans and other denominationalists "to throw their weight against the obvious evils in British society". Disappointed by the lack of response, Tawney began to ask if "Christians had forgotten the substance of their faith".

Some Anglicans were quite certain that they had. Alec Vidler in his autobiography, *Scenes from a Clerical Life*, describes how the growth of "secular humanism" during the inter-war period brought about a situation where the Anglican Church was becoming an agent of its own secularization. Examining the work of "liberal theologians" at this time, Vidler argues that their influence was disastrous:

They spoke no longer of redemption but of civilization; no longer of salvation but of culture; no longer of sin but of ignorance, no longer of heaven but of progress; no longer of the Church but of humanity; no longer of the Creed but of science, no longer of eternity but of the future...

Tawney and Henson agreed with this diagnosis but were at odds as to the remedy. Tawney believed, even more strongly than William Temple,
that the churches had to justify themselves in terms of social action. If such action alienated church members Tawney was undismayed. Like his fellow Christian Socialist, Charles Gore, he demanded "fewer Christians, if need be, but better Christians".

Henson found this unacceptable. Believing in justification by faith and not through works, the Bishop of Durham clung to the autonomist tradition of the Church of England. His views soon brought him into dispute with Gore and Temple and the irreconcilable nature of their doctrinal differences resulted in Anglicans dividing into sectional alliances. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Lang, presided uneasily over this theological feuding, frequently giving the impression of being more interested in unity than truth.

Denominational colleges had a vital interest in the outcome of these ideological battles taking place within and beyond the churches during the 1930s. Yet so minimal had been the progress made by colleges towards obtaining financial and academic autonomy that all the crucial decisions affecting their future at this time were invariably taken on their behalf. In the judgment of the National Society's Executive Committee, training colleges became "the very playthings of circumstances".

The immediate problem for staff working in the colleges was one of identity and expectations because the dispute between Gore and Henson was not evidence of the type of desultory denominational wrangling so typical of the nineteenth century. Rather, both men were debating fundamental principles and seeking to take their followers in opposite directions and therefore, for those in the colleges, the choice of road to be followed became critical. Gore and his Christian Socialist colleagues were mainly concerned that the
denominational colleges should produce young men and women capable of turning Christian principles into Christian action. Possession of a strong social conscience by student teachers was, in their estimation, imperative, denominational purity being "not worth a fig" by comparison.

Cosmo Lang, an Anglo-Catholic, and Henson, a broad churchman, were not so certain. Each, with varying degrees of emphasis, prized denominational integrity and looked suspiciously upon anything, including academic excellence, which detracted from this. Cosmo Lang during the early thirties wished the Anglican colleges to acquire some of the denominational distinctiveness possessed by their Catholic counterparts, although he was circumspect in making his views known. Maybe because of the Archbishop's reticence, or, as Tawney warned him, because denominationalism was "in decline and soon will be dead", the Anglican colleges continued to become less rather than more denominational in character and outlook.

This trend continued throughout the thirties. In fact, just as Lang and Henson were arguing about the nature of denominational distinctiveness, it quietly slipped away, its departure hastened by the fierce attacks launched upon religious bodies by the 'new' secularist alliance. Doctrinaire secularists and trade unionists (a combination of the hard and the soft left) threw their whole weight against what they termed "the evils of denominational privilege", and denominational colleges were especially vulnerable to such accusations. Throughout the twenties they had attracted mounting criticism from educational journals concerning their physical and intellectual isolation and low academic standards. Trade unionists seized upon these complaints, suggesting that the dual system was promoting double standards, one standard for state schools and colleges, another for
Suddenly, in December 1932, all the accusations levelled by trade unionists against training institutions were given a new focus. L.C. Knights, the distinguished literary critic, compiled and published an article entitled, "Will Training Colleges Bear Scrutiny?". The sharp criticisms offered by Knights in this article reached a national audience because of two particular features associated with its presentation. His survey was unusual because it made extensive use of evidence submitted by training college students. Nobody during previous investigations had thought it worth while to ask 'trainees' their opinions, and when Knights opened the way for them to do so, they responded aggressively. In particular, student revelations regarding homosexual practices in training institutions brought the article immediate notoriety. One offending passage from an anonymous female student was widely quoted and wildly misquoted:

"GP attachments were common. Sometimes they existed between two pretty girls who related their adventures with their men to each other and got the thrill twice over, who slept with each other, and usually walked about touching each other. Sometimes a sporty girl had a satellite who fagged for her and pushed her claims at college. There were few genuine friendships as far as I knew."

This mentioning of the unmentionable caused a far wider audience than usual to read the 1932 Scrutiny article, and it merited their attention. Far from being salacious, it was a scholarly denouncement of the whole training college system, notable for the incisiveness of its analysis and the sharpness of its language. "Training colleges" wrote Knights, "have become a byword for futility", because of their overcrowded and irrelevant curricula, their arbitrary systems of discipline and their obsession with training as opposed to education. Describing in detail the petty round of college life, Knights came to the conclusion that training institutions were characterized by inadequate
staff attempting to teach irrelevant material to inadequate students in shoddy buildings. As Knights acknowledged, these conclusions came as no surprise to those closely associated with what he termed 'the training machine', but he made clear his determination to bring them home to "Training college officials, the upper ranks of educational hierarchy and the world at large".

If the 'world at large' was shocked by Knights's comments, his criticisms were not unfamiliar to senior officials working at the Board of Education. Their silence in the face of such emphatic condemnation was prompted by a series of considerations. Refutation of the accusations made by Knights would involve the Board in mounting a defence of its training college policy. As a series of internal minutes made clear, no such defence could be mounted without revealing to the public the extent of the Board's own responsibility for the conditions described in the Scrutiny article. While, therefore, Pelham and Holmes could disclaim responsibility for the financial impoverishment of the college in internal minutes, they could not do so publicly. Pelham considered that any general statement, however carefully worded, was likely to reveal to the public the subordination of Board policy to Treasury demands. These latter demands were in 1933 causing such dissension and anxiety among training college representatives, that Board officials were happy to maintain a discreet silence while the media concentrated their attention on a renewed outbreak of denominational quarrelling.

There is a traditional English saying, 'Happiness flies out of the window as poverty walks through the door'. These words indicate the root cause of the denominational acrimony evident at the beginning of 1933, when all training college authorities were suffering from the effects of a twenty per cent reduction in student numbers, and were
anxiously attempting to offset the associated loss of income. In this highly competitive market each denomination was intent on safeguarding its own position, regardless of the consequences for others. Friction was therefore likely and only too evident at a conference hastily convened by the Board of Education on the 14 December, 1933. On this occasion Mr. Oppen on behalf of the Board was anxious to impress upon the training college representatives the latest demand from the Treasury, namely that increased fees should cover anticipated, but not forthcoming, rises in grants. This demand faced all those present with a nice calculation as to how far it was possible to raise their fees to cover costs, without losing students.

The Anglican representative made an opening bid by saying the Church of England was moving toward a general increase in fees to the level of, at the most, £50 per annum. There was general consternation among all denominationlists when L.E.A. delegates said they had no intention of raising their fees. As if this disarray were not sufficient, the Roman Catholic delegation then declared a £50 per annum fee inconceivable for Catholic students. Most Catholics, they asserted, coming from 'situations of poverty' were already disadvantaged by the existing scale of fees. The conference broke up without any agreement, but with all parties well aware that unbridled competition was now the order of the day.

The 1933 conference has been considered in some detail because it reveals the weakness of the denominational position. Competition may provide a challenge for those who can win but in the field of teacher training during the thirties it was apparent that the only possible winners were the university and the local authority colleges. University institutions clearly enjoyed the advantage of strong
government support. In 1934 when the Board of Education was clawing back every possible penny from church training institutions, it was supporting, through the generous allocation of grants, the extension of training and educational research work in the university colleges at London and Manchester. 

The disparity of financial provision was so obvious that it led to protests from both local authority and denominational bodies. Board officials took notice of protests from the former while discounting those from the latter. Such a response was prompted by a recognition at senior levels within the Board that local authority representatives possessed sufficient independence to make life awkward if they chose to do so. The majority of L.E.A. colleges were modern in terms of both their buildings and teaching methods. Also, as a last resort, county councillors could rely on the priceless advantage of access to revenue from local rates. In fact, local rates provided for L.E.A. colleges the autonomy of funding which came to university institutions through the independence of the university grants committee.

The great strength of the university and local authority position, their ability to secure funding not entirely dependent for its provision on the Board of Education, showed up the most critical weakness undermining efforts by denominationalists to compete on equal terms. The "trail of cheapness" which the McNair Report of 1944 claimed "had cast its spell over the training colleges" applied with particular force to church institutions. The latter were almost entirely dependent for their financial viability on grants paid by the Board in respect of individual student places, and therefore any reduction in student numbers threatened their very existence.
Protesting against Board policy was, for denominationalists, a process of 'biting the hand that fed them'.

During the period 1930 to 1939 there were marked differences between denominationalists as they cultivated the difficult art of both feeding from, and biting (when necessary), the hand that fed them. The Catholic Hierarchy and the Education Council refined this process so as to reap every possible advantage for their colleges, their greatest asset being a determination to break the rules if they felt Catholic interests were threatened. In the words of one leading Catholic active on the Council at this time, "We consistently broke the rules and consistently got away with it". Evidence that this was no idle boast is present in both Catholic and government sources of the period. The Hierarchy refused to reduce numbers of students entering Catholic colleges during 1932-33 by the required ten per cent, they declined to raise student fees to £50 per annum, and they refused absolutely to consider either the closure of, or substantial economies in, any Catholic college. Additionally, and in marked contrast to policies developed by other denominational bodies at this time, the Catholic authorities maintained their 'closed shop' policy of admissions. Every student entering a Catholic college had to show evidence of having obtained the appropriate religious certificate. When pressed to alter their policies by government, civil servants working at the Board of Education were disturbed to find that Catholic authorities on occasions refused to answer correspondence or attend Board meetings, and on every contentious issue they noticed that the Catholic Hierarchy made sure it took the final decision.

Although this policy was designed to maintain the autonomy and denominational integrity of Catholic colleges, there was a price to be
paid, one not seen by the majority of Catholics or other
denominationalists. As Mr. Oppé of the Board of Education somewhat
ruefully reflected in 1936, "A universal standard of efficiency applied
now to all the training colleges would result in the closure of
approximately half the Catholic institutions". His comments were
prompted, in part, by a series of damning inspectorate reports
concerning these colleges. However, Oppé's reflections were private,
and actions are frequently prompted not by what is true, but by what
men think to be true. In this respect the Catholic example during
the early thirties was (at one and the same time) both dangerous and
galling to other denominationalists. In the public perception a
resolute Catholic Hierarchy appeared to have successfully flouted
government policies and maintained absolutely both the efficiency and
denominational integrity of their own colleges. Methodists
responded angrily to Catholic tactics. In 1932 a reunification of
the Methodist movement took place when Wesleyans, New Connexion and
Primitive Methodists came together under the Presidency of
Dr. Scott-Lidgett. Although Robert Currie argues that this reunion
marks another step in the decline of non-conformity (a smaller flock
huddling together), in the short term reunification undoubtedly
brought some of the old fire back to Methodists of all
persuasions. It certainly helped to re-kindle Dr. Workman's intense dislike of both Catholics and Cabinet Ministers serving in
the National Government. Peppering the Board of Education with
sharply worded letters, Workman made Methodist resentment at cutbacks
in teacher training abundantly clear. "In the case of our Methodist
church" wrote Workman to Oppé, "cuts will especially apply to
Southlands College, the effects of which are quite unacceptable to
the Methodist Education Committee".
Although the majority of Anglicans were envious of the Catholics, many evangelicals and Low Church Anglicans shared Workman's dislike of the policies being pursued by Catholic authorities and the National Government, and complained bitterly of "the sort of submission which the Church of England is so fond of giving any government in power". Speaking in an Assembly debate held on the 8 February, 1934, a Manchester delegate forthrightly urged the Archbishop of Canterbury "to take a stand against the misguided sort of economy now going on".

But Cosmo Lang had no intention of making a public stand against the cuts imposed by the National Government as he was intent on building 'a special relationship' with Halifax and his successors. Like his predecessor, Randall Davidson, Cosmo Lang was determined to redress the increasing temporal weakness of the Church of England by seeking favoured treatment from those in power. Whatever the ethical propriety of Cosmo Lang's policy, it failed because the financial debilitation of the Church of England was proceeding so rapidly during the 1930s that no centrally contrived agreements could recover ground already lost and Anglican colleges were clearly losing ground very rapidly. To stave off immediate college closures the 1933 Anglican Committee of Enquiry had recommended raising individual student fees to £50 per annum and the setting up of "a central financial pool to assist in maintaining all the colleges in being". When these recommendations came before the Church Assembly they encountered determined opposition, a conflict indicating the nature and type of stress present in a declining denomination.

George Bell, Bishop of Chichester, in attempting to overturn the official motion and replace it with his own, demonstrated a distrust of centralized management coupled with a desire to return to
'pastoral autonomy'. Unlike Cosmo Lang, Bell had no faith in policies which he believed originated from "back slapping among bureaucrats", and he wished to dismantle, rather than increase, centralized management systems. He was therefore prepared to dispense entirely with the Board of Supervision and place Anglican colleges once more under the control of the dioceses and their bishops. This evident desire to 'go it alone' was prompted by several factors. In an ugly fashion it demonstrated the tendency of Church institutions to splinter when under pressure. Yet, on the other hand, it demonstrated a tough realism among a handful of bishops, a realism notably absent among those shaping central policy. Bell predicted, without malice, that the weak colleges were bound to go to the wall. Within the space of three years he was proved right.

Despite Bell's criticisms, common pool funding arrangements for the colleges went ahead in 1934, but with unhappy results. Those colleges already threatened with closure naturally wished to improve their buildings and teaching facilities. Thus the Governors at Lincoln on the 2 March, 1934, submitted to the Board of Supervision a rebuilding scheme which they considered "vital and a very minimum of what is necessary if this college is to survive". To their consternation the Governors received on the 23 March a reply from the Board indicating its unwillingness and inability to support the proposal. Not unnaturally, the Governors at Lincoln concluded that the central authorities of the Church were already anticipating the closure of their college. Actually, in 1934 members of the Board of Supervision were not anticipating closures. Like the colleges they served, the Board at this time was suffering from the financial anaemia afflicting the whole Church and, as a result, its members lacked the energy to plan. Their combined efforts were instead devoted to the
administration of the common sinking fund, whereby some fee income from the larger, urban colleges was diverted to the weaker, rural institutions, enabling the latter to stay open. However, staying open, or as one principal aptly termed it, "the survival of the weakest", was clearly not a recipe for progress and the strain of living near the edge of bankruptcy began to affect adversely the majority of college staff. Those working in the stronger colleges became frustrated at seeing their revenue diverted to weaker institutions, and officials in the latter soon perceived the hopelessness of their situation.

By December 1936 the situation had become so intolerable that the principals of the Anglican colleges asked the Board of Supervision whether 'concentration' was necessary and, anticipating the answer, formally requested the Board to prepare a scheme of closures.

Although spared the odium of having to demand closures, the Board of Supervision now proceeded to make a mess of what was an admittedly unpleasant task. Those who have experienced the closures of the 1970s will find parallels with the 1937 executions unpleasantly familiar. On the surface, the Board of Supervision presented to Anglicans a set of rational criteria associated with money, recruitment and geographical position which seemingly led inevitably to the need to close colleges at Brighton, Truro and Peterborough. In fact, the neatness of the public case owed not a little to the fact that paper C.A. 590 justified decisions which had been arrived at privately through clandestine discussions which were neither rational nor unbiased.

From an Anglican point of view things went sadly wrong from the very beginning. In November 1936 the Board of Supervision set up a secret committee to select colleges for closure in 1937. A number of the members serving on this committee, especially its unofficial
chairman, Sir Edmund Phipps, had old scores to settle with the Bishop of Chichester who for some time had been the severest critic of the Board of Supervision. Without conducting any lengthy research, the committee placed Brighton Diocesan College first on a possible list of colleges to be closed. Richard Holland, secretary of the Board of Supervision, and unused in his normal round of duties to the kind of intrigues going on around him, then caused a furore by telling Bell of the intentions of the 'secret committee'. The Bishop was furious and would have been more so if he had known of the negotiations being conducted by the committee with the Board of Education.

On the 13 November, 1936, Phipps wrote to Oppé at the Board of Education attempting to persuade him to place the authority of the Board behind the closures being planned. Oppé wrote a very careful reply: "You seem to have in mind a principle or process of elimination according to ability to bring premises to a given degree of perfection", he commented. "This seems to me quite possible but it would be exceedingly hard for us to back you at all positively as we have pronounced no premises inefficient". Despite further letters and a visit from the now not so secret committee, the Board of Education refused to entangle itself in the issue of college closures. As a disappointed Phipps confessed to his colleagues, although 'politically understandable' the Board's behaviour was nevertheless 'hypocritical'. Its 'penny pinching' policies directly promote college closures, he said, but when the results of these policies "are clear for all to see, the Board shows a remarkable fastidiousness in not wishing to be present at the executions".

By January 1937 the Board of Supervision was close to panic because its negotiations with the Board of Education had been abortive
and it was no closer to publishing the anxiously awaited list.\footnote{112}

Phipps therefore took drastic and pragmatic action. On the 7 February he placed before the committee a map of England and Wales and starting from the north, the panel gradually assessed the merits of individual colleges. The northern colleges, formerly the weakest, had been extensively rebuilt and were geographically well placed; consequently they emerged unscathed. Moving south, Phipps pointed out two pairs of adjacent colleges, Lincoln and Peterborough, Chichester and Brighton. The smaller of each pair, Peterborough and Brighton, were nominated for closure.\footnote{113} Continuing down and across the map, Board members came to Truro, the smallest and most western of the Church colleges. Its isolated position and lack of financial reserves meant that its name was added to the list.

This summary selection process could have been justified if there had not been an extraordinary sequel. Just as members were leaving the meeting, Canon Barker suddenly realized that all the institutions selected for closure were women's colleges. A non-quorate rump of the committee - Barker, Phipps and Holland - hastily added the names of three men's colleges, Culham, Cheltenham and Winchester, to the original list.

When rumours of these proceedings began to emerge, Anglicans quite properly had reservations regarding the competence of the Board of Supervision\footnote{114} and these doubts were strongly expressed during the 'closure debate'. The official motion\footnote{115} requesting closures of Church training colleges had scarcely been put before the Bishop of Chichester was on his feet attacking both the administrative record and policies pursued by the Board of Supervision.\footnote{116} In a sense Bell was pushing at an open door. As The Times commented, although there
was throughout the debate local support and sympathy for the doomed colleges, "As a body, they are in danger of forfeiting the support of many Church members". In this instance, the passing of the closure motion was two-edged in effect. While on the one hand its passage provided qualified support for official policy, on the other, it reflected a growing distrust of Church training colleges by many clerical and lay delegates.

Much of this distrust and suspicion resulted from the bureaucratization of government and secularization of thought in England during the thirties. Regarding the former, on the occasion of Neville Chamberlain's accession to power on the 28 May, 1937, R.H. Tawney predicted: "Once he has forgotten Baldwin's avuncular touch, Neville will make central government run the country".

In a sense the Board of Education anticipated Chamberlain's inclinations. With the Archbishop of Canterbury's full consent the Board by 1937 was already running the Anglican colleges from Whitehall. This state of affairs was resented by many Anglicans who could see alternatives in the contrasting policies adopted by both Methodists and Roman Catholics, but their anger was short lived because the college closures sanctioned by the Church Assembly in 1937 signalled the failure of Cosmo Lang's policy of "understandings in high places". Less than a year earlier the Archbishop had promised the Assembly that Anglican training colleges were "part of the fortress which could never be surrendered". As the Archdeacon of Lewes complained during the later closure debate, "three of the gates to the fortress have just collapsed, and the more the Church surrenders, the more the State steps in". These words captured some of the resentment felt by Anglicans at broken promises on the part of the
Archbishop and the Board of Supervision. Indeed, Cosmo Lang seems to have underestimated the dislike felt by Assembly delegates for bureaucratic forms of government, whether these were at denominational or national level. He also seems not to have comprehended the slump in Anglican morale caused by the evident secularization of Church institutions, especially Church colleges.

In 1982 a lively debate took place on the theme, "Church schools in a secular age: what for?". Confronted by falling rolls, teacher redundancies and economic recession, denominationalists faced the problem of defining the role of Church schools in a predominantly secular society. This debate almost exactly echoed the anxieties felt by denominationalists regarding the place of Church colleges in pre-war England. In 1933 the Archdeacon of Northumberland declared that the churches were "face to face with an insidious and militant secularism". "If the secularism typified by the media and organized labour are to be defeated", said the Archdeacon, "we must realize that Church-trained teachers are going to be extraordinarily important people in carrying through the difficult task of meeting secularism head on".

The expectation that Church-trained teachers were to be the front line troops in the fight against secularism was to cause conflicts and misunderstandings which have yet to be resolved. Forced in upon themselves by antagonism from secularists and trade unionists, denominationalists during the 1930s countered secular criticism by accentuating the most obviously distinctive feature of their colleges - the provision in them of religious instruction. While Halifax was happy to support this denominational emphasis upon religious instruction, his permanent officials most certainly were not. Almost
instinctively, civil servants working at the Board of Education urged their minister to steer clear of "the submerged rocks of the religious issue". Halifax, for personal and political reasons, chose not to do so. Opening the Ormskirk local authority college in 1932, he declared, "Training colleges, whether denominational or undenominational, all need religion, which is more and more realized to be the condition and essence of character.... I assert my conviction that no system of state education can ignore this element in the face of the many disintegrating forces now at work".

Halifax's reference to 'disintegrating forces' provides the clue to his unusual stubbornness in ignoring Civil Service advice on the religious instruction issue. Throughout their long tenure of office, ministers of the National Government were disturbed by the progress achieved by trade unionists and their secularist allies. In seeking to check these tendencies, Halifax perceived the usefulness of denominationalists as reliable supporters of the government's position. Thus, during the religious instruction debate, he encouraged the Church authorities and they responded enthusiastically.

From 1930 to 1938 the Church Assembly was bombarded with motions urging the Archbishop to take action "to ensure the proper teaching and provision of religious instruction in the Church colleges", and, in the words of the Bishop of Blackburn, "to provide for the effective inspection of the religious training given". This latter request reflected the distrust felt by many Anglicans regarding the religious work of the colleges, a distrust which from a denominational view point was justified. By 1935 the majority of denominational colleges (with the exception of Catholic institutions) were operating along secular rather than religious lines. Voluntary attendance at
chapel was becoming normal rather than exceptional, admission policies for both staff and students were increasingly non-denominational in character and the majority of college principals (in all types of training colleges) justified their institutions in terms of academic as opposed to spiritual criteria.

Civil servants at the Board of Education, through stressing academic values, had a significant responsibility for encouraging this degree of secularization in the denominational colleges. Consequently, they were dismayed by Halifax's decision to accentuate an aspect of training college work which they hoped was quietly being discarded. Therefore they mounted what can now be judged as a classic programme of Civil Service procrastination, a programme which proved entirely successful in achieving its objectives.

Having temporarily allowed their minister his head, the whole weight of Civil Service advice was deployed so as to impress upon him the unwisdom of his action. Starting with the legal position, which was unfavourable to the provision of denominational religious instruction, Pelham, Wood and Oppé pleaded ignorance of the whole topic. "It has not been our practice to inspect the provision for Religious Instruction in training colleges", they wrote to Halifax, "and we have no definite knowledge of what provision is made ... a careful, thorough and judicious investigation should be made before any precipitate action is embarked upon". The whole issue, in their estimation, was hedged about with difficulties. "Roman Catholics will probably stand outside any proposed scheme for inspection of religious instruction and the university colleges will require cautious handling, while the National Union of Teachers is already nervous on this point".
The latter comment underestimated the anxieties of the National Union of Teachers. When Halifax persisted with the idea of mounting an enquiry into the whole issue of religious instruction, the General Secretary of the Union, Frederick Mander, wrote to him warning, "Our members might at this juncture regard the introduction of inspection of religious instruction in training colleges as 'the thin end of the wedge', the prelude to more objectionable developments". Such developments, as secularists within the Union were not slow to point out, might include "disproportionately favourable treatment of denominational colleges by the Board of Education, diminishing principles dearly won in 1870".

Mander's letter was passed by Halifax to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was dismayed not only by its tone but by its evident effect on the President of the Board. Faced with mounting opposition from the N.U.T., Halifax now retreated with disconcerting speed. Although the President wrote to Cosmo Lang, "I have no intention of allowing my course to be dictated by the teachers", he added the rider, "I must confess that Mr. Mander's letter does make me incline to explore further how far it is possible to carry them with us".

The N.U.T. and the whole labour movement had no intention of being carried anywhere, either by Halifax, the churches, or a combination of both. The Union position was understood, if not appreciated, by a minority of Anglicans. Athelstan Riley, speaking in a Church Assembly debate, pointed out how the N.U.T. "were exploiting to the full" the Board of Education regulation requiring teachers to be appointed without any reference to their religious opinions. This, he said, did not mean that the N.U.T. were hostile to religious education, rather they were hostile, "to anything which tends to divide teachers into
categories and which militates against the unity to which they attach the greatest importance for achieving improvements in the status of their members.\textsuperscript{141} This was a shrewd assessment of the Union position, and one which Anglicans would have done well to remember. However, facing college closures and receiving, at best, only ambivalent support from the Board of Education, Anglicans during the late thirties entrenched themselves in a denominational bunker, a position from which distrust and hatred of unionists and secularists became automatic responses.

Denominational hostility towards the trade union movement was a factor which officials working at the Board of Education came to value during the immediate pre-war years. When Halifax left the Board in 1935, a succession of short-term Presidents left power even more securely in the hands of its permanent staff. From 1935 to 1939, first Pelham, and then Holmes, ran the Board with a minimum amount of fuss, thereby attracting little public attention. The only threats to this carefully nurtured state of administrative calm came from the trade union movement and assorted pressure groups. One of the latter, the Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education, wrote to the Board on the 17 March, 1937, demanding an immediate enquiry into teacher training. Arguing that public confidence in teacher training courses and colleges was "at an all time low", the Association requested the Board to introduce a three-year course of training by 1938.\textsuperscript{143}

This request came at an awkward moment for the Board. The senior permanent secretary, Henry Pelham, had retired in 1937, so the demand for reform greeted his successor, Maurice Holmes.\textsuperscript{144} Seeking guidance and further information, Holmes found that the head of the teacher training section, S.H. Wood, had the situation comfortably in hand.
The latter did not bother to contest the underlying analysis of the situation offered by the Association, feeling that their case was, "both obvious and incontestable". He was equally candid in informing his new chief of the root cause of public uncertainty, asserting, "Lack of confidence in teacher training derives from the poor showing made by denominational colleges". "These places", he went on, "can only be described as lame ducks; too isolated, too introverted, and having poor buildings, poor staff and poor students".145

In the light of this criticism Wood conceded that, judged on purely educational criteria, there were good reasons for dispensing with denominational colleges. However, as he hastened to point out, financial and political considerations demanded their retention. Wood felt denominationalists and their allies were performing a useful role in helping to contain labour aspirations. If this was helpful to the Board, so too was the frugal way in which denominational authorities managed their institutions. Thus, while Wood argued that the future clearly lay with university colleges, he acknowledged, "In the short term we cannot do without denominational colleges because they produce teachers more cheaply than either universities or L.E.A. institutions, and their students usually do well in public elementary schools, especially when teaching practical subjects".146

Wood's assessment of the situation was well received by Holmes who, in replying, stressed that economy and timing were his two priorities. Labour expectations had to be contained, asserted the new Permanent Secretary, because the Treasury would not finance either an extension of the two-year training course or improvements in the colleges. However, mused Holmes, this might not always be the case. If circumstances changed, he wrote, "It will be our duty, through good timing, to introduce a three-year course when it will be of maximum
advantage to the universities". In the meantime he confided to Wood, "your main task will be to damp down demands for a three-year course".\(^{147}\)

This order was well timed because Wood immediately came under heavy pressure to concede the very thing which Holmes had ruled out. In March, 1938, Wood received from the National Society three proposals for improving Anglican colleges, the most urgent being a request for the introduction of a three-year course.\(^{148}\) When the N.U.T. endorsed this demand,\(^{149}\) and persuaded the Association of College Principals to do likewise,\(^{150}\) Wood was faced with unprecedented unity among usually differing parties. He was, however, too old a hand to be perturbed by this display of apparent unity. By announcing a well timed bureaucratic initiative, Wood soon diverted attention from the central issue. The inspectorate, he said, had been asked to look into the whole question of training college curricula and in the meantime he would like to meet all interested parties, separately, for proper consultation.\(^{151}\)

Separate consultation not only proved splendidly time consuming, but also enabled Wood to pursue a devious course. Meeting Anglican representatives on the 30 March, 1939, the Assistant Secretary told them that it was very important that the universities should not attempt to, "lead staff in training colleges on matters concerning professional work".\(^{152}\) While pleasing denominationalists, this was actually a back-handed compliment. It accentuated the training function of denominational colleges, a point which Wood was happy to explain to university representatives when they met him. While there might be some role left for existing staff in the colleges to deal with school work, declared Wood, "Academic leadership of the whole teacher training
sector must fall upon the universities". He was, he said, anxious to discuss with them how more university staff could be persuaded to work in the training college field. In subsequent meetings with both university and trade union delegations, Wood's own enthusiasm for a university solution to the teacher training problem led him to discard altogether the notion of a continuing denominational role.

If Wood's enthusiasm for a university solution was to prove extreme, initially it was fanned into life by Holmes. During the final, uneasy months of peace in 1939, Holmes deluded himself into believing that the Treasury was about to relent and provide funds for a three-year teacher training course. With such a glittering prize in view, the attributes of denominational colleges dwindled into insignificance and Wood was empowered by Holmes to discreetly inform university authorities that they could soon expect the introduction of a three-year course.

Perhaps this was as far as Holmes wished to go, but in the event Wood's enthusiasm proved stronger than his discretion. He clearly gave the impression to certain members of the University Grants Committee that the introduction of a three-year course would be the signal for a 'take over' of the teacher training system by the universities. This was precisely the solution advocated by the N.U.T. and thus the same impression filtered back to unionists as had been given to university representatives. When rumours of Treasury funding proved spurious, disappointment among university staff and trade union members was matched by the chagrin felt by Holmes and Wood. Both men, however, were relieved that the denominational colleges failed to respond. Denominational representatives either did not hear (or chose not to hear) current rumours. Selective deafness almost certainly preserved the 'cordial' relations said to exist between the Board of Education
and denominational colleges in 1939.\textsuperscript{156}

Overall it was a shabby performance, one possessing all the elements of deception and evasion which characterized British foreign policy and diplomacy at this time.\textsuperscript{157} Yet Wood's tactics were, in the short term, successful. His negotiations\textsuperscript{158} were proceeding at a funeral pace when war was declared in September 1939. Thus grass root pressure for the introduction of a three-year course had been deflected and the university solution still remained a possibility. Above all, the status quo had been maintained. Altogether it was a fitting end to the inter-war years, a time so aptly described by Roger Lloyd as, 'the nondescript years'.

From all the evidence contained in this chapter, the work of two men stands out. R.H. Tawney was right; right about the decline of religion, right about the scramble among secularists and trade unionists to replace traditional religious authority with new dogmas, and right about the centralizing tendencies of the National Government under Neville Chamberlain. His was a formidable achievement, as was the specific contribution made to the training college debate by L.C. Knights. He too was right. In his article, "Will Training Colleges Bear Scrutiny?", Knights used scholarly invective to lay bare every disquieting aspect of 'the training college machine'. Significantly, five years after the article had been written, Wood was repeating in a private office minute, almost word for word, Knights's own devastating analysis of the deficiencies evident among training colleges.\textsuperscript{159}

In the denominational colleges these deficiencies stemmed mainly from two related causes - the decline in religion, and the consequent financial difficulties of denominational bodies. A substantial part of
this chapter has been concerned with examining the events leading to
the closure of three Anglican colleges in 1937, closures directly
attributable to the increasing poverty of the Church of England. This
sequence has also revealed evidence suggesting deficiencies of
management by both the Board of Supervision and Board of Education.
In the case of the former, criticism has to be set against the whole
background of denominational decline. Apart from its Permanent
Secretary, Richard Holland, members serving on the Anglican Board of
Supervision were mainly country gentlemen, possessing no particular
knowledge of teacher training. While they did their best, their
collective ignorance sometimes proved a boon to Board of Education
officials.

However, denominational failure was not caused by a lack of
expertise, this shortage being a symptom of a more serious illness.
Throughout the 1930s there is widespread and persistent evidence
indicating a general loss of confidence among believers. Many,
including some in positions of clerical authority, lost faith in the
substance of their beliefs. In short, the heart went out of
denominational effort and was often replaced in Church training colleges
by a new-found attachment to academic standards and autonomy. In fact
secularization made rapid progress in the denominational colleges during
the thirties, because it met little resistance.

What evidence supports these assertions of widespread
denominational decline? This chapter has made selective use of oral
evidence, and it is the latter which, through providing an expressive
dimension to written documents, reveals the extent of the despair felt
by denominationalists during the thirties. For example, the prevailing
mood at infrequently held and poorly attended meetings of the Anglican
Board of Supervision was invariably gloomy. As one member confessed,
"We were always overwhelmed with problems we could not put right, it was like trying to bail out the Titanic with a child's bucket".\textsuperscript{160} Such despondency was not relieved by the sombre environment of Church House, where dull brown paint and popping gas lights reminded all gathered of their churches former Victorian ascendancy. Like their counterparts serving on the Methodist Education Committee, members of the Board of Supervision felt themselves prisoners of a Victorian legacy which they considered could no longer be sustained.\textsuperscript{161}

The evidence of this failure to sustain the colleges was apparent in the colleges, especially in small, rural training institutions which often suffered severely. At Culham broken gutters and windows went unrepaired, while at Winchester the heating system was out of use for long periods. These instances of neglect (caused by poverty) could be repeated many times over in terms of rural colleges during the period 1930 to 1939.\textsuperscript{162} In contrast, urban institutions fared better, their larger numbers and access to charitable funds enabling them to ward off penury more easily than their country cousins. Thus, the differences between rural-urban colleges widened during the thirties, as did the gap between the denominational profile of Protestant institutions and their Catholic counterparts. The secularizing measures promoted by the Board of Education and mediated through centralized legislation, had reached all but a handful of the former by the mid-thirties. By 1939 Protestant institutions had few distinctively denominational features; nearly all had jettisoned their denominational characteristics.

This was certainly not the case in Catholic colleges. Constant intervention and, on occasions, non-co-operation by the Catholic Hierarchy with the Board of Education during the 1930s ensured that the dominant religious purpose of the Catholic colleges had not
succumbed to the prevailing doctrine of academic excellence. Academic standards did rise in Catholic institutions during the inter-war period but the pursuit of excellence was never allowed to supplant the simple, but potent, Catholic policy of producing Catholic teachers to serve Catholic children in Catholic schools. During the inter-war period, therefore, while Protestants shed many aspects of their denominationalism, Catholics chose instead to accentuate the primacy of their religious purpose, thereby making their colleges truly denominationally distinctive.

Although this chapter has concentrated on the theme of Protestant denominational decline, it has also shed more light on the existence of what Professor Simon describes as a 'Board doctrine'. It has been argued, following earlier examples deriving from the Percy era, that real power lay with civil servants serving the Board of Education rather than with their ostensible political masters.

The activities of Pelham, Holmes and Wood during the thirties provide strong clues as to the nature of 'the hidden curriculum' of the civil servants. Clearly, these officials were not even-handed in their administration of the training college system. Pelham and his successor, Holmes, sought to improve the university colleges, tolerating the denominational institutions only because they were useful in containing labour aspirations and because their students were still needed to staff public elementary schools. One disquieting aspect of the value laden 'Board doctrine' was the seemingly automatic assumption by senior civil servants that training college students were only fitted for teaching in elementary schools. There is irony in noting that while the majority of denominational students trained in Victorian buildings, their destinies were still controlled by officials holding
Victorian values.

By September 1939 Board policy, distilled through the customary secretive processes of the English Civil Service and shaped by the prevailing influences of secularization and bureaucratization, had played a significant part in placing the future of the denominational colleges in doubt. However, the prevailing influences of the inter-war period were now to be tested in what R.A. Butler described as 'the blast of war'. The resulting changes in policies, attitudes and directions were to be sudden, intense and surprising in effect. War, once again, was about to transform English society.


"If the unions were to use the strike threat only sparingly, they had to show that there were a great number of other ways in which they could represent their members. Bevin and Citrine achieved this during the thirties. Trade union leaders began to go to Downing Street when there was an international crisis and not merely when there was an industrial one. And Bevin solidified the position at many lower and possibly more relevant levels during his war years as Minister of Labour".


"There was a marked shift away from questions of legitimate authority, with their connotations of a stable political world, to questions of power, or the ability to exert mastery by controlling an unstable complex of moving forces".

Although H.R. Trevor-Roper made this comment in the context of his analysis of the period 1540 to 1640, he addressed his words to R.H. Tawney, with the parallels of the twentieth century very much in mind.


"The removal of the restraint of a higher religious authority was a crucial development towards what in 1939 he called 'the monstrous doctrine of national sovereignty, which, in 1919, was preserved by loving hands, like some rare and fragrant flower, but whose principle is murder'".


TAWNEY, R.H. (1937), The Western Political Tradition; pp. 18-19.


It has often been observed that the succession of Conservative Prime Ministers during the inter-war period - Bonar Law, Baldwin and Chamberlain - all came from industry. Beaverbrook said on many occasions that Bonar Law ran his Cabinet like a directors' meeting.


Ibid. pp. 68-69.

Ibid. p. 70.


GEORGE, E.A. (1969), The Wireless: This is London, This England, Spring, pp. 43-44.

In July, 1927, the Catholic Education Council submitted a detailed letter of protest to the Board of Education concerning the "wickedly secularizing influences" at work in society and to which "young people are increasingly exposed". Two paragraphs of this letter are particularly significant:

Eighty per cent of the young people of both sexes who frequent our parks and open spaces all day long on Sundays and on week nights, belong to no religious body. These young people hear from the open-air platforms of atheistic and communistic societies the most bitter attacks on all that Christians hold most sacred.

Young people have been taught to regard authority as an evil. They have been taught to regard all progress in society as the result of purely materialistic forces or as the result of revolt against those whose business it was to maintain order. Is it a matter of surprise that they make the same assumption in their judgment of contemporary politics?

These strong words have to be seen in the context of Catholic fears that wireless was about to bring the same evils into the midst of
their seminaries and training colleges.
Catholic Education Council (1927), *Annual Report*, Memorandum to the Board of Education Consultative Committee from the Catholic Education Council.


22 Catholic Education Council (1927), *Annual Report*.


24 Ibid. p. 142.

25 Ibid. p. 143.

26 "Tawney's intellectual roots lay in liberalism, but he saw that its bases - economic individualism and faith in progress and the natural harmony of interests - had lost credibility and relation with each other".

27 Ibid. p. 141.

28 "What occurred during the 'era of tyrannies' / the three or four decades after 1914/ as the totalist ideologies flourished was a shift of emphasis from economic to political categories. In contrast to the major social philosophers of the nineteenth century, those of the early twentieth century took the view that society could not be properly analysed nor cohesion won by means of economic categories alone".
   Ibid. p. 141.

29 Ibid. p. 246.

30 Ibid. p. 247.

31 "Many church reports proved distasteful to conservative bishops, partly because of the influence upon them of Tawney. His aim was to recall the Church to the radical nature of Christianity. If it is not certain that he derived his socialism wholly from Christianity, he located it within Christianity, and found it worth while to spend time appealing to Church people".
32 Ibid. p. 246.


34 Ibid. p. 248.

35 "Aspects of Tawney's socialist appeal have ... lost their power with the decline of Christianity. In expressing the social and political meaning of Christianity, Tawney assumed allegiance to the fundamentals of Christianity". Ibid. pp. 248 and 346.

36 "One no longer discussed a miracle, one passed over it, as one passed over the Old Testament, the obscure promises to the Jews, and nine-tenths of the Gospel. Suffering was only a false note. One contrived to reduce it, or - who knows? - perhaps one day to eliminate it scientifically. Man was no longer for himself a tragedy; and God having ceased to be embarrassing was no more than a majestic decoration".


38 Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, was a Christian Socialist who adopted policies advocated by Tawney. This did not make him popular within the Anglican Church, Henry Major describing him as "The Socialist Party at Mass".


41 Ibid. pp. 268-299.


Response by Charles Gore to criticism made by Hensley Henson that "denominational colleges were becoming undenominational". Interview D and for context see GORE, C. (1928), Christ and Society; and HENSON, H. (1929), Disestablishment, The Charge delivered at the Second Quadrennial Visitation.

Cosmo Lang made his views clear early in his ministry; see LANG, Cosmo G. (1906), The Opportunity of the Church of England.

A summary of Henson's beliefs may be found in HENSON, H. (1939), The Church of England.


The New Left (1930), Denominationalism Revisited, p. 9.

On the 17 January, 1918, The Times Educational Supplement printed an article from T. Raymont, Warden of Goldsmith College, asserting: Most of the training colleges stand alone. Even in places (and there are many of them) where a training college is situated right in the midst of a university, it might as well, so far as university influence is concerned, be situated a hundred miles away. Times Educational Supplement (1918), 17 January, p. 39.

Sir John Brunner, President of the Union of the Lancashire and Cheshire Institute, addressing its annual general meeting on the 26 September, 1924, complained: Segregated training colleges promote narrow-mindedness and limited thinking ... characteristics of the universally low standards of academic attainment evident in these institutions. Education (1924), 3 October, p. 129.


"The Training College has become a byword for futility, or worse. To mention it was, we found, to provoke outbursts of derision and
indignation, the violence of which would surprise those who retain any illusions about the present system".

57 "The Training College day, we are told, was characteristically a day of lectures; the electric bell rang every hour to change lecture rooms, the classes filing along the corridors. The picture is symbolic. Compulsory attendance at lectures is the rule ... to cut even the most futile of them is a serious offence. And the sense of frustration and of time wasted is intensified by the methods adopted in the classroom. The information imparted is dry, academic, often irrelevant and normally suited to the intelligence of the lowest level of the audience".

58 "The criticism brought against them [training colleges] falls roughly under three main heads:
(a) the inadequacies of the staffs
(b) the inadequacies and positive vices of the curricula
(c) the presence among the students of a large proportion of inferior material".

59 "The defects of Training Colleges are so obvious to those (though, as we have to point out, not to all) who have passed through them that it is hard to realize that they are not equally obvious to training college officials, the upper ranks of the educational hierarchy, or the world at large....".

60 Board of Education, Internal Minutes, 880A/14a, 880A/47, P.R.O. Ed. 2/1929, P.R.O. Ed. 24/1934, P.R.O. Ed. 86/60 and P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.

61 Halifax was horrified by the suggestion that the Board should offer an account of its "educational stewardship" other than through its traditional Annual Report. Thus the 1931-32 Board of Education resume of affairs claimed, quite untruthfully, that "training colleges and departments concerned have accepted the reductions (in numbers and finance) in the same spirit of active co-operation as they showed in responding to the Board's invitation for the provision of additional places in the last three years".

62 The Board of Supervision attempted in 1937 to explain to Anglicans how severely the Church colleges had been affected by Government policy. "For some years", declared the Board, "there has been evidence of a falling off in the demand for teachers for public elementary schools which has led the Board of Education to reduce, by successive cuts amounting in all to twenty per cent, the total
numbers of recognized students in training establishments. The resulting loss of income to the Church training colleges from grants and fees has been heavy...". How heavy is revealed by the Board's estimation that the loss of 1,065 student places resulted in a cut in grants equal to £65,000.

Board of Supervision (1937), The Church Training Colleges for Teachers: Memorandum by the Board of Supervision on the Policy of Concentration, including specific recommendations as to the closure of certain colleges, C.A. 590.

"If no common policy on this matter could be secured" he continued, "it seemed to them that their colleges [Church of England] would run the risk of losing many good quality students". P.R.O. Ed. 86/81 (1933), Conference with Representatives of Voluntary and Local Education Authority Training Colleges with regard to Fee Policy, 14 December, at the Board of Education.

The local authorities made it clear they wished to raise revenue via local rate increases, an option not open to denominational bodies. P.R.O. Ed. 86/81.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/61 and Catholic Education Council (1933), Annual Report, Catholic Response to the Board of Education regarding Reductions in Student Numbers.

P.R.O. Ed. 81/9, P.R.O. Ed. 82/10. See also Sunday Times, 7 February, 1932 and The Times Educational Supplement, 8 December, 1934.

P.R.O. Ed. 186/61. See also Wesleyan Education Committee (1932-34), Annual Report.

A trump card which had been played very effectively at the 1933 'fees conference' and which had not been forgotten, or forgiven by Oppé a year later. See also SHAKOOR, Op. cit. pp. 427-434.

Hence the importance to denominationalists of an agreed outcome to the 1933 'fees conference'. While to university and local authority bodies fees were something of a nominal extra, to denominationalists 'fee revenue' represented the only other sizeable source of income available to them other than grants from the Board of Education.

See P.R.O. Ed. 24/1936, P.R.O. Ed. 86/61 and P.R.O. Ed. 186/61.
73 Catholic Education Council (1930-31), Annual Report.

74 Catholic Education Council (1932-33), Annual Report. Only after Anglicans had raised their annual fees to £50 did the Catholic authorities permit an increase in their own fees to £35 for the year 1934 and £40 for the year 1935.

75 Catholic Education Council (1932-33), Annual Report. Letter from Sir John Gilbert to the Board of Education, as reported to the Catholic Education Council. "After consulting His Eminence the Cardinal, he had informed the Board of Education that the Council could not consent to the closing of any Catholic college".

76 Catholic Education Council (1936-37), Annual Report. "Every student entering a Catholic training college must under a regulation of the Bishops, present a certificate showing he or she has passed the required Religious Examination".

77 Catholic Education Council (1934-35), Annual Report.

78 Catholic Education Council (1934-35), Annual Report.

79 P.R.O. Ed. 86/107. Oppe estimated that the application in 1936 of 'a universal standard of efficiency' to all training colleges would close all the British and Foreign colleges, half the Roman Catholic colleges and threaten three-quarters of the Anglican institutions.

80 P.R.O. Ed. 86/56, P.R.O. Ed. 86/55, P.R.O. Ed. 115/32, P.R.O. Ed. 115/127, P.R.O. Ed. 115/52.

While some of these objectives had been accomplished, Oppe's comments indicate that the price paid was in terms of the standards of efficiency in Catholic colleges. When questioned by Oppe and Pelham regarding standards, the response from the Catholic Bishops was frank, "It is in our interests to be poor and free" they said, "rather than richly endowed and at the mercy of Board doctrine". Interview F.

82 Methodist Year Book (1932).

MacINTOSH, Viscount (1966), By Faith and Work.

"The Great Hall [altered to Albert Hall] was packed from floor to ceiling and this solemn historic occasion was one of the most moving in my life. It is impossible to forget the inspired moment when the thousands gathered there raised their voices in the joyful 'Te Deum'.... The Conference lasted a week and another of its outstanding events was the great Youth Rally also held in the Albert Hall" p. 153.

In 1932 Secretary of the Methodist Education Committee.

P.R.O. Ed. 186/61 and Methodist Education Committee (1932-34), Annual Reports.

"Encouraged by the Board of Education this college has spent nearly £60,000 in transferring its premises from Battersea to its beautiful, well equipped new home on Wimbledon Common; and only within the last two years, to meet further requests from the Board of Education, £1,600 was spent on new laboratories. Careful figures have been taken out by which it is clear that the loss to Southlands College in 1933-34 will be £1,459.10s.0d. and in 1934-35 £2,821. The Committee would therefore urge upon the Minister of Education that special consideration, by raising the grants to be paid per student, should be given to the smaller colleges". P.R.O. Ed. 186/61, Methodist Response to Cuts.

"One government tells us to raise the numbers of students in our training colleges, and we do so, at great expense to ourselves. Another government tells us not to train teachers on the grounds of economy, and hey presto, we instantly economize". Church of England (1934), C.A. F.100, Interim Reports of the Central Board of Finance; Church Training Colleges, 8 February, p. 141.

Ibid. Mrs. L.R. Fletcher, Delegate from Manchester, p. 141.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/107. "Sir Edmund Phipps told me some time ago that the Board of Supervision felt that, though their relations with the Board of Education were very friendly on a somewhat official plane, they did not often enough, in their view, meet the Board in unofficial and friendly conference. I replied that the Board would be glad at any time to discuss matters of mutual interest; and as a result the Buildings Committee came to ask whether it was possible for us, without making any promises, to throw any light on the possibility of an imposed cut in the output of teachers during, say, the next ten years". Memo from S.H. Wood to Minister, reporting meeting held between Lord Grey, Sir Edmund Phipps, Captain Agnew and Mr. Hussey with S.H. Wood, Mr. Finney and Mr. Bligh at the Board of Education, 12 January, 1939.


Church of England (1934), Interim Reports of the Central Board of Finance, Church Training Colleges. "That this Assembly, having considered the Report of the Board of Supervision and that of its Committee of Enquiry, urges the Governing Bodies of all Church colleges to raise their fees, and to co-operate fully and without reservation in a general pool as proposed; and desires the Board of Supervision to make arrangements to ensure, if possible, that no colleges are closed in the ensuing three years".

Motion in the name of the Bishop of Chichester. "And having noted the opposition of the other groups of colleges to the general raising of fees, cannot approve of the proposal for the increasing of the fees paid by resident students of all Church of England training colleges to £50 per annum; and requests the Board of Supervision to consider the circumstances of each Church of England training college as they may be brought before the Board of the Governing Body of the college, with a view to the determination in each case of the policy most appropriate to the need of each particular college". Ibid. p. 125.

Interview G.


When Bell's amendment was lost and the official one carried, Bishop Otter and Rippon Colleges refused to enter into common funding arrangements and when pressed to do so, declared their support for the position advocated by the Bishop of Chichester.

Lincoln, Chester and Bristol had been threatened with 'temporary closure' in 1933, and the Governors of Truro, Derby, Culham and Brighton Colleges were told by the Board of Supervision that their institutions might be 'at risk'.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/80.

The Board of Supervision finding that it is impossible at the present time to approve schemes of development in training colleges involving new loans, asked the Governing Body of Lincoln training college to defer its plan of extension for three years". P.R.O. Ed. 86/80 and Board of Supervision Minute Book (1934), Vol. II, March.
The Board of Education refused to fund major building programmes and the Board of Supervision lacked the financial resources to support any such plans. Principals working in rural environments did not even have the option of trying to raise money locally. As the Principal of Culham was fond of saying in 1936, "Have you ever asked a sheep for a donation?".

Interview H.


The Board's case was set out in Paper C.A. 590 (1937), The Church Training Colleges for Teachers: Memorandum by the Board of Supervision on the Policy of Concentration, including specific recommendations as to the closure of certain colleges, pp. 1-10.

Members of the Committee were Sir Edmund Phipps, Mr. R.G. Mayor, Canon Barker, Mr. Hussey and Mr. R. Holland.

Phipps wrote to Oppè at the Board of Education on the 13 November, 1936, assuring him that on this occasion there was "no question of temporary closure, rather 'concentration' would have to be on the basis of permanent improvement". He further added that the Church had made up its mind to "rid itself of its weaker brethren".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/107.

"To add to our difficulties Holland has gone and told the Bishop of Chichester of the appointment of this committee, which I had reluctantly agreed to be put upon, believing it to be a secret one! The Bishop is coming to see us about Brighton!". Phipps to Oppè, 13 November, 1936.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/107.

Correspondence between Phipps and Oppè, 12, 23 and 27 November, 1936.

P.R.O. Ed. 87/107.

Deputation of Sir Edmund Phipps, Mr. R.G. Mayor, Canon Barker, Mr. R. Holland and Mr. Hussey to meet with Mr. Oppè and Mr. Pelham at the Board of Education on the 23 November, 1936.

P.R.O. Ed. 87/107.

Phipps to Canon Barker, 2 December, 1936.

National Society, Archives and P.R.O. Ed. 87/107.
Phipps had forwarded possible criteria for assessing closures but they had not been agreed by the full Board of Supervision. Five criteria were discussed, namely:

1. Geographical position of a college
2. Importance, locally and nationally
3. Local educational advantages
4. Men or women's college and likely recruitment prospects
5. Power to carry out schemes of improvement for premises.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/107.

Significantly Brighton was the one college consistently rumoured to be in danger of closing.

Interview H.

National Society (1936-37), Annual Report, and Reports of Proceedings Church Assembly (1936-37), and Board of Supervision, Minute Book, Vol. II, February and March.

"That the proposal of the Board of Supervision to arrange for the closing of the Church training colleges at Brighton, Truro and Peterborough at a date not later than 31 July, 1939, be approved and the Board of Education be so informed". Motion moved by the Bishop of Peterborough in the Church Assembly, 17 November, 1937.

The Bishop of Chichester: "The Board of Supervision had made a great mistake in creating so large a pool in 1933, it had made a great mistake in almost insisting that all the colleges should raise their fees to the uniform figure of £50... The Board met very occasionally and was on the whole a somewhat receptive body". Ibid. C.A. 590.

The Times (1937), 18 November. Coverage was contradictory; while the reporter of the Assembly managed to find the Bishop of Chichester in "general support of the motion", his editor gave more space to Bell's criticisms and an analysis of the mood among many delegates. See report, "Church Training Colleges: Three to be Closed" and Editorial Comment.

For the nature and extent of this 'qualified support' see comments offered by the Archdeacon of Salisbury. Ibid. C.A. 590.

FEILING, K. (1970), The Life of Neville Chamberlain, p. 294 and TAWNEY, R.H. (1937), Manchester Guardian, 30 May, "Thoughts on the New Prime Minister".
The finance of these colleges was almost entirely controlled by the Board, their numbers of students regulated by Board decree, their curricula and examinations heavily influenced by Board policies mediated through University Regional Examining bodies.

"Nothing in the debate had been said which was more true, and which reflected the opinion of every member of the Assembly, than what the Bishop of Durham had said about the training colleges. That he regarded as the essential part of the fortress which could never be surrendered. What they had to do was to see that those training colleges were not only maintained but developed and enriched and strengthened in every possible way".


Ibid. C.A. 590. Comments by the Archdeacon of Lewes, the Venerable F.H.D. Smythe. See also The Times, 18 November, 1937.

The Times Educational Supplement (1982), Church Schools in a Secular Age: What For?, 22 January. See also SPRAKE, B. (1980), What are Church Schools For?, University of Lancaster, Diploma Thesis.


Dr. Scott Lidgett, President of the Methodist Union as quoted by CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 142.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935, Speech of the President of the Board of Education, Viscount Halifax, on the occasion of his opening the Ormskirk Training College, 1932.

"That the Church training colleges should gradually develop their Divinity teacher, each college taking action on the lines best suited to its own conditions, having regard both to the needs of the students in residence and to those of teachers in its area; and that they be given sufficient financial resources for this work.

"That assistance be given to all teachers of religious knowledge through (a) the establishment of Theological Faculties in the new universities, (b) a strong and enlightened body of inspectors or organizers of religious teaching, and that there should be a close alliance between the Church training colleges, the Theological Faculties, and the inspectorate".

Church Assembly (1930), Clauses 3 and 4 of the Report of the Commission on Religious Education (C.A. 501) moved by Major F.W.B. Cripps, pp. 496-497.
"That the Assembly requests the Board of Supervision to take immediate steps to provide for the effective inspection, in the Church's name, of the religious training given with the Church colleges".

Church Assembly (1934), Church Training Colleges, motion moved by the Bishop of Bradford, Dr. A. Blunt, pp. 149-152.

In 1929 Miss C. Reed-Newby, an Anglican lecturer in Religious Studies, startled the Assembly by claiming that "nothing whatever was being done in the colleges to teach students to teach religion". In 1933 Canon E.A. Berry made a similar attack by pointing to the sad differences between Anglican and Roman Catholic colleges. "The Roman Catholic colleges", he said, "were staffed by monks and nuns, who were there for the definite purpose of seeing that the teachers who were going out to teach the children of their Church should be men and women of definite and true conviction. Those who were finding the money for the Church training colleges had a right to efficiency; and they had a right to have atmosphere".


P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935. Section 72 of the Education Act, 1921:
(a) Local authorities can only spend public funds on providing religious instruction which is not distinctive of any particular denomination;
(b) Attendance at any instruction provided by these authorities must be entirely voluntary;
(c) Universities are not covered by these sections, and are under no obligation to provide any religious instruction.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.

Ibid. Private Office Minute, 21 September, 1932.

For details of, and evidence from, this enquiry, see P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.


"I confess I am very weary of their perpetual attitude about 'the thin end of the wedge'. I must confess that I read their
memorandum with a great sense of disappointment and indeed almost irritation. It is most disappointing that the one body which seems incapable of appreciating the new atmosphere with regard to Religious Instruction is the National Union of Teachers". The Archbishop of Canterbury, G. Cosmo Lang, to the President of the Board of Education, 7 October, 1933.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.

137 F. Mander to the President of the Board of Education, 17 October, 1933.
"The union would deprecate very strongly indeed any official intervention by the Board in Religious Education. This attitude is dictated not only by apprehension about possible extensions of this principle in the future, with the probable correlative influence on the conditions of appointment in public elementary schools and the Board's inspectorate, but also by a sense that the state which represents the collective will of the whole people, should maintain an impartial and neutral attitude toward questions about which individuals are so divided. To adopt any measure of state intervention would almost inevitably, in our view, resurrect controversy which might well be fatal to the sincere hope of progress which we share in common".

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.

138 Ibid. The President of the Board of Education to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 20 October, 1933.

P.R.O. Ed. 24/1935.


140 Athelstan Riley, Member of the Board of Supervision and Church Assembly Delegate representing Winchester Diocese.


142 This statement needs qualification. It represents a majority Anglican response, not a total one. William Temple, like Riley, was more discerning and selective in his views of trade unionists, although he detested secularists and secularists' solutions. The Anglican retreat to what may be described as a denominationalist 'bunker mentality' certainly followed the precedent already set by Methodists, although the majority of the latter maintained warmer feelings towards organized labour than most Anglicans.


145 P.R.O. Ed. 86/178.

146 Supply of Teachers: Candidates for Admission to Training Colleges: Quality of Applicants, 1937, R.476(2)/70, (1938-39).

147 P.R.O. Ed. 86/178.

148 1. That the period of training be extended from 2 to 3 years' duration.
2. That every Church college should be inspected by a representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as by His Majesty's Inspectorate.
3. That courses of lectures in Church training colleges should be arranged dealing with the application of modern methods to the teaching of the Christian faith.
Board of Supervision (1938), Minute Book, Vol. III, March.

149 National Union of Teachers (1939), The Training of Teachers and Grants to Intending Teachers, Report of the Committee of Investigation appointed by the Executive of the National Union of Teachers.

150 "We have now reached the stage in this survey of training at which it is necessary to urge most strongly that the course for the Teachers' Certificate should be lengthened to three years. We put forward six reasons for this:
1. The changing concept of elementary education;
2. The overcrowded curriculum;
3. The advancement of standards in individual subjects;
4. The need for training in education as a social service;
5. The need for students to participate fully in a college's social and intellectual life;
6. The over pressure on students.
Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and Council of Principals (1939), The Training of Teachers, The Length of the Course, pp. 67-70.

151 His Majesty's Inspectorate (1939), Training College Curricula: Suggestions by a Body of H.M.I. prepared for the Board of Education. P.R.O. Ed. 86/178.

152 Board of Supervision (1938), Minute Book, Vol. III, March, p. 36.
On the 7 March, 1939, Mr. Hussey, Secretary of the Board of Supervision, added a new factor to negotiations by writing to Wood suggesting that in future ordinands should be trained alongside student teachers in Anglican training colleges. Wood was pleased to support diversification, replying, "I am fully persuaded that there are advantages in admitting to training colleges people who are not preparing for the teaching profession, and I have little doubt that the Board would accept a proposal of the kind you make provided the financial arrangements were satisfactory and provided no legal difficulties arose". P.R.O. Ed. 86/107.

"Almost all the problems confronting us in those days could only have been solved by spending money; we had no money".
Interview J.

"At the time there were giant benevolent historical processes at work, making religion seem pigmy. The depth of frustration and internalized blame which can result from such assumptions can be readily understood ... religious organizations were informed by the view that for a long time things had been getting more secular, that for a long time one subject area after another had been taken from the sphere of religion".


"The milieu of administrative work, no less than educational and social background, neither encouraged an objective, nor an enthusiastic, approach to planning education for the majority.... This is not to say that administration was incompetent. It was competent enough and not least in terms of keeping within the limits defined and finding suitable arguments for so doing". SIMON, Op. cit. pp. 280-283.

CHAPTER 10

The Fort Relieved and then Surrendered

During the last weeks of September 1939 the eerie wail of air raid sirens echoed across English cities, while searchlights probed their skies for enemy aircraft. Heavy bombing raids were expected and students returning to training colleges were issued with respirators, or, as they were soon christened, gas-masks. While some students were immediately sent home, others were set to work on Air Raid Precaution tasks such as taping windows against bomb blast, putting up blackout screens and digging the foundations for future air raid shelters. However, during 1939 the skies remained empty and this period of 'phoney war' was, in its own way, to cause as much havoc to college life as the blitz which followed it.

This chapter (beginning with the 'phoney war') describes the pattern of events which led to the wide scale evacuation of training colleges, a procedure which, as in the first war, severed staff and students from long held patterns of academic and social behaviour. As in previous chapters, this social history is set within a conceptual framework and, in particular, the policies adopted by both government and denominational authorities are analysed in terms of a hypothesis initiated by Charmian Cannon in 1964. In an article entitled, "The Influence of Religion on Educational Policy, 1902-1944", Cannon argued that social attitudes prompted by the Second World War enabled the churches to recoup in 1944 much which they had lost during the inter-war period. Adapting and applying this idea to the specific case of the denominational colleges (and subjecting it to some academic reservation) this chapter argues that these institutions were indeed given a new
lease of life as a result of the rediscovery in wartime Britain of the value of Christian principles.

This rediscovery did not come about suddenly and owed much to widespread feelings of revulsion against Nazi attitudes and atrocities. Such a delayed reaction benefited denominationalists because it coincided with growing demands for social reform, evident during the latter years of the war and sparked off by the publication in 1942 of the Beveridge Report.5

Within this general context, a substantial part of the chapter examines the formation, progress and outcome of the McNair Report on teacher training.6 Overshadowed by the successes achieved by R.A. Butler and others in passing the 1944 Education Act, the work of Arnold McNair7 and his colleagues has often been considered a failure and their report relegated to the obscurity enveloping state documents which, judged in Civil Service terms, 'have failed to deliver the goods'. As this chapter illustrates, McNair's failure actually reprieved the denominational colleges, and preserved, for a little longer, their autonomy.

How long this autonomy was to last is the theme developed in the final part of this chapter. The concluding section, a kind of historical postscript bringing the story up-to-date, introduces a post-war perspective, demonstrating that wartime conditions really were unique. Once these conditions had been removed, it is argued, English society was again exposed to the predominating influences of the inter-war period, namely increasing secularization of thought and bureaucratization of government. The fatal consequences for denominational colleges stemming from this renewal of activity on the part of secularists and bureaucrats is encapsulated in the chapter.
title, 'The Fort Relieved and then Surrendered'. Indeed, the proposition forwarded in this chapter is that what Cosmo Lang described as "the denominational fortress" (the Church training colleges) was saved by the wartime coalition government, only to succumb to renewed post-war pressures for secular reforms. This is the major theme now explored.

Post-war reconstruction was far from the minds of staff working in the training colleges in 1939 because they were caught up in the administrative difficulties attending evacuation. Pre-war planning was based on the premise that all colleges situated in evacuation areas would close, as would men's colleges. S.H. Wood, who had drafted this evacuation plan, assumed that these closures would enable evacuees and female students to live in a small number of rural institutions, thus freeing the majority of colleges for wartime use. It was a sensible and far-sighted plan thrown into confusion by the sense of false confidence induced by the period of 'phony war'. As Mr. Hussey, the Secretary for the Church of England Board of Supervision, later noted, "On the declaration of war the plans made in regard to the evacuation of colleges broke down completely because the Government decided that men would not be called up before the age of twenty". The decision by the Chamberlain government to delay the age of call up caused confusion and frayed tempers both in the Board of Education and in the colleges. Some colleges completed their planned evacuation; others did not. Some were on the point of leaving when told to stay where they were. Some actually moved to new premises and on finding their old colleges unused, moved back again. The strain on staff and dwindling numbers of students was considerable, and led on occasions to ugly scenes. Actually the difficulties and tensions affecting staff usually came from two particular sets of circumstances. A very
high percentage of training college staff not eligible for call up volunteered for Air Raid Precaution duties and in the many London-based colleges these duties frequently included long night-time hours spent fire watching. The next day would often bring the disheartening task of teaching a diminishing group of students, with lectures liable to interruption from air raid alerts or the arrival of more call up papers. In fact the continuing loss of students was a haemorrhage which could never be staunched throughout the war, and as young men and women departed they took with them the whole life and purpose of their colleges.

The very rapid decline in the numbers of students attending training institutions was serious because it inevitably led to the closure of colleges - Culham, Saltley and Bede at the end of the academic year 1940-41 - and to large-scale redundancies among college staff. These twin evils, closures and sackings, threatened to undermine the morale of all those working in the training sector, a problem grasped by Board of Education officials. S.H. Wood, in attempting to stabilize the deteriorating situation, proposed a whole series of measures designed to maintain student numbers. In November 1939 he altered the regulations so as to reduce the minimum age of entry to training colleges from eighteen to seventeen years of age, at the same time reducing the length of the training course from two years to five terms. Wood also argued that once students had committed themselves to the reduced course, it was only sensible for them to complete it, as was already the case with university graduates studying for medical or scientific degrees.

Unfortunately, Wood's well-intentioned measures soon came to grief because a range of political and administrative factors combined to
frustrate his plans. The lowering of the age of male call up from twenty to nineteen years of age, implemented by the coalition government at the beginning of 1941, was, as Gosden has noted, "a serious blow for some of the men's colleges". As well as being a blow to the colleges it threatened the whole of Wood's strategy because it came at a moment when the National Union of Teachers were making their anxieties plain and when the Ministry of Labour, under Bevin's forceful leadership, was showing little sympathy for the claims advanced by the Board of Education on behalf of teacher training colleges. These institutions were now to pay the price for suspicions felt by organized labour concerning Board of Education policy, and for the low esteem in which that department was generally held. Until R.A. Butler succeeded in establishing a notably cordial relationship with Bevin, most Labour members of the coalition government (and particularly Bevin in 1941) regarded officials working at the Board of Education as "a very poor bunch". The immediate consequence of such a view was that Wood's policy foundered and the decline in the numbers of students attending teacher training colleges continued.

Overall, it was a downward spiral, with the attractiveness of teaching as a profession being seriously questioned, not least because of the obvious disparity shown by Churchill's government in their treatment of differing sectors of higher education. While, for example, many university graduates were granted permission to complete their degree studies, mandatory call up for teacher training students continued throughout 1941-43, although there was some mitigation of this policy when it was clear that the war was nearly won. Nevertheless, the government's handling of this issue is a striking example of the widespread view, held by many politicians, then and now, of the subordinate status of teachers and student teachers, and of the
The insignificance of the Board of Education was a factor clearly recognized by Churchill when he offered R.A. Butler the Presidency of the department at the beginning of July, 1941. The Prime Minister's long political memory went back to the time when Bonar-Law had attempted to form a Cabinet without any educational representative, and Churchill's views of state-provided education were only marginally more advanced than those held by his predecessor in 1922. Jovially informing Butler that his main duty was to introduce a note of patriotism into the schools, Churchill was nevertheless, like the King at a later interview, anxious to ascertain from Butler whether he would "take education". Churchill's pleasure on receiving a positive reply was not entirely prompted by satisfaction at having made an outstanding appointment.

It is possible to argue that Churchill's placing of Butler at the Board of Education was prompted, in part, by his determination to divide, and thus minimise, the influence of a prominent group of pre-war Conservative ministers. Butler had been the protege of Baldwin, who by 1941 was retired and reviled, surrounded, in the words of his biographers, by "a flood of public odium sealing him off from the chance of further political service". If Baldwin had given him his first chance, Butler had also been on intimate terms with Halifax and Hore, both of whom by 1941 had been packed off, protesting, to foreign posts by Churchill, neither being in a position to influence major policy decisions. Thus, as Nigel Middleton observes, there was now only Butler left to deal with and he, "as a junior minister with no personal following, could be safely allowed to remain in the country", silenced, perhaps, by the gift of a minor ministry. In fact
there is now strong evidence suggesting that Churchill gave Butler a "dead end" ministry, and was surprised when "Wab", as he called him, accepted. Churchill's surprise was prompted by his view of the post as mainly involving "wiping children's noses and smacking their behinds", a view shared by some senior civil servants. Sir Henry Channon, for example, in recording the events of July 1941 in his diary, considered that Butler had made a serious mistake in allowing himself to be shunted into "a political backwater".

This analysis of Butler's placement (which forms part of a larger revisionist critique of the period forwarded by Middleton and Wallace) enhances, rather than detracts from, the quality of Butler's achievements. Clearly, the new President of the Board of Education began his period of office in circumstances even more unpropitious than those described by Marjorie Cruickshank. With the strength of his relationship to a dominating Prime Minister in doubt, the temptation for Butler to follow the laissez-faire practices of his predecessors was almost irresistible. When the new President tentatively put forward plans for major educational reforms on the 12 September, 1941, he received a chilling response from Churchill. "It would be the greatest mistake to raise the 1902 controversy during the war", wrote Churchill to Butler on the 13 September, "and I certainly cannot contemplate a new Education Bill". To any minister, let alone one possessing, as Butler did, a sensitive, self-critical and self-doubting nature, the Prime Minister's reply was a rebuke couched in his most magisterial vein. As Butler comments in his autobiography, during the critical period of 1941 support for his reforming ideas was entirely lacking, even from his Permanent Secretary, Sir Maurice Holmes, who was in Butler's charitable estimation, "disappointingly compliant" with the Prime Minister's refusal to contemplate reforms. In short,
Butler's achievement in 1944 stemmed from the political courage he demonstrated during 1941 in deciding to press forward with reforms when official opinion was almost entirely opposed to such measures.

R.G. Wallace argues that this latter analysis, if not false, is at least a little overdrawn because he believes Butler found plans for extensive educational reforms awaiting him on his arrival at the Board of Education in 1941. Thus, while acknowledging Butler's crucial role as a protector of other men's plans, Wallace suggests that much of the credit for the authorship of the 1944 Act should go to a little known group of comparatively junior civil servants working in the obscurity of a Bournemouth hotel. This hypothesis, however, needs to be set against the performance record of officials working at the Board of Education. Both Eustace Percy and Halifax had taken on the post of President and found plans for educational reform awaiting them, but the results achieved by each minister had been equally disappointing. Percy had failed to integrate the training colleges into a system of higher education and his senior civil servants had given negative responses to the recommendations of the 1938 Spens Report. In this instance, the same group of civil servants identified by Wallace - G.G. Williams, W. Cleary and H.B. Wallis - had given cautious approval to the recommendations of the report, only to see these proposals comprehensively emasculated by their Permanent Secretary, Sir Maurice Holmes. In comparison with Percy, Butler appears to have played a crucial role during his Presidency, in not only protecting but also in promoting plans for reform. Without his intervention proposals for the 1944 Act would have been as stillborn as those for implementing the Spens Report.

Whatever the arguments surrounding the authorship of the 1944 Act, there is no doubt that Butler, from the first days of his Presidency,
had his eyes fixed on achieving an overall educational settlement.\(^{52}\) In seeking to amend the dual system he correctly judged that the key factor determining the success or failure of his initiative was likely to be the attitude of the Church of England and the terms which Anglicans would accept in regard to their schools.\(^{53}\) Butler's skilful and painstaking negotiations with denominational representatives and other parties have been extensively described and analysed\(^{54}\) and provide the context for what can only be termed as the non-settlement of the teacher training issue. As a result of his attentions and energies being fixed almost exclusively on the school system, Butler had little time to spare for the reform of teacher training and intervened on this question only when it was too late for him to effect anything more than an unhappy compromise.

Before examining in detail the events which led to this unsatisfactory outcome, it is interesting to note how the sequence of activity observable during the Second World War bears an uncanny resemblance to earlier attempts to reform the training colleges in 1902 and again between 1914-18. In 1902 the energies of all parties, not least denominationalists, had been consumed in their attempts to reach a settlement of the schools' issue, the claims of the training colleges thereby being generally disregarded. This pattern was to be repeated almost exactly during the Second World War, as were the events which made it an issue at all. As in the first war, the second was barely a year old before widespread ignorance of religion was detected among men serving in the forces.\(^{55}\) While this had been considered shocking in 1915, in 1940 it was given added point by growing concern at the bestiality of Nazi policies. In responding to public opinion, Churchill, without defining a holy war, began to stress the virtues of democracy and Christianity and this emphasis undoubtedly played a part in
modifying labour attitudes regarding denominational schools and colleges and thus in helping Butler achieve the settlement he was seeking.

For a variety of complex reasons the wartime spirit did not last long enough to remedy the weaknesses of the training colleges. These weaknesses had not unnaturally been placed to one side as the ability of Britain to survive the war was tested at Dunkirk and again in the skies over England in 1940. However, as military pressures eased in 1942, Butler's activities on the schools front gradually began to encourage officials at the Board to retrieve from obscurity earlier plans to reform the teacher training system. S.H. Wood, as head of the teacher training section within the Board, was particularly anxious that a joint reconstruction of schools and colleges should be achieved and saw an opportunity to move forward with the publication of the Green Book in June, 1941.

This book, deriving its name from the colour of its cover, contained draft proposals for an extensive reconstruction of the education system, proposals which at the time were considered "highly confidential". However, as Butler amusingly recounts in his memoirs, the Green Book was "distributed in such a blaze of secrecy that it achieved an unusual degree of publicity".

This publicity did not prove unhelpful to Wood because the draft proposals contained sharp criticisms of training colleges, criticisms which he promptly used to exert pressures on his colleagues regarding the need for an immediate enquiry into teacher training. Wood, accompanied by the staff inspector for the colleges, C.A. Richardson, discussed this and other possibilities with Butler in October, 1941. In November the President wrote back to Wood, and by tactfully asking for his advice, provided him with the opportunity to put his ideas on paper. In presenting what he described as "a considerable thesis" Wood seized the opportunity preferred, and his enthusiasm and energy.
on this and other occasions during the years 1941-45 reflect a remarkable change from the official who, in 1939, had been quietly parrying the very reform which he was now promoting. Perhaps, if people get the governments they deserve, ministers get the civil servants they deserve. Certainly under Butler's benign leadership, Wood emerges as a transformed character, who, not satisfied with supplying the President with an office minute, wrote again suggesting the appointment of "a small commission, not more than ten people, to advise on the supply of teachers and how to provide suitable training for them". This proposal from Wood, sent to Butler on the 20 January, 1942, clearly marks the inception of what was to be the McNair Committee of Enquiry into teacher training.

It could have quite easily been the Wood Committee of Enquiry into teacher training. Wood's new-found ardour to achieve swift progress led him, perhaps rashly, to offer himself as a possible chairman for the new committee, on the grounds that from this position, "he could interpret the wishes of the President and guide the committee in its consultations with witnesses". Unfortunately (in terms of the eventual outcome of the enquiry), Civil Service niceties of conduct prevented Wood from becoming chairman. Sir Maurice Holmes was offended by what he termed "Wood's lapse into self-aggrandizement", and by accentuating the opposition he was likely to encounter from training college representatives, proposed that the President should appoint instead someone "acceptable to the University Grants Committee". Considering that there were eighty training colleges as opposed to only twenty university training departments, Holmes's suggestion was ominously prophetic of the kind of solution he had in mind, because, having dashed Wood's hopes, Holmes now promoted the claims of Sir Arnold McNair. In the peculiarly abbreviated verbal shorthand
of the English Civil Service, Holmes recommended the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool to Butler on the grounds that he was "sound". Presumably this delphic phrase may have meant that McNair, from Holmes's point of view, could be relied upon not to depart from the established conventions governing the setting up and progress of committees of enquiry. Butler, after some hesitation, accepted the advice of his Permanent Secretary and on the 25 March, 1942, announced in the House of Commons the appointment of a committee, led by Sir Arnold McNair, "to investigate the present sources of supply and the methods of recruitment and training of teachers and youth leaders and to report what principles should guide the Board in these matters in the future".

The difficulties attending the appointment of a chairman to the Committee of Enquiry have been described in some detail because it was, in retrospect, to prove a critical decision. McNair consulted both Wood and Butler before accepting the latter's invitation to chair the Committee, but despite these preliminary talks, new members joining the enquiry team soon detected a note of formality in the relationships between their chairman and secretary. Some of the tension between the two men had nothing to do with personal factors but was caused instead by the heavy amount of work which now fell upon them, each being inundated with evidence. Such an enthusiastic response from all parties was caused, in part, by wartime stress, the thought of a better tomorrow alleviating, for those submitting evidence, some of the severity of their wartime conditions. Differences between McNair and Wood in their evaluation of, and response to, this evidence were, however, soon apparent. Wood came to his task with a thorough knowledge of the teacher training system and was fond of forecasting to his colleagues the likely tone and direction of evidence from the
various pressure groups, anticipating, on occasions, the very words used by such bodies as the National Union of Teachers. He was impatient of the public posturing which accompanied the submission of such evidence and became increasingly irritated by what he considered to be "McNair's narrowly legalistic interpretation of issues". However, both men throughout 1942 persevered with their tasks without signalling to anyone, other than commission members, the differences in their attitudes and approaches. Indeed, all Committee members became engrossed in the task of sifting the wide variety of evidence presented to them.

This evidence was soon pouring in, the earliest batch of papers submitted to the Committee in the autumn of 1942 containing two broadsides from the Trades Union Congress and the National Union of Teachers. The former argued in general terms for "the overwhelming necessity of young people to be fitted to take their place as useful citizens in a free democracy". In order for this to be accomplished, the T.U.C. demanded the rapid expansion of both technical and university education. This last point was quickly taken up by the N.U.T. who argued (in a separate paper) for the abolition of training colleges and their replacement by university schools of education. Union delegates were sharp in their criticism of the training colleges, complaining of their outmoded methods of discipline, old-fashioned buildings, poorly qualified staff and of their total segregation from "a coherent and integrated system of higher education". "The McNair Committee", claimed the Union, "now has a great opportunity to recommend fundamental reforms and we hope that its members will not let vested interests or prejudices stand in the way of the vital and far-reaching re-organization which is urgently necessary".
This clarion call for a thoroughgoing secular solution to the training college problem was vigorously contested by the denominational bodies, the speed and incisiveness of the denominational counter attack owing much to the fact that in April, 1942, William Temple had succeeded Cosmo Lang as Archbishop of Canterbury. Temple, who had dedicated himself to the task of modernizing his Church, both in terms of its structure and social attitudes, had no intention of allowing Anglican educational rights to be totally usurped by the state. He therefore threw himself into the fray, persuading other denominationalists to support what became known as "the Archbishop's Five Points" In the subsequent debate on these points Temple fought on two fronts, against what he perceived to be excessive union demands and, with greater difficulty, against the obstinate refusal of some Church members to contemplate reforms of any kind. In this latter context, Temple having at first dealt gently with members of the right wing National Society, later spoke to them more bluntly regarding the future of the Church's training colleges. If these institutions were to survive, said the Archbishop, they would have to change and by change he meant diversify. "If colleges are to maintain their output of teachers they need to expand and it is a good plan for the clergy to have part of their training for ordination with those training for teaching".

This blunt talking by the Archbishop to members of the National Society was accompanied by a point by point rebuttal of Union claims in the Church of England's own evidence to the McNair Committee. Responding to accusations of denominational colleges being an administrative anomaly, Anglicans countered by arguing that their training institutions increased the provision for educational diversity. Facing accusations of its colleges being old-fashioned and
obsolete, the Church of England Board of Supervision produced figures showing how much money had in fact been spent on modernization.\textsuperscript{89} Countering Union claims that grants to denominational colleges as sectarian institutions represented a misuse of public funds, the Archbishop of Canterbury made public the Anglican response already submitted to the McNair Committee. "The Church colleges", declared Temple on 25 June, 1943, "serve the whole community and are no longer selective of those of one faith; rather a range of staff and students work together in an atmosphere freed from the oppressive restrictions of compulsory denominational teaching".\textsuperscript{90} It was a strong defence, made all the stronger by the Archbishop's increasing authority, not only over his own Church, but over a wide range of religious opinion.\textsuperscript{91} In fact Temple's robust socialism made him more acceptable to the majority of Methodists\textsuperscript{92} than he was to many Anglo-Catholics within his own Church. Even the studied neutrality of members belonging to the British and Foreign School Society thawed a little in the light of the Archbishop's crusading style.\textsuperscript{93}

In the midst of this ecumenical harmony a jarring note was sounded by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Just as this body resisted all Butler's blandishments regarding a possible settlement of the denominational schools issue,\textsuperscript{94} it reacted with some violence to what Catholics viewed as Temple's betrayal of the denominational colleges' position. In this respect the Hierarchy continued to insist on the need for Catholic children to be taught in Catholic schools,\textsuperscript{95} and for Catholic teachers to be trained in Catholic colleges. Bending Temple's propositions to their own standpoint, the Catholic bishops insisted that their colleges served society in so far as they served Catholic interests,\textsuperscript{96} society benefiting from the plurality of distinctive denominational provision. This was certainly special pleading, regarded
by the National Union of Teachers as special pleading, of a Jesuitical kind. Dismayed by such trade union attitudes and by Anglican and Methodist timidity in defending their denominational rights, the Catholic Education Council compensated by submitting to the McNair Committee an uncompromising paper defending the right of Catholics to own and maintain denominationally distinctive colleges. In this paper the Catholic Council anticipated a rapid post-war expansion of their training institutions, an expansion funded by denominational contributions thereby making such places, "free from the interference by the Board of their internal administration". Throughout a series of prolonged discussions the Catholic Hierarchy and its Education Council refused to move from a position "grounded on Catholic faith and Catholic practice".

The Catholic paper, one of the last to be received by the McNair enquiry, came as something of a blow to Committee members because, as Wood observed, "Its decisive tone effectively ends any chance of an agreed settlement". Wood's comment was somewhat ingenuous because he may have been blaming Catholics for divisions within the Committee which were not of their making. In fact by March, 1943, the split in the Committee between those members supporting Wood and others supporting McNair was clearly apparent to officials working at the Board of Education. Some of the internal difficulties experienced by the Committee may be glimpsed by Butler's request to Wood at the beginning of May, 1943, to let him have some idea of the Committee's preliminary thinking regarding the possible future of the denominational colleges. Wood had difficulty in composing a reply because his ideas as to the future of these institutions were already considerably different from those entertained by Sir Arnold McNair. He therefore, quite properly, accentuated the common ground among
members regarding their collective reservations as to the isolation, outdated educational methods and poor academic standards present in the denominational colleges. Only in a concluding sentence did he really reveal his true feelings, roundly declaring, "Nothing but a revolutionary change in outlook and practice can make them fit to survive". Such forthright condemnation of the denominational colleges disturbed Butler because it confirmed rumours already circulating as to the hard line being pursued over this issue by Wood.

Temple was well aware of the hostility towards Anglican training colleges felt by some members of the McNair Committee and was himself angered by leaks from the enquiry concerning the possible closure of these institutions and their incorporation into the university system. The Archbishop therefore wrote to Butler on the 1 June, 1943, requesting an interview with the President to discuss the future of the Church training colleges, a request which Butler parried. Temple, however, refused to be sidetracked and insisted on a meeting with the President, who hastily asked Wood to be present because, he said, "things may get stormy". Storms were averted by Butler's well known tact and skill in negotiation, the President being at his most bland and soothing in the opening exchanges. He denied absolutely rumours concerning the proposed closure of the colleges or their total incorporation into the university system. Having pacified the Archbishop, Butler invited Wood to join in the discussion and the latter immediately pursued a much tougher line. "On the whole", said Wood, "the denominational colleges are not closely in touch with life". Brushing aside the Archbishop's protests, Wood said that the remedy for this condition would be painful, "For the incorporation of the colleges within a national structure is a matter of urgency as something has to
be done about the geographical and cultural isolation of these places". 108

Wood's eloquence and cogency of argument in the face of doubts expressed by the Archbishop stemmed from the fact that he had recently submitted his own evidence to the McNair Committee in the form of a memorandum embodying a proposal for "major constitutional reform". 109 Wood's paper was a tour de force: the secretary for teacher training, in three tightly organized pages, stated a problem, proposed a solution and suggested a procedure for carrying it out.

With the benefit of hindsight it is impossible not to regret the failure of the McNair Committee to implement Wood's solution to the teacher training problem. Considering the root of this problem to be the cultural isolation of the colleges, 110 Wood argued that it could be solved by enfolding the training colleges into the university system. 111 Through the creation of Schools of Education, 112 Wood envisaged a new organic relationship evolving between the colleges and universities, links enthusiastically endorsed by Lord Percy who in 1943 was Vice-Chancellor of the University of Durham. 113 Sadly, from Wood's point of view, Percy was almost the only vice-chancellor to welcome the idea of closer relationships between training colleges and universities. 114 Anticipating such meagre support, Wood appealed to university representatives to consider national needs at a time of crisis, shrewdly suggesting that their response to these claims actually promoted the best interests of the university sector. Thus, in the final paragraph of the second part of his "McNair Memorandum" Wood made a carefully judged appeal to the universities. "It may be desirable", he wrote, "for the universities, in their own as well as in the national interest, while maintaining the highest possible standards
in all the work which they have hitherto regarded as within their province, to extend their boundaries with a view to meeting the immediate and practical needs of society at a time of crisis.115

This was the whole crux of the problem, because Sir Arnold McNair, speaking both as a vice-chancellor and on behalf of his colleagues, did not consider it was the duty of the universities "to extend their boundaries". On the contrary, in a classic exposition of the university view,116 McNair argued that a university was not capable of "infinite expansion".117 In short (in McNair's view) more did indeed mean, worse. Thus, despite Wood's great disappointment at his unhelpful response, McNair was not prepared to modify his position, not least because his views immediately "received resolute endorsement from the committee of university vice-chancellors".118 Sustained by such weighty academic opinion, McNair went on to the offensive. "I think that probably the main point on which I differ from Mr. Wood is as to the true function of the universities", wrote McNair, in a terse summary of his position which he ensured was circulated to colleagues in the University Grants Committee. "It is only very slowly that the universities can be enlarged, or new universities established without destroying their real national value.... Universities must continually be vigilant lest they become too much training establishments and too little educational institutions".119

This response by McNair clearly repudiated the basis of Wood's proposals for merging universities and colleges, proposals which became universally known as Scheme A in contrast to McNair's plan for a loose federation of interests forwarded to the minister under the title, Scheme B.120 The growing disappointment of both Wood and Butler at the turn of events was increased when training college representatives
came out in favour of Scheme B,\textsuperscript{121} and when McNair, in submitting his report, wrote a covering letter which made abundantly clear the deeply divided views held by the Committee members.\textsuperscript{122} Butler replied, sending a formal letter of thanks to the retiring Chairman, a reply lacking some of his customary warmth.\textsuperscript{123} Possibly this was because the President was uneasy about the report he had just received but also because he was clearly anxious as to its reception, particularly in university circles.

Butler's anxieties proved to be well founded. Sir Hector Hetherington, Chairman of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, gave the McNair proposals short shrift,\textsuperscript{124} Archbishop Temple was critical,\textsuperscript{125} the Methodists hostile,\textsuperscript{126} and the National Union of Teachers "deeply disappointed".\textsuperscript{127} In dealing with the latter body Butler somewhat wearily told its General Secretary, Sir Frederick Mander, "Scheme A cannot be forced on the universities against their will".\textsuperscript{128} Privately, however, Butler told Mander of his strong support for Scheme A and indicated the steps he was taking to reduce university hostility to it,\textsuperscript{129} although he added, ominously, "Time is not on my side". This remark was prompted by Butler's knowledge that Churchill had decided to hold an early general election instead of prolonging the life of the coalition government. Once the date of the election had been announced,\textsuperscript{130} Butler, like his American counterpart, became a lame duck President. University representatives were confident that, whatever the result of the election, the President would depart, either through the failure of the government or by ministerial promotion. They were therefore disposed to listen with great patience to Butler's increasingly urgent appeals,\textsuperscript{131} paying lip service to his ideals but doing nothing to promote their reality.\textsuperscript{132} This procrastination by university representatives was symptomatic of the widespread caution
with which many of the McNair proposals were greeted. In marked contrast to the dazzling success of the 1944 Act, an air of gloom and incipient failure began to gather around the McNair Report. Indeed, as Butler and Wood left office together, the latter gave the report a bitter epitaph, describing it, in Civil Service jargon, as "a great fizzle".

As the events of 1944 recede into a more distant historical perspective it becomes easier to question whether Wood's first judgment of the McNair enquiry was actually a correct one. Success and failure are relative and Wood's initial response was certainly influenced by his feelings of professional pique. If, therefore, the focus upon the McNair Report is shifted away from Wood and Butler, and the report is instead viewed from a denominational perspective, it appears as a much more acceptable document. Whatever its other faults, from a denominational point of view the McNair Report preserved the autonomy of the denominational colleges, for these institutions in 1944 were (in the words of Gilbert and Sullivan) "liberated out on bail, by a set of curious chances". Since 1938 Pelham and Wood had been preparing the way for an integration of the training colleges into the university system, a reorganization fully supported by the unions and gently prompted by the minister, R.A. Butler. Just as these plans were coming to fruition curious chances intervened in the shape of Sir Arnold McNair and the movement of wartime public opinion.

It has recently become fashionable in certain styles of historical analysis to view people as the embodiments of historical movements and in this context McNair certainly represented a university viewpoint. However, this style of historical evaluation devalues personality because, in Professor Armytage's memorable words, "People have a funny habit of
jogging the levers of history - sometimes with unfortunate results".\textsuperscript{136} McNair undoubtedly jogged one of the levers of history, with results which appeared either unfortunate or beneficial depending on the audience. University and training college representatives viewed McNair's support for Scheme B with relief because it allowed them to go their separate ways, whereas Wood and the unions were dismayed by what each described, on separate occasions, as "Sir Arnold's intransigence".\textsuperscript{137}

What factors influenced McNair in his resolute rejection of the university solution to the teacher training problem? While university attitudes were of paramount importance in McNair's mind, he was not unaware in 1944 of changes in public opinion. In this respect, the closure or extensive amalgamation of denominational colleges which could have been achieved with comparative ease in 1939,\textsuperscript{138} was something which in 1944 could no longer be contemplated with equanimity. This change had been brought about by the influence of wartime events, events which, to a remarkable extent, succeeded in reviving the denominational position. As Charmian Cannon has argued, a consensus of opinion favourable to the continuation of denominational education emerged in 1943-44.\textsuperscript{139} During this critical year, she claims, revulsion at Nazi atrocities reached a peak and Christian principles, well expounded and interpreted by Temple, threw a more favourable light on denominationalism. Thus, although the concept of residual religion is notoriously difficult to apply,\textsuperscript{140} Cannon nevertheless argues that the climate of political and public opinion in 1944 enabled denominationalists, particularly in education, to recoup much that they had apparently lost during the inter-war period.\textsuperscript{141}

This analysis is strongly supported by contemporary denominational reaction to the passing of the 1944 Act, with the Bishop of Chichester
claiming that Butler was heaven sent, while both he and Temple consistently maintained that the Act was "an answer to secularism and neutral religious opinion". While Temple, not unnaturally, concentrated upon the positive and denominationally favourable aspects of the schools' settlement, he was not entirely ungrateful for the McNair Report. Although critical of its general tone, the Archbishop regarded the report as "a useful doorstop", upholding the standing of the denominational colleges and "tidying up odds and ends". Just before his sudden and untimely death on the 26 October, 1944, Temple was beginning to make plans for the reconstruction of the Anglican colleges, knowing that they were not to be swallowed whole by the universities.

If in the short term, and from a denominational point of view, the McNair Report seemed favourable, time was to vindicate Wood's assessment of its underlying weakness. In retrospect it is clear that McNair failed to tackle the major deficiency of the training colleges, namely their isolation. Wood, in his evidence to the Committee, had been blunt and yet precise in his treatment of this issue: "The loosening of their relationship with the Board of Education", wrote Wood, "has not been replaced by any corresponding relationship with any other authoritative body.... In short, the colleges, having properly been released from the Board's apron strings, have evolved no disciplined adult relationship with any other body."

When Wood and Butler tried hard in 1944 to establish an adult relationship between the colleges and the universities, they were thwarted by the latter's unyielding opposition to the insertion into their midst of "a helot class of students". Rightly or wrongly, university vice-chancellors were imbued with the idea that training
colleges produced second-class students and because of this, as one of them openly stated, such places were, "an unlovely lot to ask the universities to take an interest in".149

However, a horror of the second-rate was not the only reason for the universities' obvious reluctance to assume responsibility for the teacher training colleges. Members of the increasingly powerful University Grants Committee were only too aware of the interference by central government in the internal affairs of the colleges and consequently they viewed with alarm the prospect of these institutions acting as a Trojan horse. Accept the training colleges, argued vice-chancellors, and you accept state control.150

Such control, in a most acute and threatening form from a university point of view, was evident in the constant scrutiny exercised by the inspectorate over all aspects of training college work. Thus vice-chancellors, perceiving inspection to be the thin end of a very large state wedge, unanimously rejected Circular 112. This circular, issued in June 1946, provided the legal basis for the creation of university schools of education but, in so doing, provided rights of access for the inspectorate "to monitor and evaluate courses relating to teacher training".151

Any such inspection was totally unacceptable to the universities, and because it was linked to the creation of schools of education, the latter remained stillborn until the issue had been resolved. Only when, in 1947, members of the Association of University Teachers were entirely satisfied that they were not to be exposed to inspectorate criticism, did they and other university representatives agree to the setting up of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. Described by James Lynch as "a servile body",152
NACTST, like the earlier McNair Committee, did little more than preside over an increasingly unsatisfactory status quo. Dominated by the government and the universities, NACTST legitimized the continuing isolation of the training colleges and throughout the fifties these institutions aspired to a close relationship with the universities which the latter were clearly unwilling to countenance. 153

During the 1950s ambivalent relationships between the universities and training colleges continued against a background of ever increasing state control. 154 For the training colleges (unlike the universities) this control continued to be exerted from the Board of Education which grew and expanded, first into the Ministry of Education and then into the Department of Education and Science. Although the titles changed, the nature of the relationship between civil servants and staff working in the colleges did not, because college representatives quickly detected their lowly status on bodies such as NACTST. As one college principal recalled in 1974, "In publishing reports NACTST were operating within narrow fields of enquiry, and produced unanimous recommendations which were either acceptable to the Ministry and subsequently implemented, or were quietly shelved until official policy had been formulated". 155

During the fifties and sixties the formulation and direction of this official policy remained firmly in the hands of permanent officials, who, like their predecessors, saw no need for haste. The McNair recommendations of 1944 for the introduction of a three-year teacher training course were not implemented until 1960, and the first cohort of these three-year Certificate of Education students had not been through their cycle of training before Lord Robbins advocated the introduction of a four-year B.Ed. degree.
Surrounded by the gloom and despondency of the 1980s it is difficult to recapture the mood of optimism in which the Robbins Report was written, or the rapturous reception given to it by those working in the newly-styled Colleges of Education. The unrestrained joy shown by training college staff when the Robbins Report was published resulted from its giving the colleges what they had always sought, namely, parity of prestige with the universities and appropriate academic and financial autonomy. In short, during the brief period 1963 to 1969, it seemed as if the training colleges had finally come of age.

Now that this false dawn can be clearly seen as a false dawn, it is easy to be wise after the event, because revisiting Robbins exposes assumptions which were never questioned at the time. With the benefit of hindsight it is clear that Robbins and his fellow committee members came to believe that an increase in the status of the colleges would enable these institutions to stand on their own feet. Thus, although the committee attempted to revive Scheme A from the McNair Report, the whole thrust of the Robbins Report was towards increasing the numbers of students undertaking higher education. Unlike McNair, Robbins believed that more meant better, not worse. Regrettably, (as Hyndman has observed) this belief led Robbins to exalt the "quantitative" at the expense of the "qualitative", an aberration only acceptable so long as the demand for teachers continued to rise and colleges continued to give the impression of their becoming mature academic institutions.

This latter status was not easy to achieve because throughout the sixties any further integration of the colleges with the universities was blocked by opposition from local education authorities and central
government. There is some grim irony to be derived from observing that when the universities were finally willing to go to the altar with the colleges in 1969, they were stopped from doing so by the two bodies who had been the most ardent sponsors of the marriage in 1944. Thus the colleges were continuing as separate institutions at the time when the birthrate slumped and the demand for teachers began to fall alarmingly.

1969 proved to be a critical year, a time when, in Abraham Lincoln's homely phrase, "the bottom fell out of the tub". From 1962, when there had been 48,000 teacher training places, until 1968, when 94,800 places had been provided, the training system had been continuously expanding. In 1969 a down turn in the numbers of students recruited into teaching began, a trend which few at the time perceived to be threatening because all the training colleges had grown so fast it seemed impossible to believe that they could shrink just as quickly.

At the beginning of 1969 morale was high in most training colleges, although the pursuit of numbers had eroded still further the distinctiveness of the denominational institutions. The majority of principals entrusted with the leadership of these places had attempted to expand their colleges so as to meet the 750 student number target set by Robbins, and this rapid expansion had not dealt kindly with the remaining vestiges of denominational beliefs and values. Staff and students had been recruited into all the denominational colleges (including Catholic institutions) with little regard paid to their faith or values. It is therefore hardly surprising that John Gay in his Culham paper, The Christian Campus, identifies the sixties as the decade when secular penetration of the Church colleges was particularly acute.
Having regained much lost ground in 1944, the denominational colleges during the sixties succumbed to the materialism of the "you've never had it so good" Macmillan era. More closely associated with society than ever before, the authorities responsible for these colleges saw no reason to resist the inrush of consumer durables and therefore paperback books flooded library shelves while television aerials sprouted from student bedrooms. The prevailing materialism which was changing the ethos of Church colleges during the sixties was also, in Alan Gilbert's estimation, a major factor in The Making of Post Christian Britain during the same period.  

Much of the damage had been done, as far as the denominational colleges were concerned, by the time the Robbins bubble burst in 1970. While, however, the prevailing mood of secular hedonism which characterized the early sixties had weakened these colleges, their final demise was brought about by permanent officials working at the Department of Education and Science who, in 1965, set up a small committee to examine "the administration and control of colleges of education". This committee, led by its chairman, Sir Toby Weaver, recommended in 1966 that all colleges should be administered by "a properly constituted academic board, whose membership should be representative".

This direction hardly seemed threatening and was generally welcomed by all in the colleges, whose principals moved smartly to incorporate on to their academic boards motley numbers of jean-clad students and soberly suited laymen. Although innocuous at first, these newly introduced groups soon began to exert a strong influence, especially as student militancy (another characteristic of the sixties) dramatically increased. Difficulties in Church colleges arose because
student representatives were frequently contemptuous of denominational values,\textsuperscript{169} while laymen often joined forces with disgruntled local education authority representatives who were already seeking to curb the powers of church members. In retrospect, it is clear that the Weaver recommendations laicized the control mechanisms of the majority of denominational colleges and 1966 can therefore be identified as the years when the influence of church representatives was decisively reduced.\textsuperscript{170} The Weaver Report thus emerges as another striking example of supposedly neutral bureaucratic advice having unintended results, on this occasion weakening still further an already failing denominational presence in the colleges.

The Weaver Report was the last attempt by central government to sustain the growth of an autonomous teacher training sector. In 1965 Anthony Crosland had unveiled the so-called binary system of higher education, whereby thirty polytechnics were to be created to complement the work of the existing forty-four universities.\textsuperscript{171} Crosland remained silent as to the role colleges were to play in the binary system and consequently the colleges existed uneasily during the late sixties, sandwiched between two stronger rivals, meekly picking up the unwanted teacher training courses ceded to them by their research-oriented competitors.

This precarious position could only be maintained by the colleges so long as teacher training numbers remained high; in 1970 the figures dropped and the incoming Conservative Government drew its own conclusions. In appointing Lord James to lead an investigation of the whole system of teacher training, the Conservative government signposted his eventual conclusions through their terms of reference, one of which pointedly asked his Lordship, "whether a larger proportion of intending
teachers should be educated with students who have not chosen their careers or chosen other careers". In 1972 James responded to the hint so heavily given by recommending the abolition of monotechnic teacher training courses and their replacement by three cycles of continuing education. Narrowness of professional training was countered by James in the Committee’s recommendation that all students should first complete a two-year diploma in higher education, followed by two years of professional training, this to be 'topped up' by a third cycle of in-service training. Nicely described by John Parry as The Lord James Tricycle, the whole system failed (as Parry predicted) because the machine went on the road minus a wheel. Despite the enthusiastic response by D.E.S. officials to the idea of the Dip.H.E. they, and their minister, Margaret Thatcher, remained strangely quiet about any provision for in-service training. This silence provoked considerable anxiety in the colleges, where the official government response to James was awaited during the academic year 1972-1973.

The government response finally came in the form of a consultative paper, Education: A Framework for Expansion. After nearly a year of official silence (relieved on occasions by official leaks) the D.E.S. reply to James brought relief to college staff because it provided a stay of execution to the B.Ed. degree, but also provoked incredulity because its title referred to expansion. A more inappropriate word could scarcely have been chosen because the document, described by Professor Simon as 'A Framework for Contraction' and dubbed by David Hencke as 'A Framework for Confusion', succeeded only too well in achieving both these ends without ever seriously hinting at expanding anything. Indeed, the whole calamitous period from 1973 to 1975 was one of double think and double talk, when any D.E.S. reference to expansion in effect meant contraction, a contraction.
already being contemplated by Hugh Harding.\textsuperscript{178}

Gordon McGregor in his thesis and subsequent book concerning the history of Bishop Otter College,\textsuperscript{179} provides vivid glimpses of the role played by Harding in preparing the way for the closure and amalgamation of the colleges, a reorganization finally accomplished in 1977. Before this final solution was imposed, it was the fate of Bishop Otter College to act as a lightning conductor of D.E.S. policy. Desperately anxious to maintain the academic and denominational autonomy of the Anglican college, McGregor applied to the Department for permission to amalgamate Bishop Otter College with the University of Sussex.\textsuperscript{180} Harding was not pleased by this possible entanglement of a university with a college, perceiving it as a precedent which he was only prepared to pursue in exceptional circumstances.\textsuperscript{181} His reluctance to accept this solution led to an acrimonious exchange of views\textsuperscript{182} between the Anglican church and the D.E.S. over the future of Bishop Otter College. After a meeting where civilities were barely preserved, Harding seized the opportunity to set out a policy which was to determine the fate of all the denominational colleges. "It was accepted", minuted Harding, "that the Church must contribute proportionately to the national reduction in teacher training numbers, and if it insisted on the stronger colleges retaining their autonomy and independence this was likely to be at the expense of closing five or six of the weaker colleges".\textsuperscript{183}

News of the Harding minute quickly reached all denominational authorities who swiftly recognized their inability to counter such tactics. Faced by open-ended threats of college closures, denominational authorities pursued the unpleasant role adopted by the British government at the time of Munich. Just as Halifax had put
pressure on the Polish government to appease Hitler, \textsuperscript{184} so the central denominational authorities in 1977 applied pressure on their individual colleges in order to appease Harding. \textsuperscript{185} Senior officials from the National Society, the Catholic Education Council and the Methodist Education Committee all told principals of their smallest and weakest colleges that resistance to government policy was impossible and that it was their Christian duty to walk quietly into the darkness and not to rage against it.

The weakness of local institutions, faced by national and centralized directives, was painfully demonstrated as four Anglican colleges closed, eight ceased to be denominationally distinctive and only nine remained as free standing institutions. \textsuperscript{186} Throughout 1977 the dismal total of denominational closures rose, the Catholic college of Maria Assumpta being selected as a late victim \textsuperscript{187} while only one autonomous Methodist institution remained intact. \textsuperscript{188} Monotechnic colleges of all varieties closed, \textsuperscript{189} and it is no pleasure to observe that all parties engaged in what one embittered principal described as, "the massacre of '77", emerged with little credit. Directors of polytechnics could scarcely conceal their joy at the removal of potentially dangerous competitors, \textsuperscript{190} while too many denominational officials lamely protested that they were "unprepared and poorly advised" \textsuperscript{191} to meet a crisis which had clearly been building up for over two years. In short, the denominational college "fortress" which Cosmo Lang had once vowed would never be surrendered, capitulated in 1977.

The year of 1977 is clearly an appropriate point at which to close this final chapter, and to broach issues which will be more fully considered in the conclusions. Thus, it can be briefly observed that
in three related sections this chapter has described how the denominational colleges adapted to wartime conditions and how their fortunes were revived by the 1944 educational settlement, the advantages of which were finally lost during the post-war period. The first of these two sections has a depth and degree of detail which is certainly not claimed for the final section. This, a type of historical postscript, surveys post-war developments, bringing the story up-to-date and inviting others to research the period more thoroughly, because (as will be noted again in the conclusions) a history of teacher training from 1944 to the present day is overdue. The evidence cited in this chapter goes some way towards indicating a possible research topic as the traumatic events of 1977 have only been briefly considered and the future of the surviving training institutions is a question currently attracting both great interest and controversy.

Many academics and denominationalists, particularly Gordon McGregor, John Gay and Colin Alves, remain optimistic that church-related institutions can find a new role through "diversifying into distinctiveness". While the writer would like to share this optimism regarding the prospects for denominational education, the evidence of this final chapter is not encouraging. The laws of supply and demand which operated in 1977 were no respecters of denominational compliance, distinctiveness or, indeed, excellence. The fate of denominational colleges at this time was determined by their "market share", a stock market phrase which bodes ill for the future. What this future might hold for the denominational colleges is one of many topics now examined in the conclusions to this thesis.
Catholic Education Council (1939-40), Annual Report. The work undertaken by students was, at St. Mary's College, soon handed over to ground staff and local firms. This urgency was not solely caused by fear of German bombers. The Board of Education stipulated that air raid shelters had to be provided for all students before a college could reopen for the new academic year, 1939-40. Consequently, during the autumn of 1939, college playing fields across England suddenly sprouted concrete clad 'Anderson shelters', large enough to house ever diminishing numbers of students.


Social Insurance and Allied Services (1942), Beveridge Report. "The growing interest in post-war problems was dramatically demonstrated by the reception accorded to the publication of the Beveridge Report on the reform of the social services in December 1942. The sales broke all records and caused a queue literally a mile long outside the government bookshop in Kingsway, providentially across the road from the wartime London office of the Education Board". MIDDLETON, N. and WEITZMAN, S. (1976), A Place for Everyone: A History of State Education from the Eighteenth Century to the 1970's, p. 240.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1944), Teachers and Youth Leaders: Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders.

Sir Arnold McNair, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool, Chairman of the enquiry into teacher training, 1942-1944.


P.R.O. Ed. 86/93.

These were to prove many and various, the Army Intelligence Corps taking over King Alfred's College, Winchester, in 1940, the Air Ministry requisitioning Bishop Otter College, Chichester, in 1942, in order to use it as an administrative planning centre for D-Day. Other colleges, not used for military purposes, were often turned into hospitals, rationing centres and as alternative locations for government departments moving out of London. See ROSE, Op. cit. p. 90 and McGREGOR, Op. cit. p. 172.

"It was impossible therefore to utilize the men's colleges to house students from evacuated women's colleges. Completely new plans had to be made". Board of Supervision (1940), Minute Book, Vol. II, p. 127. See also P.R.O. Ed. 86/93, Notes on Meeting with Representatives of Training Colleges.

A decision rescinded by Churchill's wartime coalition at the beginning of 1940.

On the 19 September, 1939, the policy of evacuating all training colleges from designated evacuation areas was abandoned, see P.R.O. Ed. 136/112.

The Principal of King Alfred's College, Winchester, accompanied some of his evacuated students to Culham. At first he was given some lecturing duties, but "relationships became strained", so strained that on one occasion he was escorted off the premises. ROSE, Op. cit. p. 90.

One lecturer from Avery Hill College described to the author how she stood, night after night, on an outside ledge of St. Paul's Cathedral, with "a thermos flask of hot water, an oxo cube, and my whistle - just in case the bombers came". Interview J.

Confusion over call up continued throughout 1939. Some students and staff received call up orders, which were then rescinded. Some ignored the papers, others enlisted, and never received the countermanding notices.

"Apart from accommodation difficulties, perhaps the principal problem which the training colleges faced was that of keeping up their student numbers at a time when young women as well as young men were being conscripted for war service". GOSDEN, Op. cit. p. 112.
22 The sacking of staff (as at King Alfred's College, Winchester) was not always handled tactfully or with any serious consideration being given to the future prospects of more senior members of the staff. Three months' notice of dismissal, without compensation or any hope of obtaining an equivalent post, was hardly generous in terms of what was, for many, a lifetime's work spent in teaching and teacher training.


23 Teaching practice, which had proved difficult to organize in wartime conditions, was reduced to a minimum period of six weeks instead of twelve. See Board of Education, Circular 1489, 28 November, 1939.


25 Ibid. p. 112.

26 Union anxieties concerning the policy of lowering the age of admission to teacher training colleges, first expressed in 1941, grew so strong that in 1943 the N.U.T. broke the unofficial 'wartime truce' by sending a deputation to the Board of Education to protest at what they considered "a retrogressive and indefensible measure".

National Union of Teachers (1943), Circular to Members, No. 590/103/B.

27 In July, 1943, the Editor of The Economist summed up these views when he wrote, "Rightly or wrongly the Board of Education has acquired the reputation of being a lackadaisical department which seldom succeeds in delivering the goods".

The Economist. 24 July, 1943.


29 Interview H. While this was Bevin's view, it was not that of R.A. Butler, who, in his autobiography, refers to his Civil Service team in glowing terms: "I was no less fortunate to be served by a quite outstanding group of civil servants: the brilliant Sir Maurice Holmes, Permanent Secretary, derisive of many of the persons and futilities that came our way, yet acute in ideals and practice; Sir Robert Wood, who did much of our drafting; S.H. Wood, who kept us on the progressive path; the traditionalist, G.C. Williams; William Cleary, with his great reservoir of experience; and young Neville Heaton, who was the secretary of so many of our committees and who, in my opinion, was of the calibre to be Permanent Secretary himself".

"The general tightening of the employment situation was leading an increasing number of intelligent secondary school leavers to look to industry for a career when they might have fallen back on teaching in the days of wider unemployment. Moreover pre-service training organizations may well have encouraged some young men who might have gone to training colleges to look to the forces. The Board decided to issue a circular to try to bring the claims of teaching to the notice of senior pupils in secondary schools. While anxious not to minimize the need for young men and women in many forms of national service, the Board 'would also emphasize the fact that there will be a great need for teachers in the future'.


Butler provides a memorable account of his posting: "Ten days later, the Prime Minister sent for me. He saw me after his afternoon nap and was purring like a tiger. He began, 'You have been in the House for fifteen years and it is time you were promoted'. I objected gently that I had been there only twelve years but he waved this aside. 'You have been in the government for the best part of that time and I now want you to go to the Board of Education. I think you can leave your mark there. You will be independent. Besides' he continued, with rising fervour, 'you will be in the war. You will move poor children from here to here', and he lifted up and evacuated imaginary children from one side of the blotting pad to the other; 'this will be very difficult'. He went on: 'I am too old to think you can improve people's natures. Everyone has to learn to learn to defend himself. I should not object if you could introduce a note of patriotism into the schools'. And then, with a grin, recalling our conversation the previous week, 'Tell the children that Wolfe won Quebec'.


"Later I saw Bonar-Law about Cabinet business. He was deciding which ministers were to be in the Cabinet. He talked of leaving out the Minister of Education, but I pointed out it would result in a frightful row, and he decided to include him".


"Then he (the King) bade me goodbye and wished me luck at the Board of Education, adding 'I suppose you want to go there'".


"Rab Butler came for the night. I hadn't seen him since the war began and I was delighted with our talk. He has come on tremendously and I think has in him the makings of something really good".
Baldwin to Halifax, June 17, 1941.


"He (Churchill) had never had much time for the social services for, when offered the Local Government Board at the outset of his career, he had refused saying he did not want to be shut up in a soup kitchen with Beatrice Webb.... Like many politicians of the old school he considered the education department a dead one, and as such suitable for Butler".

Loc. cit.

Butler offers two accounts of his 'promotion' to the Presidency of the Board of Education in July, 1941. In addition to the account already cited, and taken from his autobiography, in 1966 Butler gave a television interview. The transcript from this programme conflicts in part with the written account, but is equally entertaining. Butler said that Churchill opened the interview by offering an unspecified "fowin post". Butler then requested a move to the Ministry of Education: "I said my family had always been interested in education and also I had great hopes of making some reform there during the war. He said then, that if I wanted to go he'd be glad to send me, but he wouldn't like to wipe children's noses and smack their behinds during the war; he didn't know what I'd be doing - so I said I would keep very busy and let him know".
Ibid. p. 239.

Ibid. p. 240.


"It would be the greatest mistake to raise the 1902 controversy during the war, and I certainly cannot contemplate a new Education Bill. I think it would also be a great mistake to stir up the public schools question at the present time. No one can possibly tell what the financial and economic state of the country will be when the war is over. Your main task at present is to get the schools working as well as possible under all the difficulties of air attack, evacuation, etc. If you can add to this industrial and technical training, enabling men not required for the army to take their places promptly in munitions industry or radio work, this would be most useful. We cannot have any party politics in
wartime, and both your second and third points raise these in a most acute and dangerous form. Meanwhile you have a good scope as an administrator”.


47 "There are, I feel, some advantages in having more time than ever your revised programme contemplated for reaching the greatest common measure of agreement on the more contentious issues, so that from this point of view the P.M.'s frigid reception of your proposals has its brighter side”.

48 "The evidence now available shows quite clearly that Butler exerted little influence on the educational aspects of the Act. It is not his Act in the sense that it embodies his policies or was designed by him. His contributions to its success were great, but they were not concerned with the future shape of schooling in Britain. He was, rather, the protector of other men's plans. Indeed the main decisions about secondary education were taken before Butler was asked by Churchill in July 1941 to become President of the Board of Education”.

49 "The principal authors of the Act were a group of civil servants who met at the Branksome Dene Hotel, Bournemouth, to which they had been evacuated between November 1940 and May 1941. Their physical separation from their political leaders, who remained at the Board's offices in Kingsway, London, reinforced their independence from ministerial influence”.
Loc. cit.


52 "Having viewed the milk and honey from the top of Pisgah, I was damned if I was going to die in the land of Moab. Basing myself on long experience with Churchill over the India Bill, I decided to disregard what he said and go straight ahead”.


55 Church of England (1940), Church Assembly, Minutes of Proceedings, Vol. 21, No. 2, Summer Session.


57 P.R.O. Ed. 23/694 (1939), P.R.O. Ed. 136/297 (1938) and P.R.O. Ed. 23/694 (1939).


60 Ibid. p. 93.


62 Although the 'Green Book' was published with a foreword composed by Maurice Holmes, individual chapters were written by the appropriate departmental officials, S.H. Wood writing the chapter on the training colleges. Holmes therefore regarded as 'bad form' Wood's subsequent use of his own evidence to push the need for an enquiry into teacher training. This incident seems to have been the starting point of a period of friction between Holmes and Wood, leading to the Permanent Secretary's rejection of Wood's claims for the Chairmanship of the Committee of Enquiry into Teacher Training.

63 These 'other possibilities' were set out by Richardson in a written note to the President prior to their meeting, where he identified the 'clear weaknesses, existing within the present system'. These, in his estimation, concerned 'the poor quality of staff in training colleges, the isolation of their students, their cultural isolation, and the shortness of their courses'. Memorandum by C.A. Richardson to the President of the Board of Education, 28 October, 1941, P.R.O. Ed. 136/297.

64 "I contemplate asking the universities to give the training colleges a special status within their own field", wrote Butler, inviting Wood to "come back" on this suggestion. P.R.O. Ed. 136/297.

66 "S.H. Wood, who kept us on the progressive path".


69 Interview K.

70 "He was known to have written the chapter on teacher training in the Green Book which the training colleges disliked; moreover, educational interests generally would not like having an officer of the Board as chairman".

71 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.

72 Sir Arnold McNair, educated at Aldenham School and Cambridge University. Became a solicitor in 1906 but changed to university teaching in 1926. Held a variety of academic posts between 1926 to 1937, in the latter year becoming Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool, a post which he retained until 1945. Chairman of the committee appointed by the Board of Education to enquire into the supply and training of teachers, 1942-1944.

73 Butler, in his memoirs, is less than candid regarding friction among what he called his "quite outstanding group of civil servants". On a number of occasions Butler found Holmes prickly in defending his rights and privileges and, in this instance, the President supported his Permanent Secretary when his own views were more attuned to those of junior officials.

74 House of Commons (1942), Hansard CCCLXXVIII, 204/25, 25 March.

75 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.

76 In Richard Crossman's telling phrase, "the good and the great" invited to join the McNair Committee of Enquiry were drawn almost entirely from the field of education with a slight leavening of industrial interest in the form of Dr. A.P.M. Fleming, Vickers Electrical Company. The full membership was Dr. Arnold McNair (Chairman), Sir Fred Clarke, Director of the University of London Institute of Education, Dr. Fleming (already cited), Mrs. L. Hitchens, Oxfordshire County Council, Sir Frederick Mander, Secretary of the N.U.T., P.R. Morris, Director of Education, Kent, Miss A.H. Ross, Secretary, London Union of Girls Clubs, Mrs. J.L. Stocks, Principal of Westfield College, University of

77 Interview K.

78 Before entering university teaching, McNair had been for many years a solicitor. When recording evidence, he was fond of cross-questioning witnesses and writing their replies on a legal notepad.


80 "Let us throw open the doors of the universities as widely as possible". Ibid. p. 262 and see also TROPP, A. (1957), The School Teachers, pp. 231-247.

81 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94. Evidence submitted by the National Union of Teachers to the McNair Committee of Enquiry.

82 "Training colleges at present suffer from being isolated from other educational institutions and often from the community at large. Additionally they are isolated within sexes and within a profession, and regrettably, within denominational sects". P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.

83 Committee members quickly recognized that when the N.U.T. referred to "vested interests" union representatives chiefly had in mind the denominational bodies owning teachers' training colleges. P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.

84 Temple's appointment to Canterbury was not achieved without intervention on his behalf by Churchill. As Nigel Middleton comments, "Another much fancied candidate had not been acceptable to the Prime Minister leaving the selection open for Temple". It now seems clear that this "much fancied candidate" was G.K.A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, who thus had the misfortune to be denied Canterbury twice by Churchill, in 1942 and again in 1945. MIDDLETON and WEITZMAN, Op. cit. p. 258 and Interview L.


86 In brief the Archbishop's five points were:

1) In all schools a Christian education should be given to all the scholars.

2) Religious Knowledge should be integrated into, and be an integral part of, the normal curriculum.
3) That qualified R.I. teachers should be enabled to teach their subject throughout a school.

4) That R.I. teaching should be inspected in the normal way, i.e. by H.M.I.

5) That all schools should begin their day with an act of worship.

For the full version of these five points see Church of England (1943), Church Assembly, Christian Education, p. 79.

87 Describing his first meeting as Primate with the National Society over the issue of Church schools, Temple wrote to Canon Tatlow, "I was doing a rather elaborate egg dance, and some of the eggs are such that it is most important not to break, because the smell would be awful!"


88 Archbishop William Temple addressing members of the Board of Supervision and the National Society on 25 June, 1943. "He hoped that some of the restrictions upon the effectiveness of the colleges would be removed by the reforms anticipated in future. The two main restrictions were lack of TIME and lack of FINANCE. The future would require good organization but behind it all lay the question of finance. Principals should have more freedom to provide the best sort of equipment, and to secure the best teachers unfettered by worries about money." Church of England (1943), Board of Supervision, Minutes, Vol. 6, p. 133.

89 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.


91 As Marjorie Cruickshank comments, "It was significant that Anglicans and Free Churchmen had drawn closer together in recent years, for they had realized that to prolong former antagonisms would merely weaken the common cause for which they stood". Temple's appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury promoted this feeling of unity, because just as coalition members of the government gave their support to Churchill rather than Chamberlain, so denominationalists were inclined to support Temple in ways which they had avoided when Cosmo Lang had been Primate. CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 142.

92 Methodists gave strong support to the Archbishop's five points and in their evidence to the McNair Committee solidly defended the approaches and policies advocated by Temple. "We believe" wrote the Methodist Education Committee, "that it is mainly through colleges such as ours that a supply of teachers, themselves Christians, able, willing and competent to give religious instruction can be secured for the schools. We believe that
colleges which are inspired and nourished by important branches of the Christian Church are in a favourable position to specialize in this work. We are aware of what has been said against 'segregated seminaries' for the training of teachers, but we cannot feel that the alleged evil effects obtain within our own students. Our colleges constitute free, happy communities which have a large measure of self-government".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/94. Evidence submitted by the Methodist Education Committee to the McNair Enquiry into Teacher Training.

In their evidence to the McNair Committee, representatives of the British and Foreign School Society (Teacher Training Section) commended Temple's plans for the diversification of colleges, suggesting that in addition to the preparation of clergy colleges, 'should actively participate in social service work and social work training schemes.' While the Society found itself in agreement with Temple on this issue, it parted company with him over the role and function of a denominational college. The B.F.S.S., like the N.U.T., looked forward in 1942 to what was being termed, 'the university solution', whereby the denominational colleges would either be replaced by, or become part of, the university system. P.R.O. Ed. 86/94. Evidence submitted by the British and Foreign School Society to the McNair Enquiry into Teacher Training.

Roman Catholics insisted on retaining the full denominational character of their schools. Their determination sprang from their unchanging belief that religion should be the very essence of education, and that religion included not merely doctrinal instruction but the life and atmosphere of the school". CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 143.

Catholic Education Council (1942), Annual Report, reiterating the Catholic position in relation to the education of 'all Catholic people in accordance with the Papal Encyclical, Divini illius Magistri, as pronounced by His Holiness in 1929'. See also CRUICKSHANK, Op. cit. p. 143 and MIDDLETON and WEITZMAN, pp. 262-263.

Catholic sensitivity to interference by the Board in training college affairs was echoed by the principals of the Church training colleges when they met officers of the Board of Education (Mr. Fleming and Mr. Rhodes) on the 17 May, 1945. On this occasion the principals expressed their "fear of interference by the new Ministry in the internal administration of college finances". P.R.O. Ed. 86/94, Internal Minute, R880A/98.


Private Minute from S.H. Wood to R.A. Butler, May 1943, concerning the future of the denominational colleges.

"Each college has its own governing body but some years ago the Church authorities established a Board of Supervision for Church training colleges. This Board, consisting of clerics and others, acts as an intermediary between the colleges and the Board of Education on matters which will affect all the colleges, but it has not statutory authority over them, and some do not take kindly to this attempt at control. The colleges vary in efficiency, their weaknesses are segregation by sexes, frequent geographical isolation and the general policy of appointing a cleric to be head of the men's colleges. This tends to result in theological outweighing educational qualifications. There is a narrow discipline in some of the colleges".

Wood went on to qualify this statement in the following way:

"It is extremely unlikely that the Committee will recommend the abolition of the Church training colleges, although it is possible that they might recommend that no more training colleges should be built in remote areas, nor old colleges rebuilt in such areas. It may be that a closer connection with the universities will be recommended, and this may involve less independence for colleges and more co-operation and pooling of staff between them. Possibly representation of outside bodies, e.g. the universities, on their governing bodies may be recommended, these members to have some say in the selection of staff".

Whether Wood or McNair encouraged calculated 'leaks' is a matter for speculation, but by April 1943, in Civil Service parlance, the enquiry was notoriously 'leaky'.

"This important question is still under consideration by the McNair Committee", wrote Butler to Temple, 2 June, 1943.
secure co-operation and the pooling of staff. Further measures will need to be taken to get rid of the segregation of students and to expand their outlook and experience by improving qualifications.


Committee on the Training of Teachers: Memorandum by Mr. S.H. Wood embodying a proposal for a major constitutional reform. McNair Enquiry Paper No. 102, R498/101.

"There are some 70 training colleges, apart from the 20 university and university college training departments. The characteristic feature of these colleges is their isolation; not mere geographical isolation which is true of only some of them, but cultural isolation. They are unrelated to one another and, with some exceptions, are divorced from other parts of the educational field and from the world at large. Every year they send 7,000 students into the schools as trained teachers; but as a corporate body of institutions engaged in promoting professional studies and practice, their influence on the educational world is negligible".

Ibid. Paragraph 4, Paper No. 102.

"I suggest (a) that the universities ought to be persuaded to accept a special responsibility for the training of all those who will be engaged in that pyramid of activity of which they are the apex and (b) that therefore one of the Committee's major recommendations should deal with the constitutional relationship of the training colleges to the universities".

Ibid. Paragraph 14, Paper No. 102.

"I suggest that the main constitutional reform which the Committee should recommend is that each university should establish a "School of Education"; and that other reforms such as those dealing with the place of local education authorities in the system of training, the length of the course, the nature of the course, the breaking down of segregation of both staff and students, should be fitted in the framework of the "School of Education".


"The weight of university opinion was decisively against any extension of the joint board kind of relationship, the committee of vice-chancellors proposing an alternative formula for the future development of training colleges which would involve their abandonment of the monotechnic idea in favour of a link-up with the polytechnics".


Ibid. Paragraph No. 36, Paper No. 102.
"I think that probably the main point on which I differ from Mr. Wood is as to the true function of the universities. That is, in my opinion, to advance knowledge and to educate the leaders in every walk of life to which university education can make a contribution - teachers of all kinds, administrators, clergy, doctors, divines, lawyers, scientists, etc., but it is unlikely that they will ever educate all these persons. A university is not capable of infinite expansion, and it is only very slowly that the universities can be enlarged, or new universities established without destroying their real national value".


A point which seems to have gone unremarked in the compilation of evidence for the McNair Committee is how little attention was apparently given to the views of either staff or students working in the training colleges. How representative the evidence submitted by the Training College Association and Council of Principals in support of the two opposing schemes: Sir Fred Clarke, Sir Frederick Mander, Mr. Morris and Mr. Thomas supporting S.H. Wood and Scheme A, Dr. Fleming, Mrs. Hitchens, Miss Ross and Mrs. Stocks supporting A. McNair and Scheme B.

"One thing was clear and that was that the training of teachers - all teachers - could not be and ought not to be handed over to the universities. It could not be, because the universities would not be able to deal with the numbers ... and it ought not to be, because of the aloofness of the universities from the education of the people. The universities have no contact with the elementary schools; they do not speak the same language. By contrast the training colleges are at home with every kind of school except the preparatory and public schools".

On the 27 April, 1944, McNair wrote to Butler:

Dear President,

I now send you herewith the signed copy of the Report. I greatly regret that in one respect it contains a headache for you, namely, our difference of opinion on the subject of the relationship of the universities to the new area training organization. It is a fundamental difference, and it was not possible to bridge it.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.

While this was obviously an occasion for formality, Butler frequently infused the most serious letters with a personal touch. His typed correspondence with Temple, for example, is punctuated by handwritten additions conveying warmth and friendliness.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

Hetherington, having consulted his colleagues, told Butler that the universities, "were not disposed to accept 'University Schools of Education' as a proper solution to the problem. They wished the training colleges to stand on their own feet, to co-operate more with one another and with the university, but not as part of the university organization".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

"One cannot help noticing, as one reads the McNair Report: (1) that religion is only mentioned twice and then quite incidentally and (2) that while much is said about the personal qualities of youth leaders, nothing whatever is said about the qualities of teachers".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

Methodists were upset by Butler's lack of support for the foundation of a third Methodist college in Manchester. They felt, although the President denied it, that his refusal was prompted in part by McNair's suggestions that no more denominational colleges should be built.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/108.

"The universities' anxiety not to be flooded with teacher training students has to be respected and also their feeling that universities should not be for professional training, but should concentrate more on the work of the faculties...."

P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

"I anticipate that in conversation with Sir Hector Hetherington
tomorrow morning, I should encourage him to speak to the Vice-Chancellors at Cambridge this week and suggest that they put up really positive alternative suggestions for bringing the universities into the picture and avoiding the necessity for the state to take over the training of teachers".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

The General Election of July, 1945, returned a Labour Government having a majority of 146 over all other parties. Ellen Wilkinson replaced R.A. Butler at the Board of Education.


When Butler's successor, Ellen Wilkinson, forced through parts of a teacher training reorganization along the lines of Scheme A, the results betrayed the universities' lack of enthusiasm. As Hyndman comments, "Within a decade sixteen area training organizations had been established. All but one of these were based upon McNair's Scheme A, but whether many of them actually represented much more than a cosmetic alteration to the pre-existing joint board relationship was open to doubt".


S.H. Wood's retirement coincided with the change of minister.

P.R.O. Ed. 86/110 and Interview K.

It is important to stress that McNair represented a university viewpoint, not the university view. Sir Fred Clarke and Lord Percy, both dissenters from the majority university response to McNair and Butler, found (too late) what he described as "some give" in university opinion.

Professor H. Armitage, Seminar given at the University of Sheffield, 16 November, 1975.

Interview K.

Wood, writing just prior to the outbreak of war in 1939, thought that "the training college lobby" was too small and too weak to have influence. "Any settlement of their [the colleges'] problems", he wrote, "will take place with little opposition because nobody really cares about this sector".

P.R.O. Ed. 86/107.
"Religion is a source of norms and values, but on the other hand its rites may continue to be practised because they retain social significance without religious meaning. There are also religious institutions, and these are inter-related with secular institutions in such a way that a considerable amount of religious influence may be discovered at the institutional level in an apparently secular society.... The aim of this article is to stress one aspect of this relationship by showing how the influence of religion on education has been maintained, and in some ways increased, during the twentieth century, in a period of steady decline in popular support for the churches".


Residual religion, because it is an umbrella concept, is always in danger of being something and nothing. Its use gives rise to the problem of a 'halo effect', researchers looking for its presence because of the expectation that it should be there. Cannon is probably correct in detecting evidence of residual religion in the Britain of 1944; how far 'residual influence' extends beyond this point is a difficulty.


Interview L.

"The Bill's main purpose ... is to give answer to secularism and neutral religious opinion.... For the first time in British history the state comes in and decrees that there shall be in every elementary school throughout the length and breadth of the land a collective set of worship.... 20 or 30 years ago it would have been a first-class political issue.... But it has been accepted and I am sure the Bill will be regarded as one which will have effected, as far as religious teaching is concerned, a completely revolutionary change".

Speech by Mr. Cove, Hansard, Vol. 397, Col. 2251-2 excerpts of which were repeated by the Bishops of Chichester and Canterbury.


P.R.O. Ed. 86/109.

Temple was particularly glad that the McNair Committee came out strongly in favour of the abolition of the 'pledge' whereby students could only receive a grant if they promised to enter the teaching profession at the end of their course.


Temple, only two weeks before his death, pressed the National Society to 'break the monotechnic mould' by accepting clergy and social work training as 'desirable additions' to the training
college curriculum.
The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Secretary of the National Society, 12 October, 1944, National Society, Archives.

147 McNair Committee Paper, No. 102, R498/101, Para. 6.


150 "As one of the major parties concerned with increasing academic standards in teacher education over the past half-century, the universities have thus feared a loss of autonomy as a result of association with teacher education, and have resisted trends towards greater rationalization which might have involved greater control and accountability on their part. They have been constantly concerned lest the inspection to which teacher education has always been subject by central government might, if they should be more closely associated with teacher education, render them also more accountable to government demands and infringe their autonomy. This fear has resulted in a protracted century and a half of 'ritual mating-dance' between the two major institutions concerned, the universities and the colleges, in the expression of a love/hate relationships which feared a union recognized by all as desirable". LYNCH, J. (1979), The Reform of Teacher Education in the United Kingdom; p. 3.


152 Loc. cit.

153 At one time it had been the writer's intention to leave the colleges wandering in their academic wilderness. However, in 1982, when the decimation of the teacher training system is everywhere evident, it is clearly unsatisfactory to say goodbye to the colleges in the 1950s. Therefore a historical 'postscript' is written with two main intentions: first, to bring the story up-to-date, and secondly, in the hope that some unknown reader may complete a trilogy of research theses by pursuing in depth the events lightly sketched during the period 1944 to the present day.

154 "The period has been notable for the steady increase in state control of the education system at all points". RICHMOND, W.K. (1978), Education in Britain since 1944: A Personal Retrospect; p. 13.

The title 'college of education' was borrowed from Scotland where such places enjoyed a much greater degree of prestige than that accorded to English training colleges. Committee on Higher Education (1961-63), Colleges for the Education and Training of Teachers, pp. 107-125, henceforward referred to as the Robbins Report.


"Our Report began with a statement of guiding principles. It postulated the need for a co-ordinated system of higher education; and it laid down the requirements that the system should provide for those who had the qualifications and willingness to pursue higher education; that it should ensure equal academic awards for equal performance, that it should eliminate artificial differences of status and recognize hierarchy only insofar as it was based on function and attainment; that it should ensure ease of transfer for students, as well as freedom of development and flexibility of organization for institutions; and finally, that it should encourage the cultivation of high excellence". Robbins Report (1963), p. 265. See also List of Recommendations, pp. 279-280.

Lord Robbins (Chairman), Sir David Anderson, Dame Kitty Anderson, Mr. A. Chenevix-Trench, Professor J. Drever, Mr. H.L. Elvin, Miss H.L. Gardener, Sir Edward Herbert, Sir Patrick Linstead, Sir Philip Morris, Mr. H.C. Shearman, Mr. R.B. Southall and Mr. P.S. Ross (Secretary).

Members of the Committee on Higher Education (1961-63).

Robbins by 'recommending a return to the principles enshrined in Scheme A' demonstrated how little universities and colleges had advanced to meet each other during the fifties:

"The link between the universities and the training colleges had not proved as beneficial to the colleges as might have been hoped. The colleges were not in the main stream of university life, hardly any of their students could get degrees and in many cases students and staff did not share in the activities of the university. At the same time their semi-dependence on the universities had in the eyes of some people inhibited the leading colleges from developing to the stature that they might have achieved in different circumstances". Robbins Report, Paragraph 348, p. 118.


Local education authorities, having lost control of the colleges of advanced technology as a result of Robbins, were determined to
maintain their authority over the teacher training colleges. Their claims were vigorously championed by Lord Boyle, Conservative spokesman for education, who in 1964 claimed that the separation of teacher training from the L.E.A.'s was "quite out of the question, in the middle of a large expansion of colleges and at a time when the problem of teacher supply clearly requires the closest contact between the training system and those responsible for staffing the schools". HYNDMAN, Op. cit. p. 186-187.


169 Finding their powers real rather than illusory, some student union representatives took a perverse delight in baiting college governing bodies and boards by putting down tendentious agenda items. An example of this, which provoked (as it was intended to do) a first class row in a denominational college was an item which declared, "The ringing of the chapel bell constitutes a serious interference with student sleep and sex".

170 Martin Stamm in his analysis of the secularization of Catholic colleges in America has drawn attention to the link between laicization and secularization, a link further demonstrated by C.K. Shea in her study of Mount Holyoke College. See STAMM, M.J. (1980), The Laicization of Corporate Governance of Twentieth Century American Catholic Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D., and SHEA, C.K. (1980), Authority and Compliance at Mount Holyoke College: The Passing of the Old Order, Cornell University, Ph.D.

"It is the clear intention of the Report to abolish in the great majority of the colleges the degree work (in the ordinary sense of that expression) already established and developing very advantageously both to students and institutions in most areas. This is no way towards that improved status for the colleges which the Committee professes to be seeking. It is another step on the road that removes them from higher education and puts them into the further education sector, and along with them half the teaching profession".

PARRY, J.P. (1972), The Lord James Tricycle; p. 11.

Plans for the 'third cycle of education', in-service work, were immediately put into cold storage because of 'economic difficulties'. These same difficulties seem to have played a large part in determining the political response to James, because the Dip.H.E. fell into the further (and therefore cheaper) education sector. What Hyndman therefore describes as 'a surly attachment' shown by the majority of staff in the colleges to a pattern of concurrent teacher training, was an attachment founded, not on surliness, but on a belief that the government would fund Dip.H.E.'s and ignore more expensive areas. James Porter, a leading member of the James Committee and the only college principal to implement the Committee's recommendations, later claimed that in-service education had been cynically rejected in the years following the report.


This response by the government to the James Report was made nearly a year after the initial publication of the James proposals and legislative action, contained in D.E.S. Circular 7/73, was still further delayed.


Hugh Harding, senior civil servant in the D.E.S, responsible for 'the reorganization of teacher training', who gives his own version of events in two articles, Education, 29 December (1978) and 5 January (1979).


The takeover of Keswick by the University of East Anglia, and St. Bede and St. Hild by the University of Durham, were described to the writer by a senior D.E.S. official as 'constituting regrettable deviations from departmental policy'. This policy envisaged mergers between colleges and polytechnics where geographical proximity made this suitable. Mergers between colleges and universities raised again the spectre of 'helot students' from the training colleges threatening the academic and cultural purity of this sector. With a few honourable exceptions, most of the universities in 1977 were as unwilling to merge with the colleges as they had been at the time of McNair in 1944. Interview M.


Ibid. p. 59.


Interview M.

Four Anglican colleges closed - St. Peter's, Saltley; Culham; Hockerill; Salisbury. Eight ceased to be church related through merger - St. Mary's, Bangor; St. Gabriel's; St. Bede and St. Hild, Durham; St. Luke's, Exeter; St. Matthias, Fishponds; Keswick; Norwich; All Saints, Tottenham. A further four became parts of larger institutions - Bishop Otter, Chichester; Bishop Lonsdale, Derby; St. Katherine's, Liverpool; Whiteland, Roehampton. In 1982 only nine Church of England colleges remain as 'free standing' institutions - St. Mary's and St. Paul's, Cheltenham; Christchurch; Chester; St. Martin's, Lancaster; Bishop Grosseteste, Lincoln; St. Mark and St. John, Plymouth; King Alfred's, Winchester; Ripon and York St. John; Trinity College. For further information on this subject see GEDGE, P.S. (1981), The Church of England Colleges of Education, Journal of Educational Administration and History, Vol. XIII, No. 1, January, pp. 33-42.


Ibid. Southlands Methodist College became part of the Roehampton Institute, leaving Westminster College at Hinksey, Oxfordshire, as the sole remaining Methodist 'free standing' institution.

The Times Higher Education Supplement (1976) on the 10 September provided an analysis of the 'draconian measures implemented by the government'. Of the total 151 colleges of education, only five had succeeded in merging with a university, 33 had been 'locked into' polytechnics, 63 had been amalgamated into the 44 'institutes of higher and further education', 21 were either closed or awaiting
closure. Only 29 colleges of education remained, and as the editor of The Times Higher Education Supplement gloomily concluded 'their future appears problematic'.

"As it becomes generally recognized that the future of most of the colleges of education must lie in assimilation with larger, or more comprehensive, institutions, it is very likely that some of them will find their way into polytechnics. The case for the immediate assimilation of the four colleges of education (technical) is obvious. Other colleges of education located in cities that have a polytechnic but no university are strong candidates for this. Finally, I hope that education departments will play a full part in the developments of polytechnics as a whole.... Perhaps they could become so important that they could be abolished by absorption.


Interview 0.

McGregor concludes his book with the following hopeful quotation:

"The Church colleges began as an outward contribution to a wider enterprise and that is what their successors should be, whatever the mode of change. Moreover the new institutions should be able to understand themselves as part of a corporate national policy to achieve specifiable objectives. If they do, there is no danger that they will sink without trace, but on the contrary every hope that they will act as pilot boats for the whole".


CONCLUSIONS

The major hypothesis proposed in this thesis is that attempts by staff working in the denominational teacher training colleges to achieve academic autonomy, status and recognition failed as a result of the increasing bureaucratization and secularization of English society in the twentieth century. In arguing this case, it has not been suggested that the two phenomena made steady linear progress in the period 1890-1980. Rather, what is claimed, is the notion that the secularization process sapped and weakened the denominational bodies during this time, leaving them open to coercion from increasingly centralized governments. This process, it has been argued, reached an unhappy climax in 1977. The final chapter suggests that the debilitation of the denominational colleges by this year (a condition aggravated by their internal secularization during the 1960s) prepared the way for their closure and reorganization by a government intent on achieving a centralized system of higher education.

Although secularization and bureaucratization are used as unifying concepts, it is not claimed that they provide a total explanation for these events, not least because their effects upon the colleges were sporadic. In retrospect, it is clear that secularization made rapid progress during the 1890s, so bringing into question the role and ethos of denominational colleges. The causes of this growth of secularization, namely, the increasing access by the working and middle classes to cheap transport, cheap literature and cheap entertainment, were to reappear in more sophisticated guises in later decades. In the 1890s, however, the secularizing tendencies began to transform English society from one based on the Victorian model of imposed piety, into a
society accepting (gingerly at first) the idea of cultural pluralism.

The movement towards eclectic belief, discernible during the 1890s, gathered momentum during the twentieth century. It provoked something of an identity crisis for the churches and, more severely, for the denominational colleges during the inter-war period, when disillusionment, non-belief and the rejection of idealism were rampant. Secular values and beliefs spread rapidly in the atmosphere of alienation which characterized the 1930s. Although this mood was dispelled during the Second World War and the growth of secularization was halted, the increased materialism of post-war Britain revived secular attitudes. In particular, the consumer boom encouraged the growth of media reaching all classes and making monotheistic belief seem anachronistic. In post-war Britain the solitary voice from the pulpit was rapidly replaced by that of the newsreader, the economic analyst, the special correspondent and the expert. In short, the media sanctified a new order of secular authority.

The intermittent advance of secularization in Britain is also evident in the uncertain pattern of bureaucratization during the twentieth century. Part of this growth may be traced to centralizing influences evident during the latter part of the nineteenth century. K.M. Hughes has argued that laissez-faire government in late Victorian England was conspicuous only by its absence, and if this proposition is accepted, it appears that the seeds of a centralized state were sown some time before the climate of twentieth century Britain encouraged them to grow.

Whatever the arguments concerning the extent of centralized government in 1900, there is little doubt that in the twentieth century the First and Second World Wars were the two decisive periods
during which Britain became a bureaucratized state. During both periods the primacy accorded to war aims promoted centralized decision-making at the expense of local autonomy. After 1945 this centralizing process became irreversible, to such a degree that David Martin has suggested the whole education system in Britain is now threatened by the paradox of government manipulating centralized state power in the name of ideological laissez-faire.  

The hypothesis as outlined (the failure of the denominational colleges to achieve academic autonomy because of the increase of secularization and bureaucratization) clearly raises questions as to the methodology adopted throughout this thesis. In particular, the explanation of the hypothesis places reliance upon the illuminative powers of secularization and bureaucratization; two concepts both of which are sociological in origin. Since 1977 the conceptual underpinning of both these phenomena has become more complex and sophisticated, while, in contrast, the relationship between sociology and history has grown significantly closer. Far from being eliminated (as once suggested by David Martin in 1965) the process of secularization in 1982 has become, in Alan Gilbert's estimation, the primary cause of Britain becoming a post-Christian society.  

If, however, "God has become a relic", the claims of local education authorities to retain their regional autonomy within the English education system seem destined to fall into the same redundant category. With the centralized direction of the entire education system becoming increasingly evident, claims for local autonomy and the rights of individual institutions are being drowned in what Anne Sofer describes as "a mad clamour for centralization".  
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Sofer's analysis of Britain at the beginning of the 1980s (an analysis which complements the work of Gilbert\(^1\) and Martin\(^2\)) underlines the extent to which secularization and bureaucratization have come of age and the collective re-definition of these concepts begins to raise new questions about evidence cited in this thesis, especially post-war evidence. An exhaustive history of teacher training from 1944 to the present day is overdue, a history which, if it addresses itself to the fate of the denominational colleges, will need to take account of such sociological concepts as pluralism and laicization. In the light of recent work carried out by Martin Stamm showing a causal link between the laicization and secularization of Catholic colleges in America,\(^3\) the 1966 Weaver Report in Britain takes on a new significance.

As tentatively suggested in the final chapter, Weaver's 1966 recommendations for the managerial powers of the colleges to be vested in academic boards dominated by lay representatives, may have finally caused denominational authorities to lose control of their offspring.\(^4\) This interpretation, extending still further the secularization thesis, seems to offer a new theoretical perspective from which to view the post-war decline of the denominational colleges.

Many of those working in these colleges would deny that there has been a decline. Perhaps, therefore, decline is too emotive and it would be more accurate to concentrate upon the isolation of these institutions. In 1892 the Anglican inspector complained of staff in the training colleges, "becoming indolently acquiescent in their own obscurity".\(^5\) Fifty-two years later members of the McNair Committee were still complains of "the physical, cultural and academic isolation of the training colleges".\(^6\) This problem, the relationship
(or rather non-relationship) of the denominational colleges with other parts of the higher education system, has therefore been a recurring theme.

In the 1890s the problem was not recognized because the role of a denominational college was still simple, direct and uncomplicated. The colleges carried out the intentions of their founding father, Kay-Shuttleworth, by providing a limited vocational training for members of the labouring poor, thereby fulfilling part of the social mission of the church. During the early years of the twentieth century this simple creed began to disintegrate, mainly because, as Stephen Yeo has observed, "At this time there were giant benevolent historical processes at work, making religion seem pigmy". If, therefore, as he suggests, religion during the twentieth century became redundant because of a massive transfer of social energy from religion to politics, the denominations and their colleges were clearly faced during this period with problems concerning their role and identity. For this reason, a significant part of this thesis has examined how the denominations grappled with the difficulties confronting them, and shows how to-day they are still wracked by unresolved tensions originating from past failures.

Many of these contemporary tensions stem from the former isolation of the denominational colleges, because the central failure of all these institutions was their collective inability to achieve academic autonomy, or even, in Maurice Holmes's judgment, "to establish an adult relationship with any academic body". By pointing an accusing finger in 1944, Holmes conveniently overlooked the neglect of the colleges by the Civil Service and the denominations during the twenties and thirties which had brought about the very situation which he so
abhorred. Indeed, during the inter-war period, the failure of successive governments to contemplate seriously an integrated structure for higher education meant that all training colleges wandered in what L.C. Knights termed "the training wilderness". 23

Governments and denominationalists shared responsibility for the creation of this wilderness, but the latter were particularly guilty for the "trail of cheapness" which the McNair Committee claimed had blighted the development of the training colleges. The financial debilitation of all the churches from 1900 onwards (a telling indicator of denominational decline) meant that denominational authorities were miserly in their treatment of the colleges and the staff working in them. Sadly, the latter tended to be passive victims of government and denominational parsimony. Until the 1966 Weaver Report initiated managerial reforms within the colleges, many staff working in these institutions were accustomed to paternalistic styles of government. Often the paternalism was rooted in the Victorian past because the ethos of denominationalism (especially in the Catholic context) encouraged loyalty and obedience from staff and students, rather than promoted a desire to achieve academic independence. When, therefore, the independence granted by Weaver finally came in 1966, it came too late. Anthony Crosland's binary policy for higher education provided no place for the too recently emancipated colleges of education, whose final demise was brought about by a combination of financial restraint allied to a desire among civil servants to centralize colleges and make them accountable to government. 24

Denominational colleges surviving the 1977 and 1982 closures are faced with the problem of defining their role in what is, apparently, a secular society. 25 Adaptation has proved difficult. Retreat to the days of denominational supremacy is barred because our society is now
pluralistic. Any attempt in this cultural environment to re-create a monotheistic denominational college risks what John Gay describes as the revival of an "introverted, hot-house pietistic community, alienated from its society".26

Unpleasant though this prospect is, the other extreme (which Stamm argues has already arrived in America) seems both more pressing and more dangerous. Analysing the current state of Catholic colleges in America, Stamm bleakly concludes that these institutions (which formerly possessed a sharply defined denominational profile), as a result of the processes of secularization and laicization and their pursuit of academicism, are now "in almost every respect, indistinguishable from their secular rivals".27

Denominational institutions in Britain clearly risk sharing this fate because they are subject to the same pressures which have brought about the secularization of American higher education.28 Like their American counterparts, English denominational institutions during the sixties met secularization by embracing it. This pattern of denominational compliance to contemporary values, adhered to during the sixties on both sides of the Atlantic, has since been continued in England by the newly founded institutes of higher education modelling themselves on the academic nature of the traditional universities. As Graham Stodd has argued, at a time when the numbers of students entering English higher education are falling, this denominational policy of submissive emulation is not calculated either to inspire confidence, or indeed, to ensure denominational survival.29 The American experience provides a chilling warning.

John Gay and Colin Alves30 both argue, persuasively, that the American experience is not contagious, each claiming that the future
for English denominational institutions lies in their 'diversifying into distinctiveness'. Whether this policy can be implemented is extremely doubtful, not least because it calls for an end to the kind of denominational retreat (and associated loss of confidence) which has been evident since the 1890s. Innovation, the mainspring of diversification, is difficult to achieve in a climate of economic and educational recession. Beleaguered principals of church colleges, threatened with cash limits and facing omnipotent governments, have good reason to doubt whether denominational authorities have either the will or the means to offer fresh solutions to apparently insoluble problems.

If this is a pessimistic assessment it nevertheless derives from one of the central points developed throughout this thesis, namely, that denominational institutions reflect the society in which they exist. Contemporary British society is heavily influenced by the type of standardization and conformity brought about by the bureaucratization of government at all levels. However, if denominational distinctiveness is threatened by bureaucratization, it is even more at risk from secularization. The dilemma facing all denominationalists at the beginning of the eighties is the problem of determining a future for themselves and their institutions in a predominantly secular society.

In the words of T.S. Eliot,

It seems that something has happened that has never happened before: though we know not just when, or why, or how, or where.

Men have left GOD not for other gods, they say, but for no god.31
1 Unifying concepts, preparing the way "for consecutive and cumulative research rather than a buckshot array of dispersed investigation". MERTON, Op. cit. p. 100.

2 As noted in the introduction, the concepts are used as "theories of the middle range", those describing and explaining events but not claiming, "a final and conclusive interpretation". Ibid. p. 16.

3 This sporadic and uneven effect is well summed up by H.A.L. Fisher:

   Men wiser and more learned than I have discerned in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can only see one emergency following upon another as wave follows wave; only one great fact with respect to which, since it is unique, there can be no generalizations; only one safe rule for the historian: that he should recognize in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent and the unforeseen.


5 Addressing an international conference in May, 1981, Professor David Martin declared, "Government policy has replaced student militancy as the main threat to British universities in the 1980's". Arguing that the Conservative Government led by Margaret Thatcher seemed dedicated to increasing state control, Martin went on to assert:

   Under a Conservative government British students may sink into a mean and provincial mediocrity, controlled by centralizing state power in the name of ideological laissez-faire.


10 A contentious claim made by Barbara Smoker, Secretary of the National Secular Society in an interview broadcast on BBC Radio 4, 1 June, 1982.


15 STAMM, M.J. (1980), The Laicization of Corporate Governance of Twentieth Century American Catholic Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D.

16 WATKINS, P. (1981), Sobering Story, Church Times, 3 July.


18 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94.


20 YEO, S. (1976), Religion and Voluntary Organizations in Crisis; p. 10.

21 "Alternative outlets for social energy came into being after the nineteenth century, allowing for a transfer of social energy from religion to politics".

22 P.R.O. Ed. 86/94. Memorandum by Mr. S.H. Wood embodying a proposal for a major constitutional Reform, R498/101, McNair Paper, No. 102.


26 Gay, J.D. (1979), Diversification into Distinctiveness: A Church College Route into the 1990's; p. 1.


31 Eliot, T.S., Chorus from The Rock.
Students were required to answer six questions in three hours:

Q1 What are the leading principles which determine curricula?

Q2 Give an account of the general form of instruction whose aim is knowledge. What is the corresponding form whose aim is skill?

Q3 Distinguish between Government and Discipline and state the principles of the former which apply to the primary school.

Q4 State and criticize the different meanings of the word 'discipline' as used in connection with education.

Q5 Consider 'Children should not have anything like work laid on them, neither their minds nor bodies will bear it'.

Q6 Describe the scope and purpose of the instruction in the English language given in the public elementary schools.

Q7 What are the points of a food wall map, a good primer, a good reading book for older scholars?

Q8 What general conclusions respecting the framing of time-tables may be drawn from the recent studies in 'mental fatigue'?

Q9 Specify the various dangers to eyesight which children incur when attending school.

In commenting on this paper, J.B. Thomas says, "It can be seen that Adamson was careful to link theory and practice in the examination, to apply the various disciplines of education, rather than study them for their own sake". It may be further observed that while Adamson retained the use of the term "public elementary school" in Question 6, in Question 3 he introduced the much less limiting description, "the primary school".

The innovative nature of Adamson's paper may be judged by its comparison with the Syllabus and resulting Certificate Papers prescribed by the Board of Education. The content and setting out of these papers encouraged students to think of questions as being either practical or theoretical, rarely as demanding an appreciation of both.
Appendix II

Day Training Colleges opened between 1890-1902 with annual lists of students attending

1890
Mason Science College, Birmingham
University College, Nottingham
University College, Cardiff
Owens College, Manchester
King's College, London
The Durham College of Science, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Firth College, Sheffield

1891
Cambridge University College, Liverpool
Yorkshire College, Leeds

1891
Oxford
University College, London
University College, Bristol
Bedford College, London
University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

1894
University College of North Wales, Bangor

1899
Reading College
Hartley Institute, Southampton

1901
Royal Albert Memorial College, Exeter

1901
London Day Training College, University of London

Student Numbers in Day Training Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891-2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-3</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-4</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-5</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-6</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-7</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-8</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-9</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-01</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Annual Reports and Appendices of the Committee of Council on Education 1889-98

1 JUDD, D. (1968), Balfour and the British Empire.


6 The Tablet (1902), Catholics and the Coming Education Bill, Address by the President of the Birmingham Catholic Association, 25 January.


App. III cont'd.
APPENDIX IV  
Comparative strength of the Denominations with reference to Numbers of Students and Financial Support, 1889-1891.

### Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1889</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>2,621,100</td>
<td>2,651,078</td>
<td>2,670,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British and Foreign School Society</td>
<td>412,277</td>
<td>416,253</td>
<td>416,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>214,240</td>
<td>214,819</td>
<td>212,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>334,032</td>
<td>341,953</td>
<td>348,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools</td>
<td>1,858,792</td>
<td>1,915,182</td>
<td>1,989,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Numbers on Registers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1889</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>2,166,513</td>
<td>2,168,229</td>
<td>2,157,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British and Foreign School Society</td>
<td>331,099</td>
<td>329,732</td>
<td>328,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>176,230</td>
<td>174,773</td>
<td>171,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>251,772</td>
<td>255,777</td>
<td>254,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools</td>
<td>1,830,229</td>
<td>1,875,638</td>
<td>1,912,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voluntary Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£  s.  d.</th>
<th>£  s.  d.</th>
<th>£  s.  d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>582,018  0 2</td>
<td>589,640 14 1</td>
<td>602,573 12 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British and Foreign School Society</td>
<td>83,130 5 0</td>
<td>79,723 5 9</td>
<td>81,532 11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>17,191 15 11</td>
<td>17,253 1 5</td>
<td>16,939 11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>67,480 4 1</td>
<td>70,911 10 9</td>
<td>78,048 17 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since its inception in 1811, the National Society estimated that it had spent £13,232,795 on building church schools and training colleges, and £21,461,029 on maintenance.
## Municipal Training Colleges 1904-1922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date of establishment</th>
<th>M = Men</th>
<th>W = Women</th>
<th>R = Residential</th>
<th>D = Day</th>
<th>H = Hostel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley, West Riding, Yorkshire</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton, Municipal</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe, Cheshire County</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>M + W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>M + W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, Neville's Cross</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford County</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Municipal</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds City</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>M + W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London - Avery Hill</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furzedown</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Stoke Place</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester - Municipal Mather</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Kenton Lodge</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>M + W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor Normal</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>M + W</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerleon</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1Temporary for Ex-service men.  ^2A voluntary college transferred in 1908 to a Joint Committee of County Councils.
APPENDIX VI

**Numbers of Students attending Teacher Training Institutions, 1904.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England residential</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>3,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic residential</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conformist/Undenominational</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day training</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures published by the National Society in their Annual Report, 1904-05.
APPENDIX VII

Size and Numbers of Denominational Training Colleges, 1906-1918

Small colleges needing expansion to at least 100 students according to the Board of Education in 1917:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Numbers of Students 1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culham</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith, St. Mary's</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>Evacuated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthen</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Selley Oak</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Kennington, St. Gabriel's</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne, St. Mary's</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures prepared by R.G. Mayor for the Board of Education, 1917.
P.R.O. Ed. 24/1832. Mayor also charted the shift towards undenominational provision of teacher training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>C of E</th>
<th>Wesleyan</th>
<th>R.C.</th>
<th>Total Denominational</th>
<th>Undenominational</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906-07</td>
<td>3795</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>4707</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>9708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-15</td>
<td>3766</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>4867</td>
<td>8509</td>
<td>13356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>3794</td>
<td>7853</td>
<td>11647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the light of the text, these tables illustrate two factors. First, that many of the denominational colleges were dangerously small and therefore in the estimation of the Board uneconomic to run. Secondly, the growth sector can clearly be seen to reside in the undenominational area. In contrast to the sharp rise in places in London Education Authority and University Institutions, the number of places in denominational colleges remained static. In the case of the Church of England, its 'market share' of places had actually declined during the pre-war years. Gains made by Wesleyans and Roman Catholics were insignificant compared with the massive growth of local authority provision.
The National Society worked out a scheme for amalgamating twelve training colleges into six. The staff of six colleges which were closed down temporarily was distributed among the other six. Thus, only thirty-five out of the forty-seven voluntary training colleges and nineteen out of the twenty-two municipal colleges continued to operate as separate institutions.

While all training colleges had suffered in this way, the training colleges for men had to face an additional problem arising from the large-scale withdrawal of students. During the early years of the war, 463 out of the 842 students in fifteen voluntary training colleges were withdrawn while they were still under training. Ten LEA colleges for men lost 142 out of their total of 475 students.¹

The proportion of students who joined military service was highest in the following colleges.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students in training in July, 1914</th>
<th>Number of students who joined the Forces in the Autumn of 1914</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Battersea, St. John's</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Winchester</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Durham, Bede</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sunderland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culham</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exeter, Diocesan</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Birmingham, Saltley</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chelsea, St. Mark's</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX IX

**Groupings of Joint Examining Boards as proposed by the Committee on Universities and Training Colleges, 1927-28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>University Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Training Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Northumberland and Durham</td>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yorkshire</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lancashire and Cheshire</td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Midlands</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nottingham and Derby</td>
<td>Nottingham University College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eastern Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. West</td>
<td>University of Bristol</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. London</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Southern Counties</td>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. South West</td>
<td>Exeter University College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wales</td>
<td>University of Wales</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Representations made by
Church of England Training Colleges to the
Board of Supervision Committee of Enquiry

List of colleges giving evidence

St. Mark and St. John's College, Chelsea
St. Paul's College, Cheltenham
The Training College, Chester
Culham Training College
Bede College, Durham
St. Luke's College, Exeter
Saltley Training College, Birmingham
King Alfred's College, Winchester
York Diocesan Training College
Hockerill College, Bishops Stortford
Chichester Diocesan Training College, Brighton
St. Mary's College, Cheltenham
Bishop Otter College, Chichester
The Training College, Derby
St. Hilda's College, Durham
Fishpond's Training College, Bristol
Lincoln Training College
Norwich Training College
Peterborough Training College
Ripon Training College
St. Gabriel's, Kennington
St. Katharine's, Tottenham
Salisbury Diocesan Training College
The Diocesan Training College, Truro
Warrington Training College
Whitelands College, Putney
BIBLIOGRAPHY: Layout, Introduction and Review

Layout  The bibliography contains material cited in the thesis and additional works which were found to be useful during the course of research. It is set out as follows:

Section 1 - Primary Sources
1:1 Public Record Office
1:2 Church of England
1:3 Methodist
1:4 British and Foreign School Society
1:5 Roman Catholic
1:6 Oral Evidence

Section 2 - Secondary Sources
2:1 Books
2:2 Articles
2:3 Unpublished papers and theses
2:4 Newspaper references cited in the text, placed in date order

Introduction  Geographically the centre for research work undertaken during the preparation of this thesis was London. In the light of the emphasis in the study upon the centralization of government, it is interesting to note that all the denominations had, by the end of the First World War, established offices in the capital.

Work began in one of these central offices - Church House, Westminster - the writer researching material on the Church of England and, in a separate library, the National Society. He soon discovered that a short walk over Westminster Bridge made the D.E.S. Library in York Road accessible, a library in which selected inspection reports of schools and colleges could be read, even when they officially remained closed at the Public Record Office.

The Public Record Office at Kew proved to be the central source of
primary material, the wealth and diversity of its records posing constant problems of selection. Private Office Minutes proved invaluable in terms of relating what was really going on, as opposed to what Board of Education officials said was going on. These private Civil Service memo's proved a rich source.

Equally rich, in different ways, were the records of the Catholic Education Council held at their offices in Kensington and papers of the Wesleyan Education Committee located at 25 Marylebone Road, London. Studying the latter led to the first provincial trip, to the John Rylands Library, Manchester, where the major collection of Methodist material is now housed.

London, however, soon re-asserted its dominance. Close connections between Methodism and the British and Foreign School Society led back to Borough Road College, West London, where the bulk of the Society's papers are preserved. Strained relations between the Society and the Board of Education during the 1920s led to the type of 'back tracking' familiar to all research students who believe they have finished with a period or a set of documents. The silence of Board of Education Annual Reports regarding the decision of the Society to withdraw from teacher training, led the writer into his first attempts at collecting oral information. These proved illuminating, so much so that tapes soon threatened to swamp files.

The problem of assessing the validity of oral evidence checked the growth of this source. In finally deciding whether to include oral evidence, the writer tested it against available written sources and against other opinions. In thanking all those who provided such evidence, the writer would like to stress that they were interviewed under conditions of anonymity (hence the references to Interview A, B, C etc.) and that the use made of the material is entirely the
responsibility of the author. No opinions or views cited should be traced back to anyone but the author.

Review The difficulties of using oral evidence is an appropriate point to begin a review of sources and methods. The 'validity problem' associated with using oral evidence has already been broached; the advantages of such evidence in establishing the relevance and significance of written documents has not. For example, the writer's view of the McNair Report on teacher training was transformed by a brief conversation with one of its members. As on other occasions, a short conversation proved revealing and salutary in terms of assessing written evidence.

The sources of this evidence are set out in the first part of this BIBLIOGRAPHY and their diversity constantly evoked for the writer memory of Pilate's despairing jest, "What is truth?". Truth for Anglicans was many-sided and a major problem in citing Church of England evidence was (and is) locating the source and indicating the probable bias.

In contrast to the constant mutation of Anglican policy, the apparent unity and solidity of Catholic pronouncements proved to be equally difficult to disentangle. Superficially, Catholic policy towards denominational teacher training has not changed since 1890. In reality there has always existed a tension between the Catholic teaching orders and the Catholic Education Council. Since Vatican II these strains and tensions have increased, although most Catholics are loath to admit that difficulties exist. The response of the Catholic Church to increasing evidence of secularization, especially in the field of education, appears to be a promising area for research.

Such research depends on evidence and denominational decline is endangering sources which have proved invaluable in the writing of this
thesis. Minute books of denominational committees are disintegrating in damp cupboards, while the bulk of college materials are scattered, un-indexed, un-known, apparently un-wanted. Thus, in conclusion, far from recommending new sources the writer is left begging for the retention of materials used but rapidly deteriorating.

Approximately thirty denominational colleges have closed during the last twenty years and on most occasions closure has seen the end of their records, student files and minute books. The work of the denominational colleges is in danger of becoming a memory - a memory unsupported by evidence.
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