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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since World War II, beginning especially in the 1960s, considerable work has been done on the history of the school system in England. Much of this scholarship has been focused either on the administrative development of national education or the schools as an agency of cultural reproduction or social control. The administrative approach has a long history which began with John Adamson's *English Education, 1789-1902*, which was published in 1930. Much of the interest in this area of study concerned the recent development of a school system since 1870. The latter area of study is represented by the work of Harold and Pamela Silver, and especially Brian Simon. In the 1970s these social historians founded the "History of Education Society" which holds an annual conference with such themes as "The Government and Control of Education" and "Higher Education Since Industrialization." A recent study, representative of this approach, was *Hooligans or Rebels?* au-

---

thored by Stephen Humphries in 1982. A selection of a few chapter titles shows the definite concern with the effects of social control on the lower classes: "Subverting the School Syllabus" and "Challenges to Classroom Coercion."

Almost lost amidst all these studies on social and administrative histories was the publication in 1963 of Church and State in English Education: 1870 to the Present Day, by Marjorie Cruikshank. Her book spanned the same period of focus as the other histories, but she examined a different theme, that of the churches' role in English education. In the case of English education the denominations, especially the Church of England, performed an important role in developing elementary schools. It was not until 1870 that the state entered into national education in a direct way by setting up what were called school boards (after 1902, Council or provided) schools. These schools, along with the voluntary or non-provided (the Church having by far the most buildings) schools, formed what was called the dual system. This twofold system caused rivalry and controversy, especially in regard to the teaching of religion in the classroom, and it is this

---

theme which comprised a major part of Cruikshank's book.

Unfortunately, Cruikshank's beginning was not followed; instead, the overwhelming interest has been on the social impact of the school system. To be sure, articles from time to time have appeared in such periodicals as the British Journal of Educational Studies. These usually focus on a particular piece of legislation, such as the Forster Act of 1870 or the Butler Act of 1944, and, for that reason and their brevity, do not substantially examine the religious question in English education. In a review of Cruikshank's book, N. R. Temple issued the same charge of "brevity," saying it is "almost inevitably misleading at times." In a 200 page book covering 90 years of educational history, that is not surprising. Temple concluded: "Other studies examining and assessing the changing attitudes of each of the major parties are needed and would illuminate what Dr. Cruikshank, within the limits of her study, can do little more than record." This dissertation intends to treat one of the "major parties," the Church of England.

Histories of Europe, whether of one country or the entire continent, quite often pronounce the diminishing influence of religion in Western Civilization sometime after the Reformation, usually beginning during the Enlightenment. A special

---

focus for this phenomenon, sometimes termed secularization, however, has been the twentieth century. From a sociologist's perspective Alan D. Gilbert looked at this as "the making of post-Christian Britain." Gilbert believes that modern Englishmen live in "an artificial world" that they have created and intend to control, and in which they have little or no room for a supernatural religion that is neither of their manufacture nor in their control.  

My dissertation does not intend to wrestle with the amorphous phenomenon of secularization, a concept for which some historians and sociologists claim there is no satisfactory definition. I have attempted, however, to set my study within that context. Many Anglicans who lived during the first half of the twentieth century did believe that England was abandoning its Christian heritage and becoming a secular society. A prime target of their complaint was national education. With the steadily increasing number of state-provided, or Council schools, and the simultaneous decreasing number of Church schools during the first few decades of the twentieth century, some Anglicans became alarmed that the school system would socialize the next generation to be blithely comfortable agnostics. Compounding their fears and confirming their gloomy prognostications was an evident decline in church attendance. From the 1920s concerned Anglicans could look back

---

on 50 years of provided schools for which there was no dogmatic religious teaching, and ruefully wonder whether Disraeli's comment made during the debates on the Forster Act had indeed come true: "You are inventing a new sacerdotal class, the schoolmaster, who will exercise an extraordinary influence upon the history of England."\(^5\)

I chose the Anglican denomination to be at the center of this study on the religious question because it had the largest number of voluntary schools. In fact, during the period under consideration the Church still had more schools than did the state, although the number of students in attendance at Church schools was considerably fewer. I pick up the story in 1918 when Parliament had passed the third major bill on education, the Fisher Act. The period, essentially the 1920s, is of particular interest because Anglican attitudes had changed from that held before the First World War. The Church Times drew the lines of the future with the following comment. "In bygone days it was whether one or another form of Christianity would get the best of a bargain. Now, the issue is whether Christianity or secularism shall be the future creed of England."\(^6\) To wage its fight against secularism, the Church either had to increase the number of its schools or to compel the government to pass a bill through Parliament that insti-


tuted denominational religious teaching in all English schools. On the religious front these were the two major issues after the passage of the Fisher Act. This problem was not resolved until 1944 when Parliament passed the Butler Act, which mandated both more financial funding for voluntary schools and also permitted denominational religious education in all schools in exchange for increased public control. The actual period ends, then, in 1944, but my dissertation ends in 1931 when the Great Depression terminated for the decade significant developments in English education.

In 1964 the British Journal of Educational Studies published an article by Charmiam Cannon which took an approach to England's religion question that is similar to mine. In her survey of the first half of the twentieth century, Cannon presents her framework for examining the degree of religious influence in English society. She establishes three areas of analysis: religious pressure behind legislative action, the schools themselves, and the influence of religious teaching in the schools. In her article Cannon looks at only the first area. Relying primarily on the Parliamentary Debates and two pieces of legislation, the Balfour Act and the Butler Act, she compares what was said in speech and in law between two different times in English educational history.

Like Cannon's approach my dissertation focuses primarily, 

but not exclusively, on the political area for analysis. Part of the reason for this comes from the nature of the documents I studied, which were governmental. Another fruitful source for my dissertation was the educational journals published during this period. Not only did they supplement the political documents, which provide the basis for analysis in the first area, they also provided information for an analysis of areas two and three, that of the place of religious education in the schools and of this teachings impact on English society. My dissertation, then, proceeds with an examination of the period, 1918-1931, with a primary focus on the Church's role in attempting to fulfill the Fisher Act, and subsequent educational mandates, and its efforts to gain from the government financial aid for Church schools along with a bill permitting denominational religious teaching in all schools. Secondarily, each chapter will consider the theme of Christianity's cultural role under the other two areas to the extent permitted by the information provided in the journals. Commenting through the voice of the Anglicans on the schools and the influence of religious education given in the schools will not only go beyond the realm of Church-state relations but also consider the vital question of cultural values.
CHAPTER II

THE CALL FOR REFORM AND THE ANGLICAN RESPONSE

During the emotionally ebullient years of the First World War, when British hopes for victory rose from despair in 1917 to euphoria in 1918, an education bill passed through Parliament. Becoming law in 1918, the Fisher Act followed major pieces of educational legislation in 1870 and 1902. Near the war's end in August, wartime idealism finally propelled the Fisher Act through Parliament as part of a domestic program that endeavored to "make England a fit land for heroes to live in."\(^1\) But educational reform constituted just one part of a nation-wide reconstruction that was sweeping the country; moreover, the war's repercussion was only one factor among several that brought about this major piece of educational legislation. Generally speaking, there were activist groups, such as the National Union of Teachers, within the world of education, which demanded a more egalitarian and a more administratively uniform school system. The dual system, which consisted of state-provided, Council schools and non-provided, Church schools, had furnished only elementary education, only

up to the age of 14. By the second decade of the twentieth
century educational reformers perceived that as too little and
too inefficient so in 1917 the wartime Coalition Government
began to move a bill through Parliament. The provisions of
this bill would affect both Council and Church schools. As
the manager of half the nation's elementary schools, the
Church of England had a large vested interest in the final
shape of that legislation.

During the nineteenth century basic literacy and numeracy
coupled with Christian teaching had served as education for
most of England's youth. That effort, however meager, was
part "of a persistent attack against privilege," which began
to diffuse some of the class rigidity still existent in Victor­
ian England. As the lower classes were uplifted through
educational and other reforms, English society became slightly
less stratified. Originally, much of this educational effort
had proceeded as an act of charity from the churches on behalf
of the unfortunate poor. But "what was once a question of
charity" now became a "matter of right."\(^2\)

Debates in Parliament indicated that a diverse and dis-
unified system of national education set along class lines was
now considered antiquated. In fact, the opening speech on the
proposed education act made by the President of the Board of
Education, Herbert Fisher, on April 19, 1917 declared that "we

\(^2\) Charles Birchenough, *History of Elementary Education
in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day* (London:
University Tutorial Press LD., 1938), 1.
do not want a caste system in education. We want social fusion." What was acknowledged by members of all three parties in Parliament was echoed by groups outside. For example, Beatrice Webb, a member of the Reconstruction Committee, 1917-1918, speaking in support of the National Union of Teachers, envisioned an improved and extended school life for working class pupils within an all-embracing system comprising a steady progression from infant schools to the modernized university. By the early twentieth century, some education activists, affiliated with organizations like the Working Men's Association and the Labour Party, promoted an agenda in which the school system would be used to build an egalitarian society.

Existing socio-economic conditions in England just after the turn of the century, however, did not tend to promote an ideal of equal educational opportunity. Very few of the elementary schools' graduates continued on to any type of education after the age of fourteen. On April 21, 1917 The School Guardian cited the Lewis Committee Report which stated that for the school year, 1911-1912, 81.5% of those between four-

---

3 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 92 (1917), col. 1908.


teen and eighteen were not enrolled even in part-time education. 6 Instead, most of England's youth left these lower grade schools for the "deadening effect" of the industrial environment. During that same parliamentary session in which Fisher introduced his proposals for an education bill, Commander Thomas Wedgewood, a Conservative MP, complained that an educational career which terminated at the elementary level was just "turning out the working class children as good machines to produce dividends for capitalists." 7 An even worse dilemma regarded the lack of central schools for pupils in their pre-teens. Often, in districts with only one school, twelve, and sometimes thirteen, year old students stayed on at elementary education levels, repeating the previous year's lessons. Obviously, as Fisher observed in his opening speech, "the country does not get full value out of its elementary schools." 8

The solution for this situation was expansion, including a building program. While some educators called for secondary education for all, Fisher envisioned, at least, continuing the education of the older students on some type of part-time basis. Whichever the option chosen, an expansion of the existing school system was demanded that would correspond-

---


7 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 92 (1917), col. 1983.

8 Ibid col. 1913.
ingly enlarge the role of the state in national education.

Such an expansion of the school system would affect the Church of England in two ways. The first regarded the cost of so large an undertaking. Without significant state aid the Church did not have available the financial resources needed to support a modern school system. That had already become apparent in 1902 with the Balfour Act. In order to maintain just the existing elementary schools, the Church agreed to exchange control of secular education in Anglican schools to Local Education Authorities for receipt of state financial aid to cover daily expenses. Based on statistics for the year 1900, the Bill proposed to assist 14,000 voluntary schools, the majority of them Anglican, in more than 8500 districts, which provided education to more than half the school population. Even to critics of the legislation, it was evident at that time that Anglican schools were a vital part of the national system of education. Since then, however, in the ten year period between 1908 and 1918, statistics from the Daily Mail Year Book showed that the Anglican Church’s role in English education had diminished. While in 1908 Church school seats had outnumbered state-provided Council school seats by 567,000, yet ten years later Council school seats had sur-

---

passed that of Church schools by 1,392,000.\textsuperscript{10} Besides the Council schools' on-going building program, much of that change was due to the transferral of control over schools. As the Church of England became increasingly less able to fund the rising costs of its own elementary schools, many parishes transferred control of their schools to the Local Education Authorities. While groups, like the Labour Party, the National Union of Teachers, and the Workers Educational League, pressured the state to build new schools, even during wartime, some groups within the Church demurred because they felt the Church could not afford to maintain the accelerated pace.

The quantitative change in positions between non-provided Church schools and the state-provided Council schools signalled a possible qualitative change as well within the nature of education. This constituted the second area that an expansion of the school system would affect the Church of England. Clergymen were concerned as to who would teach succeeding generations of youth and toward what life goals these young people would be directed. It was not that Anglicans opposed such ideals, as "to form and strengthen the character and to develop the intelligence of children...for the work of life."\textsuperscript{11} On the contrary, they hoped that passage through

\textsuperscript{10} "The Next Education Bill," \textit{The Church Times}, 82 (12 December 1919): 569.

the school system would facilitate youth's development into good citizens. For the Churchmen, however, capacity for citizenship encompassed more than the ability to support and govern an industrial democracy. Their vision of the educational system pictured "schools with two doors" from which the graduated pupils entered the world as good citizens of the British Empire and also the Church as members of a worshipping community.\textsuperscript{12} For this to happen, some of the clergy insisted that the schools should not only teach religion as a subject, but that the schools' very presence should convey a "religious atmosphere" during all activities. Not always delineated well, aspects of "religious atmosphere" would include practices like prayer and communion. In a speech delivered in August, 1917, Dr. Edward Lyttelton, an author of educational books including \textit{Character and Religion}, conveyed somewhat more concretely the Anglican notion of "religious atmosphere" or "religion in education." He said that certain orthodox Christians "claim then not only to be teaching truth revealed by God...but truth which embraces all other truth," so that "there is no sort of teaching which can be independent of it without propagating error." According to Lyttelton, then, some Churchmen had a particular world-view to instill in children.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} Cruikshank, \textit{Church and State}, 64.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13} "Dr. Lyttelton on Religion in Education," \textit{The School Guardian}, 42 (16 August 1917): 229.
\end{flushleft}
In the years prior to the Fisher Act in 1918, the Anglican Church, as a composite institution, however, expressed a curious mixture of two different dispositions regarding the propagation of that world-view. On the one hand, Churchmen believed "the great majority of the English people still desire ours to be a Christian country".\textsuperscript{14} Reports conducted in this period, such as \textit{Moral Instruction and Training in Schools}, strongly convey the impression that England's teachers and school administrators wanted a Christian influence in the classroom. For example, in regard to moral instruction, this report found that "there is an unwillingness to forego the religious sanction. Many teachers will admit of no other." Yet, the same report discovered that students exhibited an "extraordinary ignorance of Christianity, the biblical literature and all ideas of religion."\textsuperscript{15} Anglican journals analyzed the apparent discrepancy in the following way. Churchmen recognized that within the first years of the twentieth century, certain tendencies of modern living, especially specialization, worked towards limiting the scope of religion within society.\textsuperscript{16} A primary example of this tendency for them was the Cowper-Temple Clause in the Education Act of 1870. This article restricted religious

\textsuperscript{14} "Christianity in the Schools," \textit{The Church Times}, 82 (25 July 1919): 83.

\textsuperscript{15} Sadler, \textit{Moral Instruction}, 57, 296.

instruction in Council schools to "a once-a-week optional supplement" while the rest of the school was posited with numerous mandatory secular subjects. In the House of Lords on June 12, 1917, Charles Alfred Cripps, Baron Parmoor, warned that unless this tendency to relegate religious instruction to the periphery of the educational system ceased, he feared "it will become a secondary and optional subject instead of being a primary one of the most essential importance." While most Churchmen acknowledged "at present we are still influenced by the Christian tradition of the past," some warned about secularization, or even paganization of the nation. At the same time that Lord Parmoor cautioned the peers in the House, an article in The Times Educational Supplement confirmed these concerns. "It is true to say that the fear of secularization is increasing in the whole nation. The fear is felt by all the Churches."\(^1^8\)

During this heady time when the prospect of a new bill inspired within Anglicans both dread and hope, some Churchmen began to devise programs and agendas of their own for post-war reconstruction. During a parliamentary recess before the bill had been enacted, an article entitled, "Church Reform: the Church and the Nation," appeared in The Church Quarterly Re-

\(^{17}\) Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 5th ser., vol. 25 (1917), col. 363.


"Church and State," The Times Educational Supplement, (12 July 1917): 269.
view which proffered an Anglican answer for the Church's role during the postwar era. This, and other like-minded statements, sought to ensure that the period of postwar reconstruction would also include a religious revival. The article declared that the Church had the specific role to teach every person "to live in the fear and love of God."\(^{19}\) For many Churchmen the scope of this role was not confined to the pulpit, but as shown by statements published in *The School Guardian*, it also encompassed the classroom. Appearing in September, 1917, "To Those Who Teach An Appeal From The Church" pronounced that "the future is in the hands of the boys and girls who are being taught in our schools to-day." Therefore, this article reasoned, if this future generation should bring in "the Kingdom of God," then Christian standards must not only be left to the private, individual life, but should also be made a part of society and politics, as well.\(^ {20}\) Towards the end of the World War, then, as Parliament began to formulate another education bill, the High Church position hoped to see "that the Christian religion shall be recognized as an essential subject in national education."\(^ {21}\) This hope for a specific expression within the Fisher Act would be largely un-

---


realized in 1918.

But not all within the Church of England held to this High Church view. While some within the Church, like the Anglo-Catholics, promoted a denominational teaching which propagated fundamental doctrinal tenets as the basis of Christianity, others found the meaning of that religion in the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. Observing that "the conditions precedent to Christianity are clean homes, clean minds, clean bodies, clean streets," an editorial in The Times Educational Supplement on November 15, 1917 carried a less doctrinally disposed and more socially oriented view which warned that England could not be a Christian country until the social problem was undertaken. Anglicans, in support of this position, were appalled that "the general public do not realize at all the amount of lifelong ill health, the percentage of early death, the low standard of moral life that are the direct result of the physical conditions now existing among the 6 million school children of England."22 Since the subsequent legislation would contain so many measures to address these social ills, the Church as a whole eventually supported the Bill. From this social reform perspective, then, the bishops could back the Fisher Act in the House of Lords because Christian meaning was more faithfully interpreted in that in-

stitution as not merely conveying correct doctrinal content to adolescents, but also in carrying out acts of charity for them.

Although the Education Act of 1918 did not become law until August of that year because of opposition by the Local Education Authorities due to clauses allegedly promoting state centralization, Herbert Fisher originally proposed the legislation on behalf of the wartime Coalition Government in August, 1917. An academician, Fisher had served as Vice Chancellor of the University of Sheffield until Prime Minister David Lloyd George brought him into the Government as President of the Board of Education. Lloyd George chose Fisher instead of some politician or prominent businessman because he wanted a scholar to overhaul the system of national education. Avoiding both unnecessary controversies and abrupt departures from previous educational developments, Fisher intended to do just that. On the occasion of proposing new educational legislation to the House of Commons, Fisher noted "the very real effect which our system of popular education has had in the improvement...of our working population." In general, the Government had been impressed by the conduct of the English soldiers in the war. Fisher, among others in Parliament, asserted that the reliable performance of the re-


24 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 97. (1917), col. 810.
cruit on the Western Front was due to the education he had re-
ceived as a boy in the elementary school. Fisher definitely
wanted to continue that process of national socialization so
"that our people will be stronger, more intelligent, and bet-
ter disciplined." Developing his argument, Fisher stated that
he wanted to "fashion the minds of the young" because England
needed "an intelligent citizenry to deal with complex national
problems," such as an extended franchise, hostile interna-
tional competition, and continued industrial growth. Besides,
these national concerns, he believed that his bill would less-
en the "deadening effect" that industrial life was having on
elementary school graduates. Fisher's ideals, for which he
received considerable Parliamentary support, were part of a
national mood for postwar socio-economic reconstruction. At
the war's close many in England, especially among the radical
Liberals and the Labour Party, believed that a reformed educa-
tional system would promote physical betterment among individu-
als and social equality among classes.

Later that year Fisher stipulated certain key goals in
order to realize ideals of building a national education
system to socialize England's youth. These he enumerated in
August, 1917 as the debate on the proposed bill started to
become centered on specifics. While still maintaining the

25 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 97.
(1917), col. 1892.

26 Cruikshank, Church and State, 112.
administrative structure derived from the Balfour Act of 1902, he wanted to incorporate private schools more completely into the national system. Next, Fisher intended to raise the school leaving age to fourteen. Raising the age of graduation would compound the pedagogical problem, mentioned earlier, of too many older students repeating lessons during their last years in school. Hence, Fisher's third objective was to improve upon the curriculum of the last years of elementary school. Finally, for those students who had graduated and taken a job, Fisher was desirous of providing part-time education in a program called continuation schools. He envisioned working youths between the ages of fourteen and eighteen participating in a class room for eight hours a week. 27 As a general response, both Parliament and the nation received Fisher's initial proposals favorably. Specifically, in regard to the Church of England, the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury and Religious Education resolved in July "that this House welcomes the educational ideals and proposals outlined by the President of the Board of Education in the House of Commons on April 19, and is prepared to further them by every means." 28

Although the Anglican Church and its subsidiary educational institutions tended to support the social reconstruc-

27 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 92. (1917), col. 801.

tion contained within the legislative scheme, the Churchmen were disappointed, or at least apprehensive, with what the Minister of Education specifically avoided in regard to certain issues. For example, the second half of the Upper House's resolution stated "that so soon as such action can be taken without hindrance to those proposals a united effort should be made to secure adequate religious instruction be an essential part of the education given." What impelled the Upper House of Convocation and other Anglican educational institutions to write resolutions was Fisher's intention "that the question of education should be considered in the light of educational needs and of these needs alone." In May, The Church Times irately reacted to Fisher's decision with the following criticism:

We are invited to believe that the question of religion in schools interests a handful of faddists only, and has little bearing on the future of the nation. The things that really matter, it seem, are the extension of the school age, the provision of more secondary schools or continuation classes, and the better payment of teachers. Given these reforms, religion can be left to take its chance.

Remembering the tumult that surrounded the passage of the Balfour Act in 1902, Fisher did not want to revive old religious controversies again. In defense of his handling of

29 Ibid 207.
30 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 92: (1917), col. 796.
the Bill, the Minister of Education felt that he articulated the sentiments of the House and the country. With this view The Times Educational Supplement concurred, and on June 21, 1917, declared "the country will not tolerate the reopening of the religious controversy." Moreover, the statement recommended that the clergy part with their particular predilections before they seek to become involved with the Government in fashioning an educational bill for the entire nation.32

In regard to Parliament Fisher was quite correct. The Parliamentary Debates of 1917 and 1918 did not maintain a sustained discussion on either the issue of religious teaching or on the role of the Church in education. The occasional reference to the topic in Parliamentary speeches would caution against a too materialistic base for education or, as in the case of Sir William Collins, a Liberal MP, would vaguely affirm that "that moral instruction...has its crown in religion."33 As far as a general attitude of the nation, even The Church Times admitted that Fisher's decision to set aside the religious issue "merely represented common opinion, both within and without Parliament." During the passage of the legislation through Parliament this Anglican journal regularly remarked on how readily persons and organizations throughout England would seriously discuss educational reform without


33 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 104. (1918), col. 706.
including religious teaching as part of the discussion. It marked this predilection as a symptom of a pagan perspective.34

During a debate in the House of Lords on Fisher's decision to avoid the question of religion and education, Lord Gainford provided some insight on the complexities of this issue. As the former Minister of Education between 1911 and 1915, Joseph Albert Pease, who was made a baron in 1917, was able to draw on considerable, recent personal experience in analyzing the difficulties of dealing with religion in education. On May 9, 1917 he offered the following assessment to his peers:

I found at the Board of Education that the problem as it was then presented was insoluble. I realized that there was in this country a strong denominational body, a strong undenominational body, and a large number of secularists who believed that it was not the duty of the State to support schemes for teaching religion in the national schools; and I realized that any two of those sections would prevent the other section getting its own way.35

Now while The Church Times, a zealous advocate of denominational teaching in all schools, saw opposition to their cause as signs of secularism, The Schoolmaster, which was the educational journal of the National Union of Teachers, interpreted the same situations not in spiritual terms but in administrative ones. Their articles explained that opposition as resis-

35 Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 5th ser., vol. 27. (1917), col. 28.
tance to clerical influence in the class room. Citing a speech made at Leicester in October, the journal avowed that "it has been the intolerance and persecution indulged in by many of [the clergy] in the past that has made it desirable...for a man of Mr. Fisher's character to do this, and for other equally fine and good men to applaud him for so doing." Whereas the Anglican teachers' journal, *The School Guardian*, consistently trumpeted a theme concerning the clergy's "right of access to every Church child," *The Schoolmaster*, on the other hand, interpreted the dilemma as a need to defend "the growing authority and importance of the Local Education Authorities and of the teachers."  

In consideration of the forces arrayed against it, the Church of England adopted a conciliatory position on Fisher's educational proposals. On numerous public occasions Churchmen offered words of affirmation for and Anglican organizations passed resolutions in favor of the bill. In the summer of 1917 George Eden, the Bishop of Wakefield, cautioned members of the National Society, the association for teachers in non-provided Church schools, against resisting passage through Parliament of the proposed legislation. He said that if the


forthcoming education bill "does not affect religious efficiency or the progress of the religious side of our work, I do not think we shall act wisely...in saying that the religious question must needs be dealt with first." 38 In part, the Church adopted this course because it did not want to alienate the very class that both it and the Board of Education wanted to help, namely the working classes. Some Church leaders had grown sensitive to the fact that in the past, interdenominational squabbles had hindered the uniform development of a system of national education designed to benefit the lower classes. Therefore, religious education was "given the go-by in this scheme" by the Government so that, as Charles Gore, the Bishop of Oxford, expressed it, "the great mass of the workers...will have educational reform and more liberal public expenditure on education." 39

Although the Anglicans publicly supported the proposed educational legislation, many Churchmen experienced disappointment in the Government's decision to circumvent the religious issue because they did not hold much confidence in the state's continued support of a system which permitted undenominational religious instruction in state-provided, Council schools. From the perspective of the clergy, this system, at best, might impart some religious knowledge while


it most certainly crushed the religious instinct. "Apart from
the half-hour's religious instruction which may be given, they
have, in their educational influence on the child's mind and
character, become, and inevitably become, secular," consti-
tuted the Anglican complaint against this type of religious
instruction in these schools. As proof of secular tendencies,
The Church Times cited the following evidence. Teacher appli-
cations for Council schools asked an abundance of technical
questions but very few about religious matters. Furthermore,
the decor of the class rooms avoided biblical themes; for
example, there were no pictures of Jesus. 40

Criticisms on this topic had arisen already before the
First World War. In 1908 an international committee of
inquiry published Moral Instruction and Training in Schools.
The first volume of that study, which focused on the schools
in England, considered the issue of the relationship between
religious teaching and moral instruction. Speaking strongly
for the Anglican position, the Rev. Canon James Brooke said:

Personally I am of opinion that the present law is
most unfair to children so far as Provided schools
are concerned, as it forbids the teacher to tell the
child much that would be useful to it in the way of
help and grace which God has so liberally provided
for all. My experience gained by dealing with child-
ren of all ages in preparation for Confirmation con-
irms me in the opinion that a great deal of moral
instruction in Provided schools misses its point be-
cause it is necessarily nebulous and indefinite.
Undenominationalism is an impossible substitute for
the Christian faith not only as to the truths which

---

40 "Education Reform," The Church Times, 77 (25 May
are taught but as to the influence on the everyday life of the child. 41

As consequences of this pedagogical approach, the conclusion of the report listed examples of moral instruction not founded upon a biblically-based, religious teaching. While rights were prominent, duties, except civic ones, were held quite subordinate. Also, there was no teaching on reverence, obedience, and humility. Even more alarming, the study discovered that at a teachers' training college merely "two lessons, labelled 'Bigotry' and 'Fanaticism', were the only proposed references to religion." 42

By the early twentieth century Churchmen had become quite sensitive on the issue of teachers' training colleges. Concerned Anglicans concentrated their attention on the training schools because it was at these institutions that the future teachers of England's youth were instructed. The issue of focus was whether these candidates during their tutorial years were participating in religious instruction and activities so that when these men and women graduated to become teachers, they would become willing and able instructors of religion to their own pupils. As recently as 1890, most of the country's training colleges were managed under the auspices of the Church of England, which was teaching 2250 out of 3500 candidates that year. By the time of World War I, the number of

41 Sadler, Moral Instruction, 301.
42 Ibid 354.
candidates had increased to 12,800. Most of these teachers in training, however, were not in Anglican institutions; instead, they studied at large day training colleges connected to the universities and municipalities. Funded by the Government to the extent of 75% of their costs, these schools had readily surpassed the Anglican ones as the premier schools for teacher education.\(^43\) What bothered many Churchmen was that no stipulation existed to have religious instruction even for those who wanted it. As Lord Parmoor pointed out to his peers in the House of Lords, an attempt to require one failed in 1909 against the Government's argument that the Local Education Authorities should not be coerced in these matters.\(^44\)

During the time that Fisher promoted his bill through Parliament, numerous resolutions were sent to the office of the Board of Education for his consideration. In June the National Society sent two resolutions to Fisher. While the first one declared "its fullest sympathy" with Fisher's educational agenda, the second one urged:

That as the formation of character is the supreme aim of all education worthy of the name, and religious principle is the indispensable foundation of the highest character, this Society [requests]...impartial treatment of all denominational schools and colleges, and... that in all schools and colleges religious instruction according to the wishes of parents shall be given by teachers qualified by training and conviction to im-

\(^{43}\) Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 5th ser., vol. 25. (1917), 373.

\(^{44}\) Ibid 374.
part it.  This and other resolutions to Fisher on the issue of teachers' training colleges were based on the premise that without Christian dogma, instructing morality was an impossibility and, for Anglicans, the imparting of good moral character constituted the heart of education. At the Diocesan Committee of Religious Education, Churchmen avowed their belief that "the two stood and fell together," and without the vital presence of denominational religious instruction and moral training in the classroom, an education based on anything else was inadequate. For Anglican educational activists, then, education involved the use of discipline and teacher influence in order "to develop and train the body, mind, and character of the child...to bring him up as a citizen not only of the kingdom of England but of the kingdom of God."

Aside from their expected religious content, these Anglican sentiments and goals portray a particular pedagogical position. During the decade of the Great War, two opposing views on education existed. While the older of the two, which emphasized character-forming, found "education not...in teaching men to know what they do not know, but to behave as they


do not behave," the newer philosophy desired to foster within children the capacity to adapt to their circumstances. Due to their decided stance on teaching religion, the Church of England was often aligned with the older nineteenth century position, hence the penchant in Anglican schools for imposing standard information on docilely receptive pupils. On the other hand, the newer philosophy, with which some of Fisher's ideas were associated, perceived education as a self-active process in which the pupil wove instruction into his own being. With this latter approach the part the pupil played received priority over that of the content presented. In consideration of the fact that the Church wanted to impart fundamental religious truths and to instill certain ethical values, this Anglican position was on a collision course with developing cultural trends.\(^48\) That much was discovered by Michael Sadler's international committee of investigation which reported in 1908 on the teaching of morals in England. Their conclusion, that "it is ominous to find the teachers of the next generation affirming the impossibility of direct moral instruction," seemed to confirm the worst fears of Churchmen who complained about the lack of rigorous religious instruction at the level of the teachers' training colleges.\(^49\)


By the summer of 1917, when it had become apparent to the Church of England that Fisher would not incorporate the essence of their resolutions into the pending bill, the clergymen decided to proceed along different lines. A circular letter from the Salisbury Diocesan Council of Education printed in The Church Times on June 15, 1917 presented the Anglican position for post-war educational reconstruction. The contents show that the clergy intended to coordinate the various denominations and to solicit public support for their agenda. They wanted the offices of the combined churches correlated with national backing to urge upon Parliament the necessity of constructing an education bill that would make the denominational teaching of Christianity the law of the land.50

Then in the autumn the National Society followed the clerical lead which had been set by the circular letter written at the Salisbury Diocesan Council in June and later affirmed in July by the resolution passed at the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury. In November, the Anglican teachers passed a resolution that called for an education bill incorporating "an agreed scheme for religion."51 So then, by the end of 1917 the Anglicans had decided two issues. First, they would not act as an obstructing force against Fisher and would even render qualified support for his bill. Once the

50 "Education After the War: the Plain Duty of the Church," The Church Times, 77 (15 June 1917): 509.
President of the Board of Education had achieved his goal of an education bill without religious controversy, then the Anglicans would pursue their second goal. That involved cooperating with other denominations in order to construct agreed upon proposals that could then be presented to Fisher who presumably would take and craft them into a second education bill that could be passed through both Houses of Parliament. To satisfy the Anglicans that second bill was to find within the system of national education "the essential place of religious instruction."

The resolution crafted by the National Society left the timing for that second bill's appearance to be "in the near future." On December 31, 1917 the near future was not apparent, mostly because Fisher had withdrawn his bill from the current session in Parliament. He had not done this due to opposition from the Church of England; as a matter of fact, in response to the announced postponement, the Archbishop of Canterbury sent "a notice of deep regret" to the Government.\(^5\) The President withdrew his bill in order to resolve discrepancies over administrative clauses that LEAs had with certain clauses in the present bill. In the interim during parliamentary recess, Fisher planned to refashion his bill so that it would pass through Parliament with strong national support in 1918. In the meantime, the Church of England pre-

pared to support Fisher's bill and to organize the country in support of their own educational measures.
On January 14, 1918 Herbert Fisher reintroduced a revised education bill into the House of Commons. Basically, the new bill embodied the essence of the previous year's legislation except that the President of the Board of Education had included new administrative clauses to make the revised bill acceptable to the Local Education Authorities. In general, the main changes from 1917 lessened what the LEAs considered the excessive authority centered in Whitehall in favor of local administration. This meant that responsibility for the "progressive development and comprehensive organization of education in their area" would devolve upon the LEAs.\(^1\) Besides ameliorating the criticisms by the LEAs, certain other articles stipulated the end of half time education, the start of day continuation classes, the promotion of a variety of social and physical welfare provisions, and the aggregation and closure of schools.\(^2\) It is important to note that neither these four cited clauses nor the other five discussed in The


Times Educational Supplement on January 10, 1918 pertained to any religious issue which the Church of England encouraged.

Despite that fact, Fisher's proposed legislation generally received favorable support by the Anglicans. The predominant Anglican position through 1918 was to support the legislation and, then, once the Bill passed through Parliament, the Churchmen intended to devise with other denominational leaders an agreed upon scheme of religious education that would become the law of the land. For the course of that year's debate, then, Anglicans along with other educational activists accepted the position that opposition to the measure was reactionary. They enthusiastically rallied with Fisher's swelling support to help establish "a national system of public education, available for all persons capable of profiting, thereby."

Likewise, Fisher received strong backing for his measure in Commons. During opening debates Fisher heralded the Bill with the following words. "This Bill acclaims the principle of the rights of youth. We hold that young people have a right to be educated and that youth is the period specially set apart for that purpose." Speeches by MPs affirmed Fisher in the ideal that this Bill should be the "charter of the Worker's Child." Arguing against the old, nineteenth century


4 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 104. (1918), col. 392.
notion of education along class lines, John Marriott asked House members the rhetorical question what would have happened to them if they had during their teen years gone to work in a factory instead of attending Eton.\(^5\) Sentiment in the Commons was against a system of education which allowed the majority of youth to enter dull lives at monotonous jobs without having acquired the capacity to engage in life in any creative way. John Lewis, the Secretary of the Board of Education, even referred to the school as "a refuge for the worker's child outside the sordidness of his surroundings, an inspiration to lift him above the petty grievances and annoyances of his daily life."\(^6\)

The effort at educational reform comprised part of the popular ground swell for national reconstruction in which postwar England would be set upon principles different from the prewar world. Parliamentary speeches expressed the feelings of many English citizens that genuine reconstruction would only occur with a reformed national education system that was truly democratic. By the early twentieth century, this meant more than mere political edification which would train all citizens to become an enlightened electorate. As seen in the provisions of the Bill, to be discussed shortly, much of Fisher's legislation was oriented to addressing current social problems. In their assessment on the Act, Sir

\(^5\) Ibid col. 684.

\(^6\) Ibid col. 736.
Montague Barlow, a lawyer practiced in educational cases, and Richard Holland, the Secretary of the National Society, noted the extensiveness of the new legislation in Education Act, 1918.

It will make contact at all points...with the life of rising generations from the cradle to the dawn of manhood and womanhood; and on the social and physical training side...it makes systematic advance into a region of social work hitherto largely left to private effort, either religious or philanthropic in its inspiration.\(^7\)

In the future the LEAs would become responsible for discovering which children in their respective districts were physically impaired or epileptic. This shift in the orientation of the school system toward social welfare coincided well with the agenda of the Labour Movement. In a resolution on national education issued by Labour leaders during the summer of 1918 as the Bill passed from Commons to the House of Lords, they asked for "measures of social reconstruction" that would make available physical, mental, and moral cultivation of all citizens, young or old, without class distinctions.\(^8\)

Except among Anglican educational activists, a similar enthusiasm did not exist for the promotion of religion in the school system. A perusal of key clauses in the Fisher Act shows an overwhelming emphasis on administrative reform, so-

\(^7\) Sir Montague Barlow and Richard Holland, Education Act, 1918: With Notes and Introductory Chapters Explanatory of the Act; and of the relation of Religious Bodies to the Act (London: National Society's Depository, 1918), 17.

\(^8\) "The Labour Party and Education," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teachers' Chronicle, 94 (6 July 1918): 10.
cial improvement, and the advancement of secular subjects both in the form of new subjects and additional mandatory grade levels, but not for religion. Proclaimed as the "Children's Charter," key sections of the Act eliminated employment under the age of twelve, planned for medical inspection and treatment, and arranged for holiday camps, playing fields, baths, and swimming pools. The elimination of employment under twelve correlated with the Act's abolition of the "half-time system." Under this system English lower class children would only attend classes for a half day because they worked during the other part. For those youths between the ages of twelve and sixteen, Section 13 restricted employment.

As Stanley Curtis in the History of Education of Great Britain has observed, much of this educational legislation was not mandatory but only permissive. In particular, Section 1 of the Fisher Act told the Local Education Authorities to prepare plans for educational development. The idea was that the Board of Education would act as an advisory board in a cooperative relationship with LEAs, supporting the local authorities' efforts in the extension of the school system in their respective areas. Section 2 ensued from that proposal by calling for "the preparation of children for further education

---

9 Andrews, Education Act, 82, 83.

in schools other than elementary."\textsuperscript{11} Although Fisher did not intend to implement secondary education for all the youth of England as the Working Men's Association and the National Union of Teachers had called for, nevertheless, the ideal behind this article did envision some form of part-time schooling for English teenagers older than fourteen.

Clause 10 of the Education Act provided for what was known as Day Continuation Schools, which The Times Educational Supplement referred to as the "heart of the Bill."\textsuperscript{12} This article stipulated that over the course of a year English youth between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, and eventually to the age of eighteen, should attend schools, as set up by the Local Education Authorities, for 320 hours in a 52 week period. Although a given LEA was not to be restricted to the following structure, this worked out to eight hours per week for a period of 40 weeks in a year. During the other four days, or 32 hours in a work week, the young persons were to be on the job.

Fisher's intent was to end the current system which allowed thirteen year olds to enter the work world without having had their character affected in any enduring positive way. Except for those spokesmen of British businesses, most MPs heartily supported Fisher's scheme for Day Continuation

\textsuperscript{11} Andrews, Education Act, 84.

Schools. In a speech on March 18, 1918 Sir Edward Parrott, a Liberal, gave precedence to the welfare of the young over that of business interests:

I am quite aware that you cannot in this imperfect world give everybody a soul-satisfying occupation. There are certain dull, monotonous, necessary tasks which must be performed. But have we not a duty to those who thus serve us? Assuredly our duty is to give them more leisure and to teach them how to employ that leisure pleasantly and profitably."\(^{13}\)

Others, such as John Whitehouse, who had made a tour of American educational institutions the previous year, expanded this sentiment even further. Debating from a position similar to Labour's, Whitehouse criticized the existing educational system set along class lines. In contrast, he envisioned schools ranked according to age so that the elementary schools would become "the natural avenue to the secondary schools, and the latter to other more specialized educational institutions." Viewing students to be in a "most plastic state, Whitehouse, like the President of the Board of Education, hoped for a "new spirit of experimentation in education" that would exercise "the greatest civilizing influence" upon English youth.\(^{14}\)

Regardless of whether the Board of Education resolved to create an entire secondary school system or only to establish part-time continuation schools, the investment by the Church of England in education would be affected. New schools of

\(^{13}\) Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 104. (1918), col. 753.

\(^{14}\) Ibid col. 400-406.
whatever type raised the religious issue again. Concerning whether or not religion ought to be taught in the day continuation schools, the Act was silent. As Sir Montague Barlow observed, religious instruction was not compulsory, but he and other Anglicans optimistically hoped it might be included.\(^{15}\)

Even though religion did not directly become a part of this Bill, it was necessary for the government to accept a conscience clause for the continuation schools before the Commons sent the Bill to the House of Lords in July. The debate centered around the teaching of certain, more advanced subjects which might offend the world views of students or of the students' parents. 

Contending on behalf of the conscience clause, Sir Mark Sykes, a Conservative MP, argued the matter in the following way:

>This Amendment is based on the hypothesis that in the future education will get more and more advanced, and that being so,...there are some kinds [of subjects] which some people would seek to protect themselves and their children against them. There is no doubt that in future education certain biological subjects will have to be taken into consideration. [Finally] the objective of this Amendment is to give people the opportunity of avoiding not only having their feelings hurt, but their whole scheme of life challenged in the instruction given to their children.\(^{16}\)

Speaking on behalf of the government, Fisher accepted the amendment on the basis that even though the education to be given in these schools was contemplated as purely secular, "it

---

\(^{15}\) Barlow, *Education Act, 1918*, 30-31.

\(^{16}\) Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 108. (1918), col. 804.
still might remain possible for some part of instruction to be
given in such a manner and in such a spirit as to offend the
religious traditions and conscience of the pupils con-
cerned."\textsuperscript{17}

Both the inclusion of this amendment within the bill and
the debate in Commons concerning the amendment indicate that
the nature of religious controversy had changed considerably
since 1870. When the Forster Act was passed in that year, a
conscience clause was included in order to appease the inter-
est of secular and Nonconformist interest groups, who, in
general, opposed the bill. These groups, especially the Non-
conformists, resented and feared the preponderant influence of
the Church of England in education. These dissenting groups
dreaded the prospect of children outside the Church being
taught religion by Anglican priests. Therefore, a time table
conscience clause was attached to the Bill stipulating that
religion must be taught either at the beginning or the end of
the day so that dissenting parents might remove their children
from religious instruction without disrupting their entire
day.\textsuperscript{18} Now nearly five decades later, the Church had lost
its predominant position in education, and much of the nation
did not actively support the Anglican agenda, especially if
that meant further religious controversy. Basically in a de-

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid col. 805.

fensive position, not only were Churchmen unable to require mandatory religious teaching in the new continuation schools, they had to rely upon their dwindling defenders in Parliament to protect their interests with a conscience clause. In the early twentieth century, then, it was the children of Anglican parents whose traditional Christian heritage might need protection from the teaching of subjects set upon secular, even atheistical, principles. The evolution of the Fisher Act showed that the Anglicans confronted a very different future in the new century. The Church Times phrased that prospective destiny in the following words: "For that which is at stake is not the triumph of one denomination or another, but the maintenance of Christianity as a vital factor in our system of national education." 19

An overall assessment of the provisions of the Fisher Act shows that the existing Dual System of education, set up in 1870, was left intact. The system allowed for two types of schools to exist: Council schools which were provided for financially by the government and in which religion might or might not be taught, and Church schools which were not provided for by the government and in which religion was taught according to the given precepts of the denomination. Although the Bill was overtly non-religious in its provisions, certain clauses did affect the Church's interests. Section 29 empow-

ered LEAs to appoint teachers of secular subjects which delimited the role of the clergy, even in denominational schools, to religious subjects. Section 30 allowed for the transfer of non-provided Church schools to the jurisdiction of the Local Education Authorities.20 This was a prospect most managers of Church schools wished to avoid, but given England's adverse postwar circumstances, many found this prospect difficult to evade. According to Lawrence Andrews' assessment of the Act, Fisher's intent with this clause was to have the LEAs eventually take over complete control of all voluntary schools. In return, a future Act of Parliament would allow denominational religious teaching in these schools at the parents' request.21 Finally, clause 25 abolished all school fees, which for non-provided Church schools added to the financial burden significantly. In effect, this clause facilitated the operation of Section 30 because during the economically bleak 1920s the financially strapped managers of Church schools would have few alternatives but to transfer their schools to the secular LEAs. During the debate over clause 25 Mr. Ian Malcolm, a Conservative, evinced for the Anglicans their frustration not only with the provisions in the clause but with the increasingly defensive role of the Church in education.

It is no good saying that you can get rid of a religious controversy simply by not talking about it. That religious controversy exists, and those of us

20 Andrews, Education Act, 78.
21 Ibid 79.
who feel as we do about the denominational schools of this country say that the fewer there are of them left the more we must go on fighting for those that remain.  

On July 23, 1918 the Lords commenced their debate on the Bill in the Upper House. On the opening day's debate the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Thomas Davidson, expressed the prevailing Anglican position on this piece of legislation when he said that "this Bill is going to improve our education system administratively...in a 100 different ways, without embarrassing in the least its existing religious character or basis, and without touching it in any way. Therefore, we can support it whole-heartedly." The following day Viscount Haldane, Richard Burdon, expanded the position that the Archbishop had established. In his speech on July 24, Haldane stated two key points. First, the religious question belonged, he asserted, to the bygone Victorian era, and during that time it was the preoccupation of the privileged middle classes but not the masses. Now, the Viscount believed, England had entered a much more democratic age in which efficient administration, not denominational teaching, was the order of the day. Moreover, "if you get efficiency in administration in the Church schools as well as the private schools then you will find the controversy becoming very much less acute."

---

22 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 108. (1918), col. 931.

23 Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 5th ser., vol. 30. (1918), col. 1035.
Haldane's second point, which he offered on behalf of the continuation schools, derived from his belief that England had entered a new democratic age. Herein, he stated that "there is no distinction any more between elementary and secondary education. Education is to be looked upon as one organic whole." Somewhat similar to Labour's position, this view, held by a Liberal politician who eventually served in England's first Labour Government, anticipated the future development of the English school system which rarely enunciated a role for the Church or a place for religion.

Later in that debate Cosmo Gordon Lang, the Archbishop of York, took issue with the Viscount on some of his statements. It was not that the Archbishop was undemocratic or opposed to an organically integrated educational system; the prelate, however, did not want Haldane's zeal for administrative efficiency to eclipse the importance of religious education. He warned members of the House that the religious controversy would not lessen as educational efficiency increased. What would be necessary for a true religious settlement, he said, was that "educational reformers should realize...that religion is as entitled as any other subject...to the best possible teaching, and above all, by teachers themselves trained and qualified to give it." In general, the Fisher Act generated only slightly more

---

24 Ibid col. 1132-1134.

discussion on religious education in the Lords than it had done in the House of Commons. After only a cursory review that mainly clarified the language of the Bill, the Lords passed the legislation through the House on August 5, 1918. The most significant amendment that Lords attached, which was of a religious nature, regarded the prohibition of child labor on Sundays. This prohibition was modified by the Lords themselves to allow for certain type of work, but for no longer than two hours. As Lord Gainford expressed the sentiments, the reasoning behind the amendment still evidenced Christian thinking. "If children are employed on Sunday it is almost impossible for them to be expected to attend Sunday-school regularly." Most Lords did agree with Gainford "that Sunday-schools are one of those admirable institutions in this country," so the Upper House attached this clause to the Bill.26

In August, 1918, as the British saw the first glimmer of victory on the Western Front, Fisher’s Bill became law amid much acclaim. The Times Educational Supplement lauded the progression of the Fisher Act through Parliament with the following words:

The passing of the Education Bill into law marks the opening of a new era in English history as well as in English education. The century-long struggle for educational conditions worthy of the children of a great people has reached another stage. Educationists have to their hands at last the instruments, the facilities, and the environment to achieve their purpose. The English people, throughout their long history, have

26 Parliamentary Debates (Lords), 5th ser., vol. 31. (Lords), col. 306.
clamored for education as the birthright of their children."\textsuperscript{27} The Church of England, in particular, and Anglicans, in general, did support the Education Act, but quite often this support was correlated with statements of reservation, and even of disagreement. One month after the Bill's passing through Parliament, the National Society endorsed a resolution which expressed the Anglicans' mixed response. The resolution began with a declaration of overall approval of the Act. Then the resolution proceeded to justify its approval with a selection of religiously favorable articles from the Act; however, the pickings were rather slim. Basically, the National Society found two clauses which maintained the teaching role of the Church as it had been legally defined since 1902. But the report concluded that "the problem of religious instruction as an essential element in all education remains to be solved."\textsuperscript{28}

Ultimate Church dissatisfaction with the Fisher Act promoted a dialogue among Anglicans and others, regarding the nature of education and the role of religion and of the Church in the national school system. This public debate had rolled over from 1917, and through 1918 it paralleled the progress of the Bill through Parliament. During this open dialogue

\textsuperscript{27} "The Education Act," \textit{The Times Educational Supplement}, (8 August 1918): 339.

considerable animosity against the Anglican Church, especially the role of clergymen in the classroom, was shown by the rivals of the Church, in particular, the National Union of Teachers. Eventually, the wide-ranging discussion culminated preeminently with the publication of the Bishop’s Report in the autumn of 1918.

In January, 1918 the High Church organ, The Church Quarterly Review, put forth the question "What is the purpose of the Church?" The journal proceeded to answer the question by opining that "the Church exists to teach every man and woman to live in the fear and love of God." Moreover, the journal believed that the Church of England ought "to perform the same task for everyone in England." Many Anglicans maintained that for this task to be successfully completed the use of schools was necessary. 29 During parliamentary debate in March, Major Wood argued that "the State and the Churches have their twin influences." According to Wood’s argument, the clergy "ought to be the missionary of the gospel of religion" just as the teacher serves the country "as a missionary of the gospel of citizenship." 30 The Church Times, in discussing the importance of the teacher’s character, developed the notion of "twin influences," but its reasoning imbued the teacher with a holy character that should propitiously affect


30 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 104 (1918), col. 716.
the lives of his pupils even "after they have left school, to
t heir work in the world." The article in The Church Times
even concluded that the Church cannot rely on a fervent
religious atmosphere in the home, or that parents regularly
attended church with their children.\(^\text{31}\) Due to these factors,
then, some Anglicans assumed for the Church the role of
spiritual teacher in the classroom.

Many persons in England at the time did not share the
Anglicans' exalted role of the Church in education. Major
Wood, in the same parliamentary speech wherein he expounded on
the "twin influences" of the clergyman and the teacher, ad­
mitted that "the public has asked whether the churches really
care for education as they have seen every Education Bill be­
come the subject of bitter controversy in which education was
swamped by religious feeling."\(^\text{32}\) This charge that denomina­
tional squabbles actually hindered the development of Eng­
lish education was acknowledged by the Church of England at
the end of 1918.\(^\text{33}\)

Even more than religious rivalries, The Schoolmaster,
organ for the National Union of Teachers, complained of
clerical privilege and interference in the schools. Cor-

\(^\text{31}\) "Religious Knowledge and Religion," The Church Times,

\(^\text{32}\) Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 104.
(1918), col. 717.

\(^\text{33}\) "Christianity and Education," The Times Educational
respondence in the journal typically warned that "the Anglicans and Nonconformists are hard at work evolving a scheme which may put the teachers of the country under their heels for a generation." These types of sentiment found in the journal were not only expressed by the correspondents. In a lead article on October 5 The Schoolmaster criticized the clergy because they allegedly "displayed their superiority to the Council school teachers by lecturing them how to do their work, finding fault with it and condemning them." Written in response to Reverend James Adderley's unfavorable assessment of urban Council schools in Slums and Society, the journal terminated the article with a diatribe against the alleged authoritarianism and class-consciousness of the clergy.

In general, The Schoolmaster was not so much anti-religious as it was anti-clerical. Its view was that "religion is the responsibility of the parents and the clergy, and not of the teachers, who are State officials paid by the nation as a whole." While the teachers' journal found education to be "the most sacred profession," it did not accept that the teacher should be obliged to instruct religion in the classroom. In contrast to notions of "twin influences," the

34 "Correspondence," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 93 (4 May 1918): 574.


36 "Correspondence," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 93 (4 May 19186): 574.
NUT wanted a separation of the role of religion and of national education. In place of the Church's ideal of "adequate religious instruction," *The Schoolmaster* at times vaguely speculated about "a religion of school, a religion of education," of which the teachers would become "the earnest evangelists of the high faith."  

Although not definitively delineated by that journal article just what "a religion of education" would entail, an approximate appraisal can be made by piecing together various statements relevant to the topic. Overall, these statements indicate a tendency towards the secularization of education involving both the de-emphasis of religious content and the limitation of the role of the Church in the school system. In the December 5 issue of *The Times Educational Supplement* in 1918, a lengthy article discussed Sir George Newman's Report on the school medical service. Newman served as chief medical officer of the Board of Education and promoted child health care as essential to national education. It is not surprising that in an essay on national health the theme would be the physical and mental well-being of children; however, the regular emphasis of such issues in early twentieth century England rather than religious concerns would seem to signify a shift in focus of English society regarding what was impor-

---

37 "A Tribute By a Dean," *The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle*, 94 (14 December 1918): 663.

tant. Even the terminology in the article's conclusion, which states "the salvation of the child involves the social salvation of society as a whole, and preventive medicine, in the largest sense, is the necessary instrument of salvation," reveals the tremendous concern put on mankind's temporal well-being. Published at the end of the year, the Archbishop's Report, "Christianity and Industrial Problems," enunciated a similar interest in matters of health, claiming that much education effort expended in the elementary schools is wasted in a vain attempt to educate children who are not physically fit. Furthermore, before all else, the children needed "the care of a doctor or of a nurse." 39

Simultaneous with that secular emphasis there existed an apparent retreat by some devout Christians on the issue of Christian evangelization through the schools. To be sure, there were still those Anglican Church leaders who believed that English national education should be "truly Scriptural and Christian, God-inspired and God-dominated," but many others seemed to be reconciled to pursue the course taken by the Nonconformist churches two generations earlier that relinquished edification on the "love of God" to the sole purview of the Sunday schools. 40 In a letter written to the editor of The Times Educational Supplement, Beatrice E. Morton


promoted precisely that position. Focusing on the Ten Commandments as the summation of Christianity, Morton arbitrarily split the Decalogue in half. While the Sunday schools should teach the first five commands, or the "love of God" as she termed it, Morton wanted the day schools to concentrate on the second half. Their goal must be "to educate their children in the highest conceptions, of citizenship, of intercourse with other nations, of fair dealings in business, of self-control, self-respect, and self-sacrifice."\(^{41}\) Such a suggestion set the prestige of the national school system, ever increasing as state support expanded, squarely behind only the moral aspect of Christianity while the spiritual basis of the religion was relegated to a national institution in decline. The question to be addressed in this study, then, is to what extent did this national tendency to dichotomize the Christian religion lead to its relative unimportance in England.

Just as there was some Anglican sentiment to restrict the scope of religious teaching in national education, there also existed a Church movement to limit the role of the Church in the nation's schools. As the Fisher Act passed from the House of Commons to the Lords during the summer of 1918, the Bishop of Oxford provided a scheme for religious instruction in schools. The scheme resulted from the negotiations carried out by Anglicans and Free Churchmen at a joint conference.

\(^{41}\) "Letters to the Editor," The Times Educational Supplement, (4 July 1918): 284.
Basically, the scheme provided for a trade-off between the control of schools and the teaching of some type of religion in the classroom. The bishop proposed that the Church of England should relinquish its management of voluntary schools to the state, and in exchange, religion, including denominational teaching for those parents who desired it, would be given in all state-provided Council schools. Although the Church of England did gain the prospect of religious instruction for all English young persons, this scheme did mean the abandonment of the dream of a "religious atmosphere" pervading the entire environment of the school. In effect, clerical control of national education would be limited to one subject. During the early 1920s after the enactment of the Fisher Act, this scheme, and other similar proposals, became the basis of negotiations among interested politicians and church leaders for an agreed upon scheme of religious education.

In September, 1918 the Archbishop's Report, "The Teaching Office of the Church," was published. This was one of five Anglican committees set up during the second half of World War I as a result of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope to consider various problems of the Church's organization and work in anticipation of England's postwar reconstruction. Appearing only one month after the enactment of the new Education Bill, this report in many ways corresponded to and inte-

grated with the dialogue over national education that surrounded the progress of Fisher's Bill through Parliament. In total, the Archbishop's Report presented a very dismal view of religious education in England. It found fault not only with the general ineffectiveness of clerical teaching, but also with a profound disinterestedness in spiritual matters among the laity.\(^{43}\)

First, the report affirmed "that the Church is very commonly regarded as an effective obstacle in the way of educational advance." The committee found this to be true even when "it is pointed out that the Church was carrying on the general education of the country at a time when the State had no thought of touching it."\(^{44}\) This feeling within the country resulted from the century long struggle between the Church of England and the Nonconformist churches for control of national education. Although that controversy had abated considerably by the end of the war, "there are," as The School Guardian admitted, "many in every class throughout the nation who do not come under Christian influence and would resent the guidance of the Church."\(^{45}\) One organization that epitomized this assessment was the very powerful National Union of Teachers that successfully challenged the National Society,


\(^{44}\) Ibid 401.

the Church's educational arm, for leadership in English education.

This resistance, whether passive or active, was what confronted Anglican clergymen when they attempted to fulfill their teaching mission. In October an article based on the Archbishop's Report appeared in *The School Guardian* which evaluated numerous factors for the failure of that mission. Under general causes it blamed the "gradual severance between the sacred and secular, as department after department of life has risen into independent activity." Even after decades of religious teaching in elementary schools, a survey of frontline soldiers showed religion not to be a practical part of everyday life; it seemed that the Gospel message was "out of touch with contemporary thinking." The conscious flourishing of key Christian ideals, such as a spiritual brotherhood and mutual consideration, fell prey to rival mental occupations and the practical demands of life. The committee noted no serious clerical challenge to this drift away from spirituality, and even complained that despite "the pastoral work and the wide activity of the clergy there is not a reasoned theology which can build up the religious life of the laity."46 In fact, the report bluntly stated that the clergy just didn't preach the Gospel. Part of this was due to lack of solid preparation at the Church training colleges. Somewhat alarmed, since these were the institutions which trained

---

46 Ibid 272.
the teachers who taught the people, the committee laid the following charge:

The Church training colleges are not so efficient in training their students to give religious instruction as could be wished. In municipal elementary training colleges, and in colleges for secondary school teachers, very little is officially done.  

Besides this, the Archbishop's Report accused the clergy of sloth, and said they lacked courage against any possible provocation.

Although the committee did not specifically cite what these antagonisms might be, it did give an evaluation of the spiritual condition, including attitudes of the laity whose overall spiritual lethargy had a deadening effect on any possible postwar religious revival regardless of clerical efforts. The following statement, paraphrased from the Report, reveals the extent of the problem.

But all the fault does not by any means lie with the clergy. The laity have also failed, both as learners and as teachers of their fellow Churchmen, showing no such enthusiasm as is manifested by Christian scientists or certain Socialist bodies in trying to convert others to the opinion they hold. Home influence too frequently fails to plant religion in the hearts of the children, and even where religious education is conscientiously undertaken in the home it is made either meaningless or merely a stern and repressive interference with the child's natural inclinations. The loss of authority due to divisions among Christians is also noted.  

Apathy and indifference with regard to religion in whatever form was what the Archbishop's Committee found the religious

48 Ibid 401.
condition of England to be as it entered into postwar recon-
struction. Moreover, it was with that "loss of authority" that the Church had to confront this less than promising spiritual scene as it sought to mobilize public support for national religious education.

As Marjorie Cruikshank correctly commented in her book, Church and State in English Education: 1870 to the Present Day, "the issue has changed."⁴⁹ Continuing with a paraphrase of a lament from The Church Times, Cruikshank remarked that "in bygone days it was whether one or another form of Christianity would get the best of a bargain. Now, the issue is whether Christianity or secularism shall be the future creed of England." In the aftermath of the Fisher Act's enactment, the Church of England persisted in its efforts to devise an agreed upon scheme which would pass through Parliament and make religious education the law of the land. One of those proposals was provided by Leslie Wright, Diocesan Inspector for Chichester. Claiming support from the Archbishop's Committee on the Teaching Office of the Church, Wright advised the churches to cooperate with the Local Education Authorities in order to adopt a Diocesan Syllabus on religious education common to all school districts.⁵⁰ This idea found some


support from other Churchmen, but more than Anglican encouragement, such schemes needed to generate the eager enthusiasm of the English people. Otherwise, a Parliamentary bill on behalf of the Church's interests carried only with Anglican backing would die in Parliament.
CHAPTER IV

NO AGREEMENT: THE FAILURE OF THE AMENDING BILL

After World War I the Board of Education attempted to implement the provisions of the Fisher Act as part of the postwar National Reconstruction. Simultaneous with the Board's effort to erect new institutions, such as the continuation schools, the Church of England sought to obtain a statutory guarantee that denominational religion, through an arrangement agreed upon by the various interested parties, would be taught in all the schools of the land. The Fisher Proposals of 1920 became the basis for an agreed upon scheme for many Churchmen, but for few of the other groups involved, to reform the dual system. Eventually, in 1921 these provisions were incorporated in a parliamentary bill, called the Davies Amending Bill. But, as with the government's attempt to expand England's system of national education, the Anglican effort to make religious teaching and worship an integral part of that system came to nought. Part, but certainly not all of the explanation for those failures, was due to the economic slump beginning in 1920-1921 which overwhelmed any effort to implement a major reform in education. Also of importance in accounting for the abortive Amending Bill was the renewed controversy over the place of religion and the role of the
Church in English education.

One full year after the Armistice The Times Educational Supplement noted that "the year 1919 has been a period of marking time in education as in other fields of national endeavor."¹ But the editorial opined that "the Act came too late for an immediate reconstruction on the close of the war." Some time was needed for England's economy and society to re-adjust to postwar conditions before a considerable expansion of the school system could take place. In regard to the construction of the new day continuation schools, for example, not only money was needed. Once the academic accommodations for students were acquired, The Schoolmaster estimated that 32,000 more teachers would be needed to staff the class rooms.² The difficulty of finding so many teachers was compounded by the war's draining of teacher candidates from the training colleges to the trenches. High casualty rates during wartime service had depleted the profession of many experienced teachers, who could not be easily replaced.

Moreover, implementation of the Fisher Act was not the sole item on the government's peacetime agenda. Other high priority goals, such as new housing starts, competed with educational reform for the government's attention and financial expenditure. Hence, the appointed day for key provisions of

² "London Education," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 95 (April 19, 1919): 582.
the Act, whether that be the commencement of new types of
schools or the abolition of half time employment of young
pupils, was temporarily delayed.

Although 2000 teachers had been killed in the war,
138,000 students were still displaced from their school build­
ings, the inflationary postwar boom had burst, and the provi­sions of the Fisher Act had not even been implemented, the
Board of Education envisioned future sweeping reforms. That
policy revision, which echoed the demands of interest groups,
such as the National Union of Teachers, called for "the aboli­tion of the distinction between elementary and secondary edu­cation." The term elementary, increasingly being viewed by
educators as "an uncomely relic of a patronising, charity­dispensing, class-irritating Victorian past," would henceforth
be replaced by primary. The connotation was that primary edu­cation, unlike nineteenth century elementary education, was
not an end in itself, but would prepare students after the age
of eleven to enter secondary schools. To set up such an uni­form system of national education would involve tremendous
costs for both material and personnel because in 1920 there
were only 356,637 pupils in secondary schools. Moreover,
only 2% of English youth matriculated from the elementary

3 "The Report of the School Board," The Times
Educational Supplement, (12 June 1919): 293.

4 "The Board's Report," The Times Educational Supplement
(5 August 1922): 367.
schools into the elitist secondary system.\textsuperscript{5} Despite England's economic adversities during the 1920s, "secondary education for all," at least up to the age of sixteen, became the nationally accepted objective for education by the Labour Party and the National Union of Teachers.

As the Church of England and its approximately 10,700 non-provided schools (figure is for 1921)\textsuperscript{6} entered the postwar era, they were affected both by the existing parliamentary legislation and future goals for the schools, and also by the country's economy. These changes beset the Church schools with the imposing prospect of imparting religious education under modern conditions. Not only did the National Society face the difficulty of conveying religion to a country that seemed to have "managed to get along without it altogether,"\textsuperscript{7} but in regard to the Fisher legislation, "the Church...would have very little control over the children after the age of eleven" because they would be in state-aided, non-religious continuation schools.\textsuperscript{8} Through notable voluntary efforts during the nineteenth century the Church of England had built a fairly extensive network of elementary schools, but now in

\textsuperscript{5} "Transfer of a Church School," \textit{The Times Educational Supplement}, (7 August 1919): 403.


\textsuperscript{7} "The War and a Northern Parish," \textit{The School Guardian}, 44 (15 February 1919): 80.

the new century Anglicans were unprepared to develop that system, whether by continuation or secondary schools, so as to address the educational needs of pupils between the ages of eleven and sixteen. Indeed, the early decades of the twentieth century showed the Church that it was unable to uphold elementary education. As families moved from the cities to the suburbs, the children most often entered state-aided Council schools run by the Local Educational Authorities because Anglicans could not afford to build enough new schools. The six year period between 1913-1914 and 1919-1920 disclosed an enrollment loss of 116,230 students in Church schools.9 Further bad news assailed the Anglican cause when the 1921 annual report showed that yearly contributions declined by £900 in 1920.10

The problem for the ordinary Anglican was twofold. As a citizen of England, he paid rates to the local authorities and taxes to the government to provide for council schools. In addition, as a member of the Church of England, he was encumbered with the burden of freewill contributions to maintain the voluntary schools. By the early 1920s the venture to maintain Church schools for the purpose of teaching denominational religion was abating. In May, 1923 The Times Educational Supplement reported the following disturbing statistics

9 "Correspondence," The Church Times, 89 (22 June 1923): 716.

on school closings for the three previous years. During that time frame of the 201 elementary schools that had closed, 196 had been run by the Church of England; in fact, all 97 of the elementary school closings in 1922 were Anglican. The solution for this continuous loss, according to Canon Winfield of Burnley, was to reach a compromise with the government, the teachers, and other church denominations. In order to secure "definite Christian teaching...in all publicly supported schools by those desiring it," the canon believed that Churchmen would have to accept "the discontinuance of the dual control by Church and Local Educational Authorities, in favour of that by the Local Educational Authorities only."

Behind the scenes moves to end dual control had begun, and in March, 1920 the President of the Board of Education made public what quickly became known as the Fisher Proposals. During the previous months six Churchmen, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, and six Nonconformists, one of whom dropped out of the negotiations, had been meeting with Fisher. Their goal had been to come up with an unanimous scheme which the President could present to the country. Fisher attempted to do just that at the Kingsway Hall meeting on March 27, but "rowdyism" by teachers protesting against the Chairman of the London Education Committee made it impossible for the Presi-

dent to speak. Therefore, the text of the speech was printed in *The Times Educational Supplement*¹³ and *The School Guardian*.¹⁴

The opening statements of Fisher's printed speech provided an explanation for his handling of the issue of religion and education during his first two years in office. He had avoided the introduction of religion into the recent Education Act because he felt it would have been "impossible to deal with it except on the basis of a wide general agreement." But, since the controversies at the turn of the century, Fisher claimed that "in the last five years many rough edges have worn smoother." Despite the conspicuous opposition of some groups to denominational religion in state-supported schools, he believed that "a purely secular system of instruction in public elementary schools" was contrary to current national sentiments. Therefore, Fisher intended to cooperate with interested parties, such as the Church and Nonconformist leadership, in order to establish an uniform system.

To make that step from a dual to a unified system of education, he proposed that the Church of England relinquish its control of its schools to the Local Education Authorities who would both manage them and pay for their upkeep. While this compromise offered the LEAs the free use of Church property

---


along with the right to appoint, promote, and dismiss teachers, the Church in turn received relief from the onerous financial burden for the ownership of Anglican property. That burden encompassed both costs for existing maintenance and for any new construction due to expansion of the educational system. Under the proposed unified system that responsibility would be set with the local authorities who would also control the curriculum and the conduct of the schools.

It was this latter aspect of LEA control that caused alarm among Anglicans. However, reassuring statements in Fisher's address regarding the place of religion and the role of the Church in the schools offered some of them solace. He did not believe that Churchmen were animated by "any spirit of ecclesiastical dominance." He accepted as their "honest conviction" that denominational instruction was both the most effective means for imparting religious education and that religion was fundamentally important for "the minds and the hearts of the young." Therefore, the President wanted the LEAs to be obligated to make adequate provision for religious observance and instruction in all elementary schools during school hours. In order to carry this aspect of the proposition, and thereby to make the proposed unified system a successful possibility, Fisher needed to enlist the willing cooperation of the teachers. The sensitive issue here concerned who controlled the classroom. As asserted nearly weekly in the correspondence section of The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle,
religious education in schools for many teachers meant cler­
ical entry into the class rooms or even religious tests for teachers. In order to forestall resistance by the National Union of Teachers, Fisher stipulated that "no teacher in an ordinary public elementary school should be obliged to give religious instruction unless specially appointed for the pur­pose only." Moreover, any teacher who refused to give reli­gious instruction would not be in a worse position in the edu­cational system than one who would agree to do so.

The Times Educational Supplement promptly endorsed the Fisher Proposals. The editors of the journal agreed with the President of the Board of Education that the dual system needed serious reform. They believed that teachers and stu­dents should no longer be handicapped by inefficient schools because "they answer the demand of hundreds of thousands of parents for such a religious teaching of their children as they enjoyed themselves." While the TES editors trumpeted Fisher's initiative primarily for administrative reasons, The Church Times approved the President's ideas because "for the first time, the teaching of religion in school hours as a normal part of education was secured by statute for every pub-

15 "Correspondence," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 96 (27, September 1919): 536.


Anglo-Catholic sentiment, then, rejoiced that religious teaching would become an integral part of education.

The formal reaction of Council school teachers was one of reticence. At the Jubilee Conference at Margate in April a resolution was passed which urged that "the Executive wait on the President of the Board of Education for further information as to the suggested alteration in the law concerning religious instruction in public elementary schools." But behind the formalities that counselled persistence, teachers expressed strong, negative sentiments. Walter D. Bentliff, a headmaster and former president of the NUT, articulated the commonly held view that "the continuation of denominational teaching in the elementary schools was not compatible with the abolition of religious tests they all wanted." So despite Fisher's reassurances to the contrary, many teachers saw the clergy attempting to ingress the schools "in the name of the parent." In the closing arguments of the conference, Bentliff raised the cry of "Hands off the Council schools!"

The initial response of the Anglicans, somewhat surprisingly, was minimal. A year after the original offer The Times

---

18 "National Education," The Church Times, 83 (1 April 1920): 351.

19 "Jubilee Conference at Margate," The Times Educational Supplement, (8 April 1920): 188.

Educational Supplement even complained that the Churchmen ignored Fisher's overture to the point of tacit rejection. Indeed, during that twelve month period not much news ensued from the Anglican camp. A response typical of the Anglicans was a circular, summarizing the annual meeting of the National Society, sent to Church schools during the summer of 1920. While the Society recognized benefits in Fisher's ideas, that body felt the President had not provided them with enough information either to accept or reject. For example, John Kempthorne, the Bishop of Lichfield, wanted to know if the proposals would encompass secondary and continuation schools. The problem here for concerned clergy was that the future teachers of England's youth were trained in institutions where religious education was no longer a requisite to become an elementary school teacher.

In the autumn of 1920 a symposium entitled, "The Presentation of Christ to Young People," was held at the Church Congress. At that meeting Sydney Boyd, the Prebendary of Ilton in Wells Cathedral, delivered a paper, "Church and State Education--Line of Cooperation," that analyzed the differences between the existing dual and the proposed unified system.

---


While the new system did not preserve the religious atmosphere of the Church schools, Boyd discerned the following advantages.

Mr Fisher’s proposals offer the new and far-reaching advance of a statutory obligation to teach religion, subject to a conscience clause, in every school, within school hours, in accordance with the wishes of a parent and by a teacher belonging to the body. And they give this right, where it has never been given before, in the Council schools. If this system came into operation, the Church schools would not be Church schools in the sense and degree they were before, but their leading purpose would be secured, and a great deal more, viz, Church teaching for Church children where, they are now receiving no Church teaching at all.  

Boyd warned that establishment of this system would require the clergy to make sacrifices. For instance, "there would be no right of entry, and the religious teaching would be given in school only by teachers on the staff."  

Faced with this dilemma, Anglican educators needed to ask which was better, maintaining schools with religious atmosphere in a system that slowly atrophied, or obtaining some form of religious teaching in all schools set within a basically secular system of national education. In May, 1921 the Archbishop of Canterbury finally made an offer to the government which the National Society supported. Provided that "religious education of a definite and dogmatic character" would be given by properly qualified teachers, the clergy agreed to a transfer of Church


schools to the State and the local authorities.\textsuperscript{26}

By the time the prelate had made that offer, the country was already in a recession. England's economic downturn significantly effected educational reform, including negotiations on religion and education, after 1920. From the vantage point of December, 1920 The Times Educational Supplement provided the following perspective regarding the near future: "If the outlook is cheerful from the point of view of education as such; it must be admitted that at the moment it is not cheerful for the ratepayer and taxpayer."\textsuperscript{27} Very few continuation schools had been started since the passage of the Fisher Act, and some of those few that had begun were closed. In Birmingham the Local Education Authority shut down the continuation schools after only one month of operation. In an effort to maintain teachers' salaries, which had risen by nearly £13,000,000 between 1913 and 1920,\textsuperscript{28} LEAs curtailed, and even cut out, new programs. The effort was to little avail. In 1922 the government, under recommendations from the Select Committee on National Expenditure, chaired by Sir Eric Geddes, slashed spending. The financial cuts included teachers' pay and pensions. Moreover, in order to save money, the

---
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size of classes for teachers was increased while the school-starting age was raised to six. In December The Times Educational Supplement concluded that 1921 had been a reactionary year and that the nation was losing its confidence in Fisher, who later resigned from the Board of Education with the fall of the Lloyd George government in 1922. 29

The weak economy and its effect upon the school system was what attracted the interests of educational activists and grabbed headlines in their journals. Part of the picture conveyed was that of juveniles idle on street corners. The closure of continuation schools "has thrown upon the streets armies of children who have left school," and with the recession "cannot get work." 30 Of course, pay and pension scale reductions angered the National Union of Teachers. Despite criticism for its opposition to the reduction of the Burnham pay scale, 31 William Cove, a Labour MP and President of the NUT, persisted in his censure, and labelled the Geddes Report a cover for the destruction of the education system. 32 Richard H. Tawney, speaking on behalf of the Labour Party, accused the Conservatives and their allies, a reference in-


dicting Churchmen, of wanting to maintain socio-economic inequalities and to train cheap, juvenile labor.\textsuperscript{33}

As the economy continued to slump, the national dialogue on education shifted away from the implementation of the Fisher Act and the future reform of the dual system. During this crisis the Church sought to retrench and to restrict spending. Anglicans intermittently resumed their debate over religious education. Many Anglicans hoped that their more than 10,700 schools would provide the basis for negotiations. The premise was that a financially strapped state would make an attractive offer to obtain these buildings as the starting point for future educational expansion. The attractive recompense to the Archbishop of Canterbury was "religious education of a dogmatic kind for those who desire it" in the schools of the new unified system.\textsuperscript{34} Other Anglicans, generally not at the level of Church leadership, decried any change in the dual system. John Sawbridge, Canon of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, predicted that "no tests for teachers" and "everything, including religious teaching, under the complete control of the Local Education Authority" meant "the awful crash into mere secular and materialistic education."\textsuperscript{35} For the canon evidence of this inevitability was the state of

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid 61.

\textsuperscript{34} "National Society’s Annual Meeting," \textit{The School Guardian}, 46 (18 June 1921): 183-184.

\textsuperscript{35} "Correspondence," \textit{The Church Times}, 87 (12 May 1922): 484.
education in the United States. Although discussed during 1920-21, the debate over the dual system, especially among Anglicans, did not become enthusiastically engaged until after November.

On November 1, 1921 Thomas Davies introduced the Amending Bill in the House of Commons. Davies, an ex-teacher in Church schools and a Conservative MP from Gloucestershire, initiated this piece of legislation as a private member's bill at the end of Parliament's session. The hope of Davies and his supporters was that the bill would "be examined thoroughly by all the parties concerned within the next few months" so that "it may be re-introduced next Session as an "agreed measure.""36 At that time, they imagined, the government with considerable support in the country would carry the measure through Parliament just as it had done with H. A. L. Fisher's Act in 1918. Toward that end of fashioning a measure widely supported among Anglicans, Davies aligned his bill with the Fisher Proposals of 1920 and official Anglican sentiment.

An enunciation of that "agreed upon" sentiment was put forth in the form of the Three Principles of the Archbishop, which in themselves were an attempt to affirm Davies's bill. The principles originated as a result of a joint conference between six Anglican and six Nonconformist church leaders,

presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury. "To consider how the present dual system of elementary schools may be modified so as to secure economy, efficiency, and religious equality in elementary education," the conference asked that within all state-aided schools religious teaching should be given by teachers, competent and willing to teach it, to children whose parents desire that they should receive such education. Furthermore, the third point petitioned "that religious teaching must not be of a vague or indefinite character, but must mean for Christian children the definite teaching of the elements of the Christian Faith." Upon the basis of abstract theory many Anglicans and Nonconformists agreed in early 1922 about teaching "the Christian Faith." The question for the future was whether theory, especially in regard to the third point, could be transformed into practical application. An ominous hint to that matter was imparted during the conference proceedings when Dr. John Clifford, a Noncomformist clergyman opposed to the Anglican position on education since the Balfour Act of 1902, dissented from the principles.

For administrative considerations and a perspective "not directly concerned with the religious question save in so far as it impinges upon the national system," The Times Educa-
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tional Supplement endorsed the Amending Bill. The editors of the newspaper believed that the stipulations set forth by Davies provided for broad consensus and a widely supported bill. In general, the proposed legislation afforded an united, integrated system of national education. Articles one through four established the Local Educational Authorities as the governors of all schools, and stated their rights and responsibilities as the new managers. In recompense for that transferral of property and authority by the Anglicans, the latter four articles designated that the Church would have a role and religion would have a place in the schools. Numbers five and six, listed below, held particular importance for the Church.

That the local education authority shall make adequate provision in all public elementary and secondary schools for religious observance and instruction, differentiated as far as practicable in relation to religious tenets, such instruction to be given in school hours by teachers suitable and willing to give it, subject to a conscience clause and provision for withdrawal for religious observance or instruction elsewhere;

That every training college for teachers (other than a college established for the purpose of training teachers in subjects of practical or physical instruction) aided by grants out of moneys provided by Parliament, shall provide a course of training which will prepare students to give such religious instruction as is suited to the capacities of children, and that where the giving of such instruction is directed by a trust deed, such instruction shall be given in accordance with those di-

38 "The Dual System," The Times Educational Supplement (12 November 1921) 507.

While article five made possible dogmatic religion in not only instruction, but also in observance, number six ensured that the colleges training the teachers to teach English children would prepare candidates to be religious educators as well as instructors of secular subjects. On paper, at least, it seemed that Davies's Amending Bill would secure support, but it was not reintroduced in Parliament during 1922.

A month after Davies introduced his Amending Bill, The Church Times wrote that there was not "the slightest chance" that the government would carry the bill through Parliament "unless a very large measure of general support from all parties concerned" formed behind it. Two months later the journal reported on a meeting of the English Church Union Conference which showed that broad support would not be forthcoming. E. G. Sainsbury, who represented the NUT at the meeting, said that the teachers preferred to stay with the dual system because that, at least, allowed them to have separate schools without denominational religion or creeds for teachers. That predictable response by the teachers' union was not surprising, but the following one made by a Churchman

40 "A Bill on the "Dual System of Schools,"" The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 100 (5 November 1921): 688.


was. Reverend Alfred Edwards, curate of Berkhamsted, 1918-1920, confessed that "he rejoiced that the National Union of Teachers was against the Bill, that the Roman Catholics were against it, and he hoped a sufficient number of Church people were against it to render the passage of the Bill impossible."
The loud applause procured by the comment at a Church conference revealed that even among Anglicans it would be difficult to obtain favorable assent for the Bill.

Throughout 1922 various resolutions were passed by educational and religious organizations against Davies's bill to amend the dual system. In October the Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers at Sheffield proposed "that the Board of Education Certificate should carry with it the right to teach in any State-aided school without the imposition of any religious or denominational test, and that no settlement of the dual system can be satisfactory which does not include this provision."43 As had been the case for more than fifty years, the non-Anglican teachers' organizations received support from many Nonconformist denominations. During the summer the Primitive Methodist Conference at Leeds took a stand against the introduction of sectarian religious education into state-provided schools and teacher training colleges. Furthermore, in defense of the teachers' position, the conference resolved "we strongly protest against the right of entry into

43 "National Federation of Class Teachers," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 102 (6 October 1922): 498.
schools for religious instruction, and we strongly object to religious tests for teachers."""44

A groundswell of support among the Anglicans united with this chorus of censure aimed at the Amending Bill. One example of that popular Anglican surge was the Church Schools Emergency League. A group of Anglican educational enthusiasts in Manchester had formed this league in order to keep the Church schools operational within the existing dual system. The League believed that the Church gave up too much in the compromise reached under Davies's Bill. In particular, it objected to the loss of control of Church school buildings to local authorities, the reduction of Church school managers from a 2/3 majority to a 1/3 minority on the LEAs, and the surrender of the power of appointment of the head teacher to the local authorities.45 Through the year grassroots Anglican movements organized in support of the dual system despite the call for its reform by the higher ranking clergy.

Amidst the controversy over the Amending Bill, The Times Educational Supplement raised its voice on behalf of the clergy determined to reform the dual system. Quite often editorials appeared in the paper which castigated those, like the teachers, for their opposition to the parliamentary bill. In May, 1922 the editors warned the teachers' organizations


that "if the view becomes general that this revision is being delayed by the teachers, we can conceive that the general sympathy of the public for the teachers...will evaporate." 46

Although the TES was primarily interested in the bill for administrative reasons, its editorials would also argue strongly for reform from a position of religious education. To the proponents of existing conditions under the dual system, the paper argued that "it is no satisfactory answer to this contention to say that in the majority of provided schools there is religious instruction." 47 The fallacy with current conditions, the editors believed, was that "religious instruction is not essential" in state-aided schools. In October, 1922 the TES declared for the statutory position on religious education which was the same position that the Anglican leadership took to Nonconformists and teachers in a final effort at compromise. At the end of that year TES editorials urged the aforementioned parties to secure an "agreed upon" scheme that the government could carry through Parliament as a reintroduced Amending Act.

Nearly one year after Davies introduced the Amending Bill in Parliament, Anglican educational activists struggled through the month of October attempting to procure the support of Nonconformists, and perhaps even the representatives of
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teachers' unions, to a compromise that would establish religious education within an unified school system. The basis for that compromise from the Anglican perspective was the Joint Memorandum issued by the Education Committee of the National Assembly of the Church and the Standing Committee of the National Society, the Anglican teachers organization in Church schools, on July 6, 1922. The Joint Memorandum acquiesced in the termination of the dual system in that the clergy would agree to transfer its schools to the control of the local authorities provided that the Church would receive statutory guarantees for religious education as outlined in the Fisher Proposals. Toward that end, the two committees requested that the following amendments be added to Davies's Amending Bill: the religious teaching in schools should accommodate the denominations of the districts, there should be inspection of religious education, and any voluntary school must have the option to "stand out" of the new system.

In October, as the Church leadership attempted to secure an agreed upon measure, The Times Educational Supplement endorsed the Joint Memorandum. "In a sense the Church may be said to have burnt her boats and to have adopted the policy that if the principles for which the voluntary schools stand

48 "Dual Control," The Times Educational Supplement, (14 October 1922): 447.

become, as they ought to become, the principles relating to religious education throughout the national system, they are willing to hand over the schools to the State." The newspaper anticipated the reintroduction of the Amending Bill as government-sponsored legislation. The Anglo-Catholic journal, The Church Times, also espoused support for the Joint Memorandum. Under the protection of a parliamentary act it envisioned for all English children a "religious teaching as an integral part of education, instead of as an extra which any Local Authority might expunge from the time-table." Another aspect of the dual system slated for discontinuance, a fact which pleased many Anglicans, was the Cowper-Temple clause. In place of this non-sectarian instruction, which an Anglican civil servant, Sir Frederick Holiday, characterized "as the religion of nobody taught by anybody and paid for by everybody," Anglicans wanted an arrangement that Parliament had recently granted to Northern Ireland. There "the children of various denominations will do their secular subjects together, but there will be separate religious teaching. The teachers will willingly teach both, according to their denomi-
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nations, and no friction is anticipated." But this settlement, which The Times Educational Supplement praised in Ulster, failed in England.

Through October and into November of 1922 the Churchmen were unable to gain the support of the Nonconformists and the teachers for the Joint Memorandum which could be offered the government as an agreed upon scheme. Although the various clergy could draw together upon the idea of the Archbishop's Three Principles, they could not agree upon a syllabus of religious education "which would contain what Anglicans regard as indispensable essentials, and, at the same time omit what Nonconformists would consider as doctrinal." Furthermore, the Churchmen were unable to appease the teachers' demands of "no tests" for teachers and "no entry" by the clergy while at the same time insisting upon definite religious teaching. Therefore, the National Union of Teachers and the Association of Education Committees rejected the Church's agreed upon scheme at the Memorial Hall Conference.

In the aftermath of the failure at the Memorial Hall Conference the various parties went their separate ways. In a number of statements made during the first part of 1923, teachers and their associates showed that they had little affinity for the Church's agenda on religious education. In an
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address to the Unitarians Dr. Lawrence Jacks, Principal of Manchester College, said that "the schoolmaster of to-day is not as willing as he was thirty years ago to accept the parson's view that he is incompetent in the matter of religious teaching." Jacks concluded, "whatever Bills might be rushed through Parliament,...the ministers of all denominations would have to reckon in future with the new mentality of the schoolmasters." According to a speech by Edward Stanley, the fourth Baron Sheffield, before the Education Association at Central Hall, Westminster, that "new mentality" was antithetical to traditional religious teaching. The octogenarian lord, a lifelong opponent of Anglican influence in national education, focused his criticism upon a joint conference of Churchmen and "Calvinist Methodists" to develop a religious syllabus for Wales. Scornfully, he labelled their thinking "an attitude towards historic Christianity which still prevailed in Sunday Schools." The implication conveyed was that Sunday School teaching had no place in England's future system of national education. Sheffield predicted that if the clergy attempted to impose their views in the national class rooms, they would be confronted by the non-cooperation of the teachers and the sullen resentment of the pupils.

What really excited the teachers were not symposiums that
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formulated an unified system with religious education, but rather conferences that outlined an unified system without the inclusion of religion. At their Brighton Conference in April the NUT renewed its earlier interest in an unified system of secular education. The teachers passed a resolution which declared that "the time has now arrived when the primary and secondary schools should be definitely correlated, the function of the former being to provide that general education which is the foundation of all further studies, while the latter should be of varying types suited to varying needs." 57 Of the seven items stipulated in the resolution as necessary toward fashioning an unified system, none referred to religion. This was a revelatory sign to the nation regarding not only the clash between teacher and clerical interests, but also what national education in the future would be.

Meanwhile, one month after the Brighton Conference the National Society held its annual meeting at which a majority of Anglican educators voted against the Joint Memorandum of their own Standing Committee of the National Society and the Education Committee of the National Assembly of the Church. The Church Times reported that "to everyone's surprise, the annual meeting of the National Society, on Wednesday, was crowded beyond its doors; indeed, the anteroom could not ac-
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commodate the later comers."\(^{58}\) Whereas the previous meeting had had only 22 participants at its commencement, the ranks of ordinary Anglicans swelled this meeting to pass by a majority of ten votes a resolution that called for a revitalization of the dual system. Although there was complaint that those against the Joint Memorandum had packed the hall with "London enthusiasts," later correspondence in The Church Times resolved that the National Society’s annual meeting really was widely attended from persons all across the country. Indeed, in responding to Canon Cairns’s charge that the hall was packed, Laura Helen Sawbridge claimed that members from the following organizations had attended: the National Society, the Manchester Schools Emergency League, the Church Extension Association, the Church Managers’ and Teachers’ Association, and the Association for the Defence of Church Schools.\(^{59}\)

That the Joint Memorandum was repudiated at the National Society meeting should not have been a surprise to clergymen, such as Canon Cairns. Events during the six months preceding the conference showed that many Anglicans preferred abiding with the dual system. This was especially true after the Church leadership failed to convince the Nonconformists and
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the teachers' unions to support the Joint Memorandum. For example, one month after the failure of the Memorial Hall Conference a petition signed by 1100 clergy, teachers, and managers was presented to the Bishop of London. The petitioners urged that "the policy of diplomatic negotiation should be abandoned as tending negatively to diminish enthusiasm for Church schools, and for the cause of religious education generally." Instead, they wanted the clergy to call upon devoted Anglicans to maintain their schools with the same "self-sacrificing spirit" by which they had been established. Through the subsequent months numerous Anglican organizations concerned about religious education passed resolutions in opposition to the proposed unified system. The sentiment behind these resolutions favored the dual system because it, at least, allowed a place for their schools where dogmatic religious teaching could be given.

A statement delivered in early May by the Church Schools Emergency League and the Association for the Defence of Church Schools asked for a revitalized dual system and much more. "We now call upon Church people," it read, "who value Church schools and who desire that education shall be based upon religion, to join us in the determination to maintain those schools, and to insist upon definite religious education for

---
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all schools--elementary and secondary." Along with maintaining the particular environment of their own schools within the dual system, many Anglicans now insisted that all state-aided schools within that system teach dogmatic religion. This was the attitude that prevailed later that month at the annual meeting of the National Society.

The meeting commenced on May 30 with an attempt by Sir Frederick Holiday who made a motion to reaffirm negotiations based on the Archbishop's Three Principles. Holiday's motion was challenged by Francis Thicknesse, Rector of St. George's, Hanover Square, who said he wanted to amend the motion. The contents of Thicknesse's statement, in fact, negated Holiday's attempt to affirm the Church hierarchy's abandonment of the dual system. Thicknesse's statement, which carried by a majority of ten votes, proposed the following:

That the National Society considers that it is urgently necessary that the authority of the Church should be respectfully invited to abandon the policy of negotiation for the surrender of Church schools and to aid the Society by putting 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 Christian faith to Christian children in all schools.

Thicknesse, who received considerable applause during the meeting, defended his resolution with the rhetorical question, "But why need we give up our church schools in order to


improve the others?" Thicknesse and his supporters asserted the position that Anglicans ought to keep their Church schools and "claim our rights in the other schools." While clerical influence in Church schools would ensure Christianity being imparted there, Thicknesse resolutely insisted that teachers be religiously trained in order to teach Christianity in Council schools. The majority at the meeting carried this point also, and a resolution in support of religiously based training colleges was passed. At this point the Archbishop of Canterbury sadly commented that the Church did not have the resources to finance both the building of new training colleges and the renovation of elementary schools. Indeed, the National Society, itself, had reported last May that voluntary contributions in 1921 were only £17,110 while in 1913 they had been £21,634. Despite these criticisms based on actual conditions, Prebendary Thicknesse and two of his associates were elected to the Standing Committee of the National Society where they might try to implement their agenda.

In the aftermath of the victory at the annual meeting of the National Society Thicknesse and his confederates had to make a concerted effort to solicit voluntary contributions to preserve their own schools within the existing dual system.

63 Ibid 623.


This had already begun when the bishops were unable to devise a compromise with the Nonconformists and the teachers at the Memorial Hall Conference. Anglicans, acting with inspiration from Prebendary John Hall founded two organizations for the preservation of Church schools: the Church Schools Emergency League and the Association for the Defence of Church Schools. Since the bishops were unable to solicit universal support for the Joint Memorandum at the Memorial Hall Conference, these two organizations and others began a campaign to stop the transfer of Church schools to the local authorities. Anglicans supporting these organizations perceived the transferrals as abandoning children, even Church children, to secularism. For example, the Church Managers' and Teachers' Association made the following claim on this issue.

This meeting of the Bury St. Edmunds and District Association is of opinion that the Church Elementary Schools should not be surrendered as suggested in the memorandum issued by the National Society last October, but considers that every effort should be made to defend all Church schools for all generations of children and to secure full Christian teaching in all other State-aided schools attended by the children of Christian parents.

Eventually, under sustained criticism from Anglicans determined to hold on to the Church schools, the Joint Committees of the National Society and the National Assembly issued a


call to maintain a firm defense against individual transfers of schools until a general agreement could be reached on the unified system. In May, when even a majority of Anglicans voted against the unified system, this course of action was officially accepted by the Church.

Through 1923 Anglicans could claim some success in an increase in voluntary contributions for Church schools. Laura Helen Sawbridge wrote *The Church Times* in March, 1923 that the following monies had been received: £520 for Ashmonbaugh, £1500 for Aylsam, and £200 for Hempton. She believed that with the uncertainty gone regarding whether the Church would keep the schools within the existing dual system, voluntary support would only increase. An editorial in *The Church Times* admitted that "enthusiasm ran high" for the £100,000 goal set by the Association for the Defence of Church Schools. Still, the editorial wondered whether those parents who could afford subscriptions would not rather send their children to public schools and that those who couldn't afford the fees would not have the money available to contribute to Church elementary schools.

Although the failure of the Memorial Hall Conference had brought many Anglicans to unite among themselves to save Church schools, some Churchmen still sought to reach consensus
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with other educators. During 1923 Anglicans within the dio-
cese of Manchester met with Nonconformists and teachers, but
this conference also did not achieve agreement. Thereupon,
the Bishop of Manchester formed a committee to address the
question: "What is meant by Christian Education, and what is
the place of Denominational Schools in relation thereto?" 70
Although The Church Times was correct in criticizing the Mem-
orandum as too abstract and without any "concrete proposals
for preserving and extending" religious education, 71 the fol-
lowing statement, submitted to the Diocesan Conference on No-
vember 20, did delineate well what the committee meant by
Christianity and how it should impact the lives of English
youth.

Our aim is to train characters which are truly and thor-
oughly Christian and to suggest an outlook upon life
which is directed by Christian conviction in all
respects. This involves a complete permeation of the
whole school life with Christian principles. The goal is
reached...when the children go out from school, having
at least begun to learn the lesson that love to God and
love to men can alone guide rightly the decisions which
they have to make either as individuals or as citizens.
A school which is giving a truly Christian training is
one which keeps before its members this question: Are you
prepared in all matters, small or great, private or
public, to act as one who believes that the supreme power
of the universe is revealed in Jesus Christ?

Our aim is to lead the rising generation to an intel-
ligent apprehension of the Christian faith as it is
set forth, for example, in the Apostles' Creed. Our aim
is to convey what we believe to be the truth concerning
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God and consequent duty of men. Further, our aim must be to convey this, not as a set of opinions which happen to be held by a certain group of individuals but as body of truth, 'articulated' in the several 'articles' of the Creed, which is held by a body pledged to a life corresponding thereto; which body is the Church. Care must be taken that the whole instruction given leads to a living and intelligent grasp of Christian truth, not a parrot-like repetition of sounds that convey no meaning to the mind. To this end, actual religious practice must form a part of religious instruction.72

Considering the historical context in which this statement was made, Anglicans faced a struggle to convince the nation that a vital knowledge of Jesus Christ as defined in the creeds was of paramount importance and then to implant that ideal within a national school curriculum. Other than the few activists in Church organizations, there were not many persons living in 1920s England who involved themselves in promoting Christianity as did the few Anglicans. The Church Times complained that even among Anglicans, "only about once in ten years, when some Parliament Bill forces it upon their notice and makes it a political issue, will the mass of Churchpeople show any real interest in religious education."73 It supported this assertion with reference to attendance at National Society meetings, which were "mostly composed of old ladies." Moreover, The Church Times claimed that Church Convocations usually shelved proposals on religious education from the National Society in order to focus on other

72 "What is Christian Education?," The Times Educational Supplement, (27 October 1923) 474.

issues, such as the prospect of "women preachers."\textsuperscript{74}

Worse yet for Anglican intentions, the general populace seemed to show an even greater indifference. In March, 1921 \textit{The Church Times} ran an article entitled, "Christianity or Paganism?."\textsuperscript{75} Speaking for Anglo-Catholics, its thesis opined that "we are drifting perceptively towards paganism, and that no adequate steps are being taken to check that movement." As evidence, the essay lamented "the queues of children ranged outside the cinemas of a Sunday evening" and "fathers who take the schoolboys and schoolgirls of their families to spend the whole of Sunday on the golf-course or the river, giving them no encouragement to attend a place of worship except for a smart wedding." In contrast, the article noted that practically every Christian denomination in England tabulated a decline in Sunday School attendance during recent years. In an essay about the spiritual training of working boys, Francis Underhill, Canon of Birmingham Cathedral, asserted that the minimal Christianity imparted to English youth was eroded away in the daily life of the office and the factory. In these places Underhill believed the Christian sentiments to whither under assaults of "insane criticisms...by anti-Christian associations" and "the cheap
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arguments of ignorant windbags."\(^{76}\)

The Anglicans' remedy for these dilemmas was the nurturing of Christian youth in national schools under the influence of the Church. But, even here there were problems for Churchmen. First, and already discussed, there were many Englishmen, especially among Nonconformist activists and the teachers, who felt "it was the duty of the nation to supply the education and the duty of the Church to supply the religion--outside the school."\(^{77}\) Secondly, Anglican enthusiasts encountered parental indifference regarding the Christian upbringing of English children. The Church Times complained that many, "perhaps even a majority" of parents do not exercise their rights through the conscience clauses under existing laws to obtain their own denomination's religious teaching for their children. The excuse most often given for failure to exercise this option was "I do not want him differentiated from the other children; think how uncomfortable he would feel."\(^{78}\) Apparently, then, the attitude prevailed among the English people that one's religious sentiments should not interfere with the teacher's daily routine in the classroom or with what the children of their peers accepted in
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that environment. Reverend Ernest Barnes, a theological modernist and the future Bishop of Birmingham, predicted that "this meant the schools will rule the churches." While Barnes optimistically interpreted this phenomenon as the means of reunion for England's fractured school structure, he did admit that pessimists might foresee "the virtual repudiation of Christianity" through the Church's diminished role in society. 79

In conjunction with the internal debate among Anglicans, numerous articles appeared in the educational journals and newspapers which discussed and analyzed the presiding impact of the schools upon English society. In a front page lead article for The Times Educational Supplement, the correspondent asserted that whereas present-day methods of religious education seemed irrelevant to the lives of English youth as they matured, the professional teacher's pedagogy impacted the student as pertinent to his life. The correspondent believed this because the Council school teacher exercised enough control over his discipline so as "to inoculate students with his ideals;" moreover, the teacher anticipated and thereby led public opinion. 80 Teachers and educators were not unaware of their tremendous social influence. Speaking before the Fifth Annual Conference of Reading and District Teachers' Associa-


tion, Spurley Hey, Director of Education, denominated the men and women in England's classrooms as "thousands of teacher missionaries." President C. Barras of the National Federation of Class Teachers envisioned a crusade for these "thousands of teacher missionaries" which was "moulding the life of a nation." "Their work," Barras proclaimed, "ought not to be confined to the schools, but they should be in touch with social problems."

England's teachers had indeed assumed a notable role in social reform. J. E. Cuthbertson, Director of Education at Barrow-in-Furness, wrote to The Times Educational Supplement "it is well that it should be noised abroad that there is a vast amount of public service being performed quietly and unostentatiously." Some of this public service to which Cuthbertson referred was voluntary work done by teachers to provide breakfasts and lunches six days per week for 1/6 of the school children during the recession. In 1923 England's educational system received indirect praise from the annual report of the Ministry of Health. It was reported that the infant mortality rate was down to 77 per 1000, and The Times Educational Supplement attributed this achievement to the

---
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health services provided in the schools. The editorial even advocated that "every school should be a centre of propaganda" through which literature from the Ministry of Health could be distributed to the homes.  

The Church Times evaluated these social developments with a degree of apprehension. "The effect of the education that exists to-day is to develop the mental and physical rather than the spiritual side of life," stated the editorial. It was evident that the material well-being for the lower class English was much better than two generations ago, but the writer doubted that the spiritual health had been improved. The journal assessed the impact of these conditions on students to be that they realized "that religion really occupies a small place in the minds of the teachers....In this scheme of instruction the State and the world are everything." This was not an indefinite critique launched out at cultural intangibles. As evidence, The Times Educational Supplement indicted the report of the Consultative Committee on secondary education, which claimed to deal with "the curriculum at present in use, including all school activities," for completely ignoring religion. The Anglican fear, to paraphrase the

---
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words of Jesus Christ, was that the English were fashioning a society which could live "on bread alone."

Along with the obstacles of the teachers' opposition and the parents' indifference to religious education, Churchmen confronted a third challenge to their attempt to promote Christianity through the schools; this one came from within. Speaking to the National Society on modernism, Lord Hugh Cecil said there was a movement which "seems to be unlike Christianity to which we have been accustomed." Instead of fostering the "personal worship of a Personal God," Cecil claimed modernism presented god as "a principle without being a Personal Being." 87 In a lecture given at Bingley Training College, Reverend Ernest Barnes expounded upon this movement. 88 His comments show that the modernist interpretation of the Christian religion might have been quite different from the Statement of Aims composed at the Manchester Diocesan Conference. Whereas the Diocese spoke of truth "articulated" in creeds, Barnes emphasized "a reasoned and reasonable interpretation," and whereas the Diocese preached "the supreme power.... revealed in Jesus Christ," Barnes focused on his manhood and love for others. The reverend admitted that he "deliberately ignored the Old Testament, because he would not have Christianity seem dependent on primitive barbarism or
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mythology." Clearly, this was a different approach to Christianity from what more traditional Anglicans followed in their propagation of the faith. So, while the Church of England demanded the legal right to teach Christianity to the English youth, all Anglicans had not reached agreement on what that was.

For the Anglicans the year 1923 ended without an agreed upon resolution to the problem of religious education in a national system of schools. In contrast to 1918 when the nation had rallied behind H. A. L. Fisher to pass an education act without religious provisions, not much stirred in the nation a few years later except opposition when the Archbishop of Canterbury and Thomas Davies promoted a bill that was specifically religious. Admittedly, the economy had slumped into a recession, but nonetheless, the Churchmen had not successfully handled the three challenges they had faced. They did not attain agreement with the Nonconformists and the teachers on the issue of religious education within an unified system of schools; the clergy were unable to inspire the parents to zealous involvement for the sake of religious teaching in the schools; Anglicans had not united among themselves over an interpretation of Christian education. To be sure, there was enthusiasm among the dedicated Anglicans, especially during 1923 when they campaigned both to save Church schools and to invest Christian education in all other English schools. That latter demand was shouted rather loudly by Canon Thicknesse
and his associates at the National Society's meeting in May, 1923. But, two simple questions by Canon James Cairns criticizing Thicknesse's posture of making demands spoke even louder. "From whom are we to demand it? Is the present Government, or any alternative Government in sight, in the least likely to listen?"89 That was the Church's dilemma during the 1920s. Who, besides devout and devoted Anglicans, would listen to the cry that Christianity was vital for the life of the nation?

89 "Correspondence," The Church Times, 89 (22 June 1923): 716.
CHAPTER V
THE EDUCATIONAL LULL, 1924-1926

During the three years that followed the failure of the Amending Act in 1923, educational developments in England slackened until the end of 1926 when the government published the Report of the Consultative Committee on The Education of the Adolescent. Until this study, commonly called the Hadow Report, realigned the perception of public education in England, the middle years of the 1920s were cluttered with abortive attempts by the Church to heal the hemorrhaging of schools that were being transferred to local authority control. The most noteworthy of these Anglican attempts, presented in the form of local enabling bills, once again fell before the opposition of the NUT just prior to the publication of the Hadow Report. As had been the case with the Amending Act, these proposals invigorated the public discussion during 1926 on religious education and the role of the Church in the schools.

Despite the previous autumn's debacle at Memorial Hall, the year 1924 opened surprisingly well for the Anglicans. According to The Church Times, the National Society commenced its annual meeting with an assembly that overflowed the hall. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, was reported
as having said that regardless of disagreements at the Memorial Hall Conference, there were "hopeful signs of the eventual realisation in the educational system of the country of the ends for which the National Society and the Church have always stood."¹ Yet, an editorial in The Church Times, remembering the "No Surrender" crowd from the previous year's conference, warned "before very long, the whole scheme of elementary...schools must be drastically reorganized." That implied, unless the Church made radical readjustments, the dual system of provided Council schools and non-provided voluntary schools must end, but during this three-year period the hierarchy primarily engaged in talk.²

One of those adjustments that needed to be made, even before the end of the dual system, concerned the condition of existing Church school buildings. By mid-decade the material conditions of both Council and Church schools had come under governmental inspection. In February, 1925 the Board of Education sent out a circular declaring which schools were unfit and to be placed on the infamous "Black Lists." According to the 114th Report of the National Society, voluntary schools in thirty-five dioceses had been listed in the following categories: for Group A the Board's inspectors had found 151 schools, affecting 49,446 pupils, to be incapable of improve-


ment; for Group B the Board's inspectors had designated 215 schools, affecting 83,993 pupils, to be in need of large expenditure for satisfactory improvement; and for Group C the Board's inspectors had accepted 81 schools, affecting 25,778 pupils, as suitable for the lower grades.³

Although the circular's intent was more of an invitation to fix a wrong than a condemnation, as Lord Eustace Percy, the new President of the Board of Education, declared, the educational journals took a high moral tone with this story. It was a mistake to label publicly the circular as "only one of the usual fulminations of the Board," as the outspoken LEA member discovered from his pillory in the press.⁴ Although both Council and Church schools had been listed, greater public attention was given to defective Church school buildings. During early 1924, when voluntary school supporters eagerly listened to the Archbishop predict fulfillment of Anglican goals in the near future, Frank Leslie at the North of England Education Conference "attacked the present condition of the non-provided schools throughout the country." As secretary of the Association of Education Committees, he had conducted a survey covering 2032 voluntary schools for which he claimed only 49% were in good repair. Considering his
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sample representative of England, Leslie calculated that £3,000,000 was needed to refurbish unfit schools. In a series of articles on Church school buildings The Times Educational Supplement complemented Leslie's assessment. Citing the work of Sir George Newman, Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education, the TES compiled a long list of accommodations considered necessary for the modern school. The journal added moral obligation as a conclusion when it stated that, if Anglicans did not "fulfill Sir George Newman's minimum demands, the interest of the laymen of the Church of England in national education will seem to be waning."

Along with the government's demands of the "New Building Regulations," Church schools sustained pressure from Circular 1350 which called for the formation of junior schools. Administrators projected that these schools would remove pupils over the age of eleven from lower grade schools to receive an education commensurate with their maturity. This provision would fall hardest upon the Church in the countryside where there were many non-provided schools with 11+ pupils in the lower grades. Grouping numerous small village schools into one

---


central junior school would necessitate a new larger building for which the Church lacked funds. The case of a forty-year-old-boys school in Wantage shows some of the difficulties the Church faced with these new regulations. In order to procure funds for a new school that would also accommodate 11+ boys from the surrounding villages, J. Lamb of Belmont wrote a letter of appeal to The Church Times. Besides the £7000 needed for the school, the hopeful correspondent admitted that the parishioners were already committed to build a community hospital. 8

According to a reprint of a Western Morning News story in The School Guardian, Plymouth became the first area of the Board’s crusade against black-listed schools. The reforms required included playgrounds, lighting, ventilation, classroom accommodation, and a reorganization of buildings into junior and senior schools. The Bishop of Plymouth estimated a minimum need of £10,000. 9 In contrast to The School Guardian, the Anglican teachers’ journal, The Times Educational Supplement did not favor these piecemeal efforts to save Church schools. Whereas one locality might estimate £7000 for renovations and another as much as £10,000, the TES calculated that "the Church of England will have to find a sum of...not less than £5,000,000 without doing anything for the great mul-
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titude of Church of England children who are in the provided schools." The editorial added further that it was futile for the Church to refurbish old schools when parents demanded even better facilities than what currently existed. Since a majority of Church children were already in Council schools, as the Bishop of Salisbury conceded, the Anglican effort to maintain old buildings would retain an increasingly smaller section of the student population as the government built newer schools, especially at the 11+ grade level.\textsuperscript{10}

Despite the gloomy prognostications that the Church of England could not maintain pace with the government's educational goals, Anglican leaders continued to issue appeals to Churchmen for funds. During the middle years of the decade such overtures from the Archbishop of Canterbury were regular features at the National Society's annual meetings. Along with their efforts to mobilize the rank and file laity, Church leaders sometimes challenged the Board of Education regarding its policies. The Bishop of Gloucester accused Lord Eustace Percy of using the black-lists "to put the Church in a difficult position." Since the state still needed the 10,000 Church of England schools to teach the children, \textit{The Schoolmaster} predicted that Percy wouldn't coerce the Church but

wait until it had "the means" to modernize the schools.¹¹

Indeed, The Schoolmaster's editorial was right; the President of the Board called for cooperation among those responsible for education in the localities. That, however, was difficult as was shown by the problem in the borough of Totnes, S. Devon. While the local authorities were willing to contribute public money for the reorganization of higher level education with one junior Council school and one senior Church school, the authorities did not receive permission from the Board of Education to carry out the project. Since the Church school was not a public building, the Board could not legally sanction the expenditure. In consequence, the Church school managers were left with the prolonged process of public appeal.¹² Such tedious methods only served to provoke more critical comment in the educational journals about the continued stalemate on religious education due to the dual system. This stalled dialogue of circular recriminations persisted until 1926 when an Enabling Act expedited in the localities seemed to render a resolution.

As a precursor to the idea of the Enabling Act, agreed upon syllabuses for religious education were popular notions during 1924 and 1925. The most famous of these was the Cambridgeshire Concordat. The intent of the Cambridgeshire Con-


cordat and other similar plans was to encourage Church school managers to transfer their schools to the local authorities, with the prospect that the children of Anglican parents would still receive Christian religious teaching. To ensure the quality of that teaching, the Concordat included the following key provisions: to assist the LEAs an advisor committee would supervise religious education, religious teaching would be promoted in training colleges, and teachers would be advised to take courses in the Bible and in religion.\(^{13}\)

Reaction to the Cambridgeshire Concordat was varied. The NUT and its organ, The Schoolmaster, acclaimed it. So did Michael Sadler in his book, Our Public Elementary Schools, because he, like the teachers' journal, considered undenominational teaching to be undogmatic, yet substantive, Christian education.\(^{14}\) In contrast, the Standing Committee of the National Society passed a resolution that expressed "grave concern" about the Concordat. The Committee was troubled that the scheme was not made secure by an Act of Parliament to guarantee the teaching of denominational religion to those children whose parents desired it.\(^{15}\) The Anglo-Catholic journal, The Church Times, found it to be "insidious" for two


\(^{14}\) Michael Sadler, Our Public Elementary Schools, (London: Thorton Butterworth, 1926), 40-44.

\(^{15}\) "The Bishop of London on Church Schools," The Times Educational Supplement, (7 June 1924): 246.
reasons. First, "Church schools once surrendered cannot easily be regained," which meant that for any future national settlement the Church would bargain with reduced resources, and secondly, the Bible would be taught "as no more than a code of Christian ethics."16

Beginning with the Cambridgeshire Concordat in 1924, a public dialogue ensued regarding religious education, moral instruction, England's spiritual condition, and Christianity. This dialogue grew until it culminated in an acrimonious debate centered on a proposed Enabling Act. The heated exchanges that occurred in 1926 once again resurrected the religious controversy over the nature of religious education and especially the Church's role in teaching religion in the schools.

In response to the prevailing support for agreed upon syllabuses during 1924, The Church Times presented a lead article on the theme, the consequences of state-enforced "Common Christianity." The journal argued that Church children would experience conflict between the undenominational teaching in school and what they learned from the Church Catechism. This would result, The Church Times believed, because the content of an agreed upon syllabus would involve a compromise with twentieth century Nonconformity that viewed the

Bible more as history than divine revelation.  

Another specific Anglican concern, which for them reflected secularism's encroachments, was that the teaching of Christianity in Council schools had become mere moral instruction. A couple of statements from Michael Sadler, who had earlier upheld Anglican religious concerns are quite revealing. Near the beginning of his book, *Our Public Elementary Schools*, he made a statement that evinces an indifference regarding Christianity's influence in socializing England's youth.

Whatever be the future of the Christian religion in English public elementary schools, there is now general agreement that education must be so planned as to touch the springs of character, to inculcate allegiance to a spiritual ideal, and to teach the obligations of fellowship for the common weal.

The strength of Sadler's language was given to the various aspects of fashioning character, not to determining whether Christian education had a place in English schools. Later in his book Sadler enumerated the qualities that fashioned character. As a composite they show that moral decency not Christian faith was the essence of public elementary education.

The instruction should be specially directed to the inculcation of courage; truthfulness; cleanliness of mind, body, speech, the love of fair-play; consideration and respect for others; gentleness to the weaker; kindness to animals; self-control and temperance; self-denial;

---


18 Sadler, *Elementary Schools*, 27.
love of one's country; and appreciation of beauty in
nature and in art.\textsuperscript{19}

In an address to future teachers at Bingley Training
College Board President Eustace Percy emphasized a number of
factors that had demoted religious education to a level of
secondary importance. Time for religious education was
"pinched...by the teacher's desire to get rid of any work not
connected with the school curriculum before the period of sec­
ular instruction begins." Percy also complained of "the vague
doubt" that troubled college-trained teachers "as to how far
the Bible is trustworthy," and insisted that "we must get rid
of...the idea that it is..risky to quote Jeremiah or St.
Paul." Finally, he deplored current expressions of religious
thought that had "vulgarised" terms so that "the Gospel of
Christ" had become "the New Testament ethic."\textsuperscript{20}

At the annual meeting of the NUT, held at Portsmouth in
1926, the welcoming speech given by the Archdeacon of Ports­
mouth confirmed Sadler's assessment, of which Percy had com­
plained at Bingley that teaching "the New Testament ethic," not faith in Christ, was the business of the schools. What
the archdeacon found so similar to the Church's stress on
character was that "the members of the Conference emphasized
more and more, that their duty was...to produce good and ef-

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid 50.

\textsuperscript{20} "Religious Teaching," The Schoolmaster and Woman
Teacher's Chronicle, 110 (6 August 1926): 184.
ficient citizens." The Schoolmaster, which reported the conference, commented approvingly upon the applause which greeted the archdeacon's words, and editorialized that "a striking feature of the Conference...was the great manifestation of a will to peace on the religious question." The editorial was correct provided that religious education was acknowledged in undogmatic terms only and that Christianity was recognized primarily as fostering good character. Somehow overlooked by The Schoolmaster's glowing account of conference proceedings was the usual teachers' resolution which declared their "determined opposition to the intrusion of denominational teaching into Council Schools."23

Editorials in religious and educational journals during these same years remarked on society's apparent apathy regarding religious training and Christian practices. In an article that addressed the adolescent departure from Christian worship, Reverend W. J. Stuart Weir noted "a striking contrast between the crowded Sunday school and the small congregation which is found in Church...often half-filled [by] the elderly and middle aged."24 Canon Peter Green, rector of St.


Philip's, believed that "earning a living and the individual enjoyment of pleasure" had displaced Bible-reading and family prayers. In pungent terms Green declared the typical English attitude about praying to be "a merely perfunctory survival of childish carp." Even more distressing to the canon was the Englishman's capability to reject Christian standards "so long as you do no harm to anybody." Canon Green's analysis, along with the comments made by Sadler and Percy, indicated that sterling ethical conduct coupled with "incredible ignorance of the fundamental truths" had become socially acceptable during the 1920s.25

The irreligious sentiments that the clergy found to be prevalent throughout English society had a parallel, according to the clergy, in the schools. Reverend Charles Scott Gillett, Dean of Peterhouse, Cambridge, said "a considerable portion of [boys] keep pretty straight morally, but their moral code has no obviously essential connexion with their religion." To them, the dean continued, "The Faith" was only modern England's moral code tacked onto "a Jewish peasant...who died a long time ago." Moreover, Gillett bemoaned, these stories along with their conjoined ethical standards had been relegated by school boys "to a small clique of pious persons [the clergy] with whom they are anxious not to be officially...con-

nected.\textsuperscript{26} Weir accepted Green's observations, and concluded that "whatever the truth regarding religious training we have to face the fact that the Church has to deal with the product of the schools." Weir insisted that "the approach of the Church to the young people cannot be radically different from that of the schools" or religious teaching in the schools would fail as miserably as had "the old-fashioned Sunday School.\textsuperscript{27}

Despite the reservations of some Anglican teachers, Weir presumed that school subject matter should be subordinated to the student's interests and the student should become "a co-partner" in his own education. The adolescent was not interested in the memorization of creeds and doctrines, Weir opined, but "primarily in life as he experiences it day by day in people and circumstances.\textsuperscript{28} Moreover, this meant that certain portions of the Bible, especially within the Old Testament, ought to be regarded as irrelevant to modern societies. An evolutionary approach to history, including Biblical history, coupled with higher criticism meant some Old Testament standards were not sacred but obsolete. An anonymous school manager who wrote a letter to \textit{The Schoolmaster} applauded these pedagogical changes.

\textsuperscript{26} "The Church Congress," \textit{The Church Times}, 92 (3 October 1924): 372.

\textsuperscript{27} "The Church Fellowship," \textit{The School Guardian}, 51 (20 March 1926): 120.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid 120.
The teacher is not hidebound to any particular creed or dogma; he has an open mind to the advances made by scientific criticism and historic research; the results of modern criticism, the ascertained facts of religious knowledge, he can freely impart to the ultimate benefit of the child. The child thus taught has not to unlearn in latter years the out-of-date teaching of the unprogressive parson, who is steeped in ideas of the past and either unwilling or unable to broaden his mind to the influence of modern thought and ideas.29

Even worse than being relegated to obsolescence, "creed and dogma" had been indicted as obstacles hindering education in the classroom. For many Englishmen, even commentators in these journals, religion had become a private matter and its practice voluntary. Besides, it was not a matter of worry, The Schoolmaster opined, because the people of England "are living the Christian life and keeping the Christian morality, whether they go to church or not."30

For many Church leaders the religious sentiments of their fellow countrymen was a matter of worry. They believed it was insufficient to instruct people only with Christian ethics because "then they were teaching people to interpret the life of man in this world as if God did not count."31 In order to preserve the place of religion in national education and the role of the Church in the schools, the Church Assembly in 1924 authorized the Education Commission "to survey the present po-

29 "Correspondence," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 106 (15 August 1924): 236.


sition of the religious education question." Specifically, the Church's commission was to consider the issue of non-denominational teaching in Council schools, the steady transfer of Church schools to the local authorities, the prospect of state aid for Church schools, the Board's condemnation of old school buildings, and the Board's circular for the grouping of both Council and Church schools into central schools. In effect, the Education Commission was the Church's next response, after the failure of Davies' Amending Bill, to deal with educational developments emanating from the Fisher Act.

In November, 1924 the Education Commission presented its second report before the Church Assembly. The guiding principle given to the Assembly by the Commission was summed up in the catchy refrain, "unity of administration with variety of type." This meant that, while denominational religious teaching would be an integral part of the national school system, provision for a variety of type would be made at the local level. The Times Educational Supplement awarded the Church Assembly praise for passing a resolution that instructed the Education Commission to continue its inquiry under the report's guiding principle. The TES lead article even held out high hopes that "the drift towards secularization in education

---


33 Ibid 468.
is to be stopped and the religious rights of parents are to be secured as part of a national system no longer disfigured by dualism." The journal even foresaw England's future educational system as "inherently Christian and Progressive." 34

A more careful reading of proceedings might have elicited a less sanguine assessment. The Church Times noted that, when the Chairman announced that forty names had been entered to debate the report's findings, groans erupted from the Assembly. 35 All too often educational issues were scheduled at the end of the Assembly's session when the clergy had already expended themselves on other matters and there was little time left on the program for any discussion. Frequently this entailed postponement of the issue until the next session. In July the Assembly had resolved to hear a second report in November when the clergy voted again to hear another report at the next Church Assembly. "While the Churches talk, the children will not wait," wrote Margaret Avery, a teacher, to The Times Educational Supplement. She concluded that in the meantime a religious education all too frequently displaced by secular subjects would "make the England of the future." 36

A few months after the Church Assembly met, The School-

34 "Church Policy," The Times Educational Supplement, (29 November 1924): 479.


36 "Letters to the Editor," The Times Educational Supplement, (29 November 1924): 480.
master presciently predicted in March, 1925 that "before July the thing will be quietly dropped. In any case, no such scheme has any chance of becoming law in this country." 37 Admittedly, Anglican provisions, such as religious education committees and denominational sub-committees which were proposed to fulfill the notion of "variety of type," did not generate much enthusiasm outside the Church of England, but what sunk the Commission's report were developments in the localities that made the guiding principle irrelevant. These local developments were schemes for transfer, usually drawn up by the LEAs. Based upon the idea of the Cambridgeshire Concordat, they were attempts by the local authorities to induce the transfer of Church schools ostensibly in return for guarantee of religious instruction. These schemes eventually led to calls for parliamentary legislation, the so-called Enabling Act, that would legally sanction the local arrangements. While the Local Education Authorities favored these plans, both the Church and the NUT were reticent. While the Church feared that without a statutory guarantee no denominational religion would be taught in transferred schools, the NUT worried that the Church would somehow still teach denominational religion even after the schools had been transferred.

One of the more prominent schemes was the West Riding Concordat. Provisions eight and fourteen, quoted below, be-

37 "Notes of the Week," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 107 (20 February 1925): 305.
came the focus of controversy regarding the nature of religion in transferred schools.

The County Council will have the exclusive use of the school from 8 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon from Monday to Friday in each week, except from 9 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. on two mornings each week, to be mutually agreed, subject to the provision of Clause 14 below, and such further time as is required for cleaning.

Religious instruction in accordance with the syllabus approved by the County Council shall be given in all Council (including transferred) schools daily between 9 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. In schools transferred under this arrangement religious instruction in accordance with the provisions of the trust deeds may be supplied by the trustees on two days of each week to be mutually agreed upon to the children of such parents as may express a desire to have it, the instruction being by some person or persons appointed by the trustees. 38

Many Anglicans, as The Church Times indicated, believed that without an Enabling Act which guaranteed religious education, Christianity would no longer be taught in the schools. The religious instruction to be taught daily from a County approved syllabus would be "valueless to Churchmen" because the contents would be the result of a compromise. In regard to the provision for denominational teaching, clause 14 only stipulated the time. No details were offered concerning where and how the instruction would be given. While the NUT was apprehensive that the clergy might be given "right of entry" for two days a week, Churchmen wondered if students would have to be trundled off to another location for denominational teaching. Furthermore, without an Act of Parliament a subse-

quent election might return members to the LEA who would overturn the two clauses. All in all Church leaders felt that they were surrendering a great deal of their freedom for very little gain.\textsuperscript{39}

Despite the Church's reservations and the NUT's criticisms, the local authorities proceeded with preparations until finally in June, 1926 during the annual conference of Association of Education Committees the membership voted in support of an Enabling Act. The resolution asked "that the difficulties arising in many areas from the present administrative relations of provided and non-provided schools should be alleviated by an Enabling Act empowering local arrangements of varying character to be made to suit local conditions."\textsuperscript{40} The difficulties that the resolution referred to were the local authorities responsibility to replace or upgrade black-listed schools and the responsibility to group schools in order to provide central schools in key locations. The existing dual system was an encumbrance to carrying out these tasks. As the Anglicans so often claimed, the Church held numerous school buildings which, although many needed repairs, could be used

\textsuperscript{39} "Religious Education in Wiltshire," \textit{The Church Times}, 96 (13 August 1926): 176.

\textsuperscript{40} "Association of Education Committees," \textit{The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle}, 109 (18 June 1926): 974.
in a program of educational expansion now being pursued by the government. Sir Percy Jackson, a Nonconformist and Chairman of the West Riding Education Committee, argued at the annual conference in an exchange for legalized local agreements Christian religious teaching should be obligatory in all schools. His reasoning was based on a twofold consideration: teachers and children should not have to jeopardize their health in insanitary buildings, and English citizens should not be made to finance Church schools through the rates but rather the state be brought to manage and fund these along with the Council schools.41 Despite the uneasy feeling generated by the debate concerning who was to decide what Christianity is, the resolution did pass.

The Schoolmaster, speaking on behalf of the teachers, issued a statement containing both empathy and warning. "We understand and sympathize with the desire of administrators to get rid of the dual system [but if] the non-provided schools are still to remain non-provided schools in essence, we think the teachers will have something to say about their own position."42 The journal believed that the teaching profession was confronted by something worse than the "right of entry."


In the past *The Schoolmaster* cautioned against the prospect of clergy entering teacher's classrooms to give religious education, now it warned that the Church would use Anglican teachers within the schools to convey denominational religion. If such an activity would be permitted in Church schools transferred to state control, *The Schoolmaster* argued that there could be no logical reason for excluding the same or similar practices in "de facto Council schools."43

During the spring and summer of 1926, as support for an Enabling Act grew, teacher unions held conferences on the local and the national level in opposition to the proposed Enabling Act. At the teachers' annual conference President F. Barraclough said that the Council schools socialize "healthy, dexterous, adaptable, nimble-witted youths and maidens, clean in mind and morals" without recourse to denominational religion. In response to Barraclough's direction, the teachers resolved that "the Conference further expresses its determined opposition to the introduction of denominational teaching into Council schools."44 Once again, the teachers chose to uphold certain values, which might be classified as Christian, but not to accept a Christian faith that was dogmatic. It was not that teachers within the union were non-Christians, as C. T. Wing, former president of the NUT stressed, but that the


teachers, who were willing "to train our scholars in habits of reverence," wanted to be treated as state civil servants who would not have their politics and religion dictated to them.45

By the autumn the tone of the public dialogue on religious education, which was centered on the proposed Enabling Act, had become acrimonious. Much of this came from the teachers' side of the debate. At the end of 1926 The Schoolmaster, the NUT's organ, no longer crooned about the "peace on the religious question" but thundered that "the Church Authorities demand dominance" in the national system of education. The journal editorialized that "an agreement acceptable to the Church would be unacceptable to the NUT, whether it operated nationally or merely in a locality." The Schoolmaster drew this conclusion because the Church Assembly would only accept the Association of Education Committees' proposed Enabling Act with a statutory guarantee for definite religious education in all schools and training colleges.46 In November the debate at the conference of the London Teachers Association was disrupted when Walter Sharman declared, "The council schools exist to create citizens."47 The statement was provocative

because it implied that the Church did not; in response, some Anglican teachers threatened to walk out. Regardless of Sharman's withdrawal of the comment, for some in the NUT camp, Anglican teaching did not teach citizenship. In a letter to The Schoolmaster A. V. Parker propounded why Council school education was superior to Church school education. The immoderate terms Parker used drew the dividing line rather sharply between the two sides. In Council schools, the letter stated, religious education "is not fettered by additional dogma, nor has it to be distorted to fit a particular form of priestcraft. In day schools children's minds ought not to be befogged and bewildered with ideas of ceremony and ritual unnecessary to the Christian belief." 48

While the controversy raged within educational circles, including Anglican ones, the Church Assembly met again in November. The account written by the special correspondent for The Times Educational Supplement about the conference renders a distressing indictment of confusion with the Church. To begin with "no clear lead was given" because the sick Archbishop of Canterbury was absent; in consequence of that and of internal divisions among Anglicans, a "futile debate on the dual system" resulted. The correspondent wearily says, "The tedious afternoon was symptomatic. The education policy of the Church of England is in a morass; plenty of guides pro-

48 "Correspondence," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 110 (19 November 1926): 770.
claim their ability to find the way out, but none is able to show where the firm ground is." Since the Church was so divided on the religious education issue, and the Education Commission was, not only quite large, but also divided, the correspondent concluded that the Church Assembly had only two ineffectual courses from which to choose. "It could have produced a majority report with various dissentient documents appended; or it could have effected a semblance of agreement by putting forth abstract theorems and proposals which bear little relation to practical politics." Phlegmatically, he stated the clergy chose the latter and have "given forth an uncertain sound." 49

Even prior to the meeting, the clergy were in transition from one position to something else. After some postponements the Church Assembly had accepted its Education Commission's suggestion that England's system should be based on "unity of administration with variety of type." But, that course was pre-empted when the LEAs began to formulate local arrangements, such as the West Riding Concordat and Middlesex's Conditions of Transfer, that were dissimilar and not related to any general principle. Once the local authorities showed their seriousness for these schemes, all of which did not guarantee religious teaching in all of England's schools, by proposing an Enabling Act to the President of the Board of

Education, the Education Commission waived its own original proposals. As Frederick Holiday, secretary of the National Society, pointed out, the Church was willing to accept an Enabling Act for the transfer of schools provided that Parliament guaranteed religious teaching in all schools.\(^50\) The Church's goal was not to lose the distinctive religious character of its schools once they had been transferred and to ensure "adequate religious teaching" for pupils in all schools, including Anglican children in Council schools. The second point was what sparked the contentious controversy through the latter part of 1926 because the terminology of the requirement was indefinite but suggestive enough to Council school teachers to imply that Christianity was not being taught in their classrooms.

The Church Assembly accepted the Association of Education Committees' resolution in favor of an Enabling Act, but with conditions. The Assembly's response declared that no Enabling Act would be satisfactory without the following two statutory provisions:

- adequate religious instruction, subject to a conscience clause, as an integral part of the curriculum in all schools, training colleges, and training departments receiving rate or State aid;
- the supervision of such instruction in all provided schools, and in all training colleges and departments other than denominational training colleges, by the establishment of Religious Education (Advisory) Com-

\(^{50}\) "Correspondence," *The School Guardian*, 52 (18 December 1926): 38.
mittees, both local and central.⁵¹

The Church's ambition was that its schools and a version of Christianity, as definitive as possible, should play an integral part in the national school system. To ensure that, the Assembly added further that 1/3 of the managers of transferred schools should be appointed by the trustees.⁵² These were exacting conditions and, as the TES correspondent covering the Assembly commented, "unless the reformers can carry the teaching profession with them their measures are likely to be ineffectual in the long run."⁵³

The Churchmen did not carry the NUT with them. At a special session of the Executive of the National Union of Teachers, the leadership formulated a negative response to the Association of Education Committees' resolution for an Enabling Act and a hostile, negative response to the Church's conditions regarding the proposed Enabling Act. The statement composed for the LEAs said that "the considered opinion of the Executive is that they cannot be a consenting party to a proposal involving a variety of local agreements not yet determined and anticipating unknown legislative powers." In a closing comment W. D. Bentliff bitterly added, "What a spec-


tacle it was to see non-provided school managers in some districts managing schools 'not fit to house pigs in' simply because they were so prejudiced on religious grounds that they were not willing that the schools be placed in an education position!" 54

The week following its rejection of the proposed Enabling Act, the Executive of the NUT abruptly severed deliberations with the Church Assembly regarding the issue of religious education. During the summer, as it had become apparent that the Education Commission had lost its purpose, the two archbishops appointed a second Religious Education Commission under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Hadow, the same educational administrator who currently chaired the government's Consultative Committee on The Education of the Adolescent. The purpose of this Commission was "to inquire into the position of religious education in this country and its relation to the development of national education in all grades of education, with power to hear evidence and collect information and to formulate suggestions for the guidance of the Assembly." 55 During the autumn, at the invitation of the Church leadership, the teachers had participated individually through certain NUT members joining the Commission and officially by sending a memorandum of evidence for the members to consider. At the end of Novem-


ber, after the Church Assembly had stated its conditions concerning an Enabling Act, the Executive decided by a vote of twenty-seven to six to withdraw its memorandum.\(^\text{56}\)

Although three years of talk and efforts at the local level had come to naught, the year 1926 did not end entirely dismally. While the Bishop of Manchester’s Education Commission had unravelled by late summer, a new commission under the respected leadership of Henry Hadow, a renowned educational administrator, had been established with a wider scope and more varied membership than the previous one. This was necessary because the other committee that Hadow chaired, the government’s Consultative Committee, had issued its report at the end of the year. This report affirmed the newer view of education which insisted that the elementary schools were really a primary stage in the process of national socialization that led to secondary education for all adolescents. That the government officially supported this view meant that the proposed Enabling Act, as it had been discussed during 1926, itself, was obsolete. The last part of the decade witnessed the eventual acceptance of primary-secondary education by English society. Therefore, the vital question for Anglicans was whether they would finally abandon the dual system and allow their schools to be integrated in one, much larger educational system, even if no statutory guarantee for

\(^{56}\) "The Union and the Church Assembly," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher’s Chronicle, 110 (26 November 1926): 786.
denominational religious education could be obtained, or would they hurl themselves into the monumental task of not only refurbishing their existing elementary schools, but also building secondary schools.
In December, 1926 the government published the Report of the Consultative Committee on Education of the Adolescent. More commonly called the Hadow Report, after the name of its chairman, Sir Henry Hadow, the committee's study officially committed England to "Secondary Education for All." The program's major innovation stipulated four years of secondary education beginning at the age of eleven. During the last few years of the decade the various educational organizations and interests, including the Church schools, sought to realign themselves to the new agenda. For the Anglicans this effort culminated in the Church Assembly’s contentious debate on the report presented by the Archbishops’ Commission on Religious Education in 1929. Appearing in the autumn of that year, this inquiry, also chaired by Henry Hadow, marks the end of a distinct stage in England’s educational development between 1918 and 1931 because, as the Church attempted to commit itself with some semblance of unity to the principle of universal secondary education, the Labour Government had already submitted legislation based on that ideal to Parliament.

On January 1, 1927 The Times Educational Supplement declared the educational changes recommended by the Hadow Report
to be "far-reaching." The most famous detail stipulated that by 1932 the school-leaving age should be raised from fourteen to fifteen in order to make secondary education a reality. Since 1870 parliamentary acts had raised the school-leaving age a year at a time until the Fisher Act in 1918 raised the mandatory age to fourteen, with the proviso that the Local Educational Authorities could add one more year of voluntary attendance. Although the government had added on extra years of schooling, quite often 11+ students received an education not much different from younger children in the elementary grades. This was the unfortunate situation in rural areas where many schools still had only one or two classrooms. The compelling attraction of the Hadow Report was to restructure national education into an integrated, two-part whole. The age of eleven was to form a break between seven years of primary education and four years of secondary education. The thinking of the committee was that the first seven years of schooling would serve as preparation of four years of further education, which purpose was to prepare English young people to enter society with diverse opportunities of self-development.¹

According to the Hadow Report, "all normal children are

capable of profiting by some form of secondary education."\(^2\)
The committee foresaw English schools developing the capacities of all adolescents so that their "character and intelligence" would "determine the quality of national life" in the future. National education should not only prepare the young "to enter the various branches of industry, commerce, and agriculture at the age of 15," but also train adolescents "to delight in pursuits and rejoice in accomplishments," whether they be in liberal or manual arts. The school, then, along with the home, the State, the churches and other voluntary organizations, would become "one of many forces that go to mould the intellectual, moral and physical character."\(^3\)

In regard to the school's role in national socialization, the Hadow committee envisioned the "curricula calculated to bring their pupils into closer touch with local economic conditions and requirements of modern civilization."\(^4\) The various subjects and activities comprising the curricula, the committee argued, should be grouped into two main areas: activities promoting character development and those promoting intellectual development. The first area called for religion and physical exercises, and for the second language, litera-


\(^3\) U.K. Consultative Committee on The Education of the Adolescent. Report, 1926, xxiv, 36, 102.

\(^4\) Ibid 126.
ture, history, geography, music, science and handicrafts.\textsuperscript{5}

Religion, however, was not one of the designated subjects. While the committee members found religion, because of its underpinning for morality, to be vital for character development, they did not include it as an aspect of intellectual growth. During the 1920s this bias by the school system had been the complaint by many Anglicans who insisted, and would continue to insist, that the Christian religion should be imparted to pupils as more than just a catalyst to foster noble traits, such as self-control, loyalty, and teamwork. Many Church people involved in the schools continued to believe that Christian knowledge provided the basis for a true understanding of life.

The \textit{Report}, on the contrary, recommended that detailed instructions of religious education should not be stipulated for classroom teaching, but the "Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching for Schools" was suggested as a good guide for nondenominational religious teaching in schools.\textsuperscript{6} Sir Cyril Norwood’s \textit{The English Tradition of Education}, published shortly after the \textit{Report}, stated that the typical English child, unless exempted by a conscience clause, received about seven years of Bible lessons. Norwood calculated the curriculum of 26 hours per week as follows: 10 hours for reading, writing, and arithmetic, 5 hours for history, geography, draw-

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid 188-189.

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid 190.
ing, and singing, 5 hours for handicrafts, 2 1/2 hours for religion, and the rest of the time for drill and routine business. It was this limited amount of time given to religious instruction and practices, and more especially the nature of that religious teaching, that aroused Anglican ire.

Three years later The Schoolmaster printed a revealing interview of a teacher concerning the nature of religion in Council schools. Composed as a defense of Council school religion, the teacher's statements show clearly, even humorously, why the Church was reluctant to have its schools incorporated within a national system of education, based on the Hadow Report, but without a statutory guarantee of denominational religion in the schools.

We teach it [religion] all day long... We teach it in arithmetic, by accuracy. We teach it in language, by learning to say what we mean... We teach it in history by humanity. We teach it in geography, by breath of mind. We teach it in handicraft, by thoroughness. We teach it in astronomy, by reverence. We teach it in the playground, by fair play. We teach it by kindness to animals, by courtesy to servants, by good manners to one another, and by truthfulness in all things. We teach it by showing the children that we, their elders, are their friends and not their enemies.8

An even more notorious example, quoted in the Torquay Times, stated that "in the Council schools the children were taught that the parable of the Good Shepherd meant only kindness to

---


8 "Notes of the Week," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 115 (20 June 1929): 1240.
animals....They were told also that the parable of the Prodigal Son pointed out the necessity for taking care of one's money." Cases like these, coupled with the government's neutral and detached stance to demands by the various conflicting communions, brought The Church Times to "the reasonable fear that adequate religious teaching in schools may be lost in England."¹⁰

A 1928 government report by the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education on school books affirmed that "the supply of Bibles in many elementary schools is unsatisfactory." The report's primary concern was the "progressive impoverishment of imagination and feeling" due to the limited use of great works of literature.¹¹ But for many Anglicans the Bible was more than a part of literature.

A comprehensive article on Bible reading that appeared in The Church Times concurrently with the Consultative Committee's report confirmed that study's disheartening assessment of the declining use of the Bible in England. "Considering the place frequently assigned to Scripture teaching in modern education," the lead article proclaimed "there is no reason for surprise at this ignorance of Scripture in any class in

⁹"Notes of the Week," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 112 (22 December 1927): 1200.


modern England." Moreover, the impression given was that the Bible was unimportant, and quite often was read as literature containing subjective opinions rather than as a revelation of objective truth. In consideration of such an educational background from the Council schools, The Church Times asked "what else can we expect than a partially paganized generation?" The article concluded that "the British public, to a positively alarming extent, seems indifferent to the awfully serious question whether the writer on Biblical subjects is expounding or undermining the Faith." Unfortunately, it seemed to devout Anglicans that the combination of undenominational religious instruction in many schools, low church attendance, and indifference at home had fashioned a modern Englishman who did not know nor care whether Jesus was "His Redeemer" or "a misguided fanatic." 12

Despite the eventual challenges by some Churchmen, especially Anglo-Catholics, others received the Hadow Report with considerable rhetorical enthusiasm during 1927 and 1928. In March, 1928 the Council of Ministers on Social Questions, an association of Nonconformist clergymen, sent a supportive statement to Lord Eustace Percy, the President of the Board of Education. The Council called for "a vigorous backing" on behalf of the report and pressed "the Government at once to take measures for carrying its recommendations into effect."

12 "Is Bible Reading Decreasing?", The Church Times, 99 (18 May 1928): 585.
Like the Hadow committee, the ministers deplored "the moral and intellectual deterioration" of adolescents because of the fourteen year old school-leaving age and the limited opportunities of secondary education for most English youths. Following the leadership of Randall Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the National Society's Consultative Committee unanimously agreed to recommend that Church school managers and Diocesan Education Committees prepare to reorganize their schools as stipulated by the Hadow Report. The Consultative Committee emphasized that local funds should be set up to support the National Society and that Church teaching should be arranged for 11+ students who enter Council schools.

The Times Educational Supplement attempted to explain the general enthusiasm for the Hadow Report as the recognition by the parents, who themselves had been socialized in England's schools, that national education offered opportunities of betterment for which they could not finance. "A generation of married people has arisen," the editorial argued, "to whom their own school life had a real significance as a period when both interests and idealism were aroused, and they are anxious that their children should have the very best of what the

---


14 "Grouping of Rural Schools," Times Educational Supplement, (3 December 1927): 541.

school can give them."  

Some of the best that national education offered parents during the 1920s was a strong connection between home and school through the medical service and "open days," wherein parents could talk to teachers at school. The schools and the teacher's role in them had profoundly changed English attitudes regarding what a necessary education meant. Shortly after the publication of the Hadow Report, The Times Educational Supplement criticized the National Society for its title. "The title, 'The Incorporated National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales,'" proclaimed the TES, "is misleading." Like the Hadow committee, the journal believed that, regardless of the parents' class, every child has a right to secondary education; ideals of charity belonged to the last century.

Despite the chorus of praise, criticism of the Hadow Report's recommendations did appear, and the first organization to raise objections was not the Church of England. The London County Council at the end of 1927 accepted its education committee's report, which stated that it would not be prepared to raise the school-leaving age to fifteen. Whereas the Hadow study had set 1932 as the date for raising the age, Dr. Scott Lidgett, a member of the London Education Committee,


claimed that "ten years would be needed to meet the additional accommodation required." Scott and others on the committee found the task of constructing the buildings and training the teachers necessary for 50,000 more London students by 1932 to be impossible.

A close reading of Anglican documents from 1927 indicates that Church leaders of education also felt pressure from the economic implications of the Hadow Report. The 116th report of the National Society maintained that the organization lacked the necessary funds to make grants available to blacklisted Church schools that required renovation. Despite the special appeal made by the Archbishop of Canterbury, contributions remained inadequate. The TES concluded an article on the National Society’s report with an insightful observation about the problematic future for Church schools now. "If all were done that should be done in this matter of the renovation of buildings the Church educational authorities would still be unprofitable servants of the community unless they came into line with the educational policy of the age." The journal’s comment was a clear reference to the changed perceptions since the publication of the Hadow Report.

A common sense approach, which many both within the government and the Church had recognized, was that Council

---


schools and Church schools should be reorganized into one system. The idea, already implemented in a few communities, was that one school, whether Council or Church, should operate as the central school in a given region. The central school was to be upgraded in order to provide secondary education for local youths between the ages of eleven and fifteen. But even here problems existed. Some clergymen and even parents objected to the erosion of parish boundaries. For nearly a year in one Midland village, parents refused to bring their children to the new central school, one mile from the village.  

In an article on "the new prospect in education," The Church Times complained that reorganization based on the Hadow Report would pull adolescents "a tram-ride" away from the quasi-family life of the old school house.  

In respect of this resistance, ever increasing through the end of the decade, Percy remarked that "our policy cannot be carried out by dictation or against the wishes of those who speak for voluntary schools."  

Percy used this same optional approach with the local authorities and the Council schools during his term at the Board of Education.  

During 1927 and 1928 the educational journals printed ac-

---

20 "Grouping of Rural Schools," The Times Educational Supplement, (3 December 1927): 541.


counts of voluntary attempts to fulfill government guidelines. Portsmouth was one of a number of towns that experienced extensive suburban growth during the postwar years. The Church Times reported that "bungalows, villas and cottages are being built in almost lightning-like rapidity." With such quick suburban growth the Anglo-Catholic journal concluded that, owing to enormous costs, the Church would not be able to build enough new church buildings, let alone schools. 23

The news report of St. Albans' new school building in Manchester was a much brighter story. The Church Times recorded that "amidst obvious signs of joy and thankfulness," the foundation stone was laid by the Bishop of Manchester in November, 1927. The day's affair included a moving church service and a procession that marched to the site. Both events were attended by "a great gathering of people." At the time of the ceremony nearly all the money needed for construction had been received, but a further £12,000 was anticipated as necessary to equip the new building. 24

Eighteen months after this groundbreaking in Manchester, the St. Albans' Diocesan Board of Education declared that "they are desirous of retaining all church schools," because "they provide a safeguard against the growing tendency to a purely secular attitude towards life." Since it would be


24 "St. Alban's, Manchester," The Church Times, 98 (18 November 1927): 583.
difficult after reorganization to retain all children currently within Church schools, the diocesan policy recommended that secondary, rather than primary, schools be built. The board members had been swayed by the Hadow committee's insight which asserted that "far greater opportunities to develop a strong corporate life" existed in secondary than in primary schools. In an effort, then, to ensure the continued religious development of English adolescents, St. Albans wanted a part in secondary education. The diocese's motivation for this policy was strongly religious, as can be seen in its demand regarding religious education in Council schools. The clergy would "not give consent to a syllabus of religious instruction unless it expressly includes the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith." 25

As The School Guardian perceptively predicted in January, 1927, "obviously the response of voluntary school managers must, to a very great extent, depend on the arrangements that can be made with regard to religious instruction." 26 Previously, Anglican education activists had carried on a struggle to maintain denominational religious education for children in elementary schools. Now, after the publication of the Hadow Report, that struggle would shift to the secondary schools for the religious instruction of adolescents.


In a retrospect that surveyed the enthusiastic rhetoric along with the minimal tangible results since the Hadow Report, The Schoolmaster declared, "More prolific in pronouncement than in performance!...Undoubtedly 1928 has been notable more for the formulation and expression of ideas and ideals than for their practice or achievement." The journal, which liked Percy, found him to be a good propagandist for the Hadow Report, but, as the President of the Board of Education, it characterized him as "a man in chains." The Times Educational Supplement was much less generous to the lack of progress. After more than two years of inactivity, the TES declared in 1929, an election year, "Time is up!" In a bluntly worded article, the TES, a journal usually supportive of Anglican educational interests, thundered "either the Church must provide satisfactory school buildings everywhere or...surrender these schools and hand over the task to the local authorities."28

The problem was lack of money. "The truth is that money is wanted for a vast operation, and Churchpeople will not find it." The TES referred to the lacklustre responses made to appeals by Randall Davidson when he was Archbishop of Canterbury, and demanded that the new Archbishop speak "very plainly on the subject." In an article critical of the Anglican in-

---


ability to raise the necessary funds, the TES told how Exeter's plight was typical of the Church's predicament. At the annual meeting of the Exeter Diocesan Board of Education in 1928 the Committee of Management reported that its appeal for funds was short of the stipulated goal. The diocese wanted £25,000 for the improvement of a training college, but during the past year only £4,500 had been received.29 The Church Times disclosed an instance with even more faltering results. The diocese report for Manchester in 1928 stated, that of £100,000 solicited, only £3,592 had been received in a twelve month period.30 After a consideration of the case of Exeter, cited in the journal's previous number, and other problems with voluntary schools, the TES warned that: "The dual system in its present form is inconsistent with change, and the Church of England will have to provide either a system of central or post-primary schools especially devoted to the period from eleven to fifteen years, or to restrict its activities to purely education for the children under the age of eleven."31

Despite the journal's criticism of the Church's handling of problems centered in the dual system, The Times Educational


30 "Diocesan News and Notes," The Church Times, 100 (16 November 1928): 568.

Supplement still supported the Anglican agenda to maintain denominational religious education in primary schools and to gain that teaching in secondary schools. However, as the TES observed, the profound impact of the Hadow Report on voluntary schools might eventually mean increasingly less religious teaching in English schools. While the TES sympathized with the Anglican effort to secure "for the children of Church of England parents the religious instruction that those parents desire," at the same time "the full benefit of the proposals for universal secondary education contained in Sir Henry Hadow's Report" should not be denied English adolescents due to sectarian reasons. Sir Cyril Norwood pointed out that more than a half million youths over the age of fifteen received no education whatsoever. More than the problem regarding their lack of education, this meant that the expense devoted to re-organizing the schools had been wasted because so many adolescents had not received a full four years of secondary education.32 What could be done? During 1929 some solutions surfaced in the educational journals, a few of which proved to be controversial.

One option was to make vigorous use of the Anson by-law. This law had been passed so that children in a single school district would not be compelled to receive a religious teaching contrary to their beliefs or their parents' wishes.

In the nineteenth century the problem this usually addressed was Anglican teaching of Nonconformist children in rural areas. Since World War I, Churchmen appealed to the Anson by-law on behalf of Anglican children. The appeals increased greatly during the latter half of the 1920s under the impact of the Hadow Report. The London Diocesan Conference in October, 1928 dealt with one such appeal, but the majority was ready to make accommodation with the secular authorities. According to The Church Times a proposed resolution to adopt "some form of the Anson by-law by each of the Local Education Authorities within the diocese" was defeated because of a "prevailing spirit of caution among members." Prebendary Reginald Osborne said he did not want the Church to "alienate the existing and growing good will of the local authorities and the teachers." The concluding speaker had made a "forceful condemnation" of the resolution, and, as The Church Times caustically noted, "it was half-past five, members were anxious for their tea, and they were only too willing to take the line of least resistance that he had suggested." While the Church in the London school districts declined to offend the teachers with the Anson by-law, or any other practice designed to secure religious instruction, this was not the case in other parts of the country.

The most notorious case to appear in the papers at that

33 "London Diocesan Conference," The Church Times, 100 (26 October 1928): 489.
time concerned the Dorset letter. In late 1928 the Board of Education, still under the Presidency of Eustace Percy, had written to the Dorset Education Committee regarding the utilization of unused classrooms in Council schools for denominational religious education. The thinking behind the Dorset Education Committee, and others like it, was that it would be easier to teach students denominational religion, for those parents who desired it, on school premises rather than transport the students to and from other locations. Because of reorganization, such transport from a central school to the nearest Anglican church might mean two or three miles. This arrangement had been tried previously at York in 1925, but it had "created much perturbation among the local teachers" because they feared that the "right of entry" for the clergy would be revived. 34

In February, 1929, when the "Dorset Letter," was published in The Times Educational Supplement, an even greater perturbation was aroused. The excitement was focused on one ambiguous passage, which seemed to connote the Board's approval of denominational teaching during school hours in Council schools. The unclear passage read as follows:

It is common knowledge that local education authorities sometimes permit the premises of a council school to be used otherwise than for the purposes of the school...on Sundays or Saturdays or after school hours on other weekdays, and it may be that, if on occasion there is a room which during part of

34 "Primary School Notes," The Times Educational Supplement, (9 February 1929): 64.
the school hours is not required for school purposes, similar permission is sometimes given to use such rooms.  

Perhaps the passage was unclear to some, but not to the teachers who reacted with "a storm of protest." The Schoolmaster declared "an egregious blunder" on the part of the government. Moreover, the teachers' journal added, "if the intention of the Board of Education were to raise a hornet's nest around the old question...of "right of entry", its initial step, in the shape of the letter to the Dorset authority, may be adjudged a complete success."  

A correspondent writing for The Times Educational Supplement in March predicted that "perhaps a fight is inevitable." The correspondent believed that the National Union of Teachers parlayed their slogan, "No Right of Entry," to pose more as the "right of exclusion" for anybody but themselves. Managers who treated the school building as private property, he remarked, would only add another obstacle to the reorganization of all schools within one system of national education.  

The "storm of protest" was not limited to denunciations in The Schoolmaster. That spring at Llandudno the TES reported that at a great gathering of teachers at the annual NUT  

35 "Local Authorities' Notes," The Times Educational Supplement, (2 February 1929): 57.  


37 "The Case For "Right of Entry,"," The Times Educational Supplement, (2 March 1929): 97.
conference, the assembly erupted into cheers when Frederick Mander denounced the "Dorset Letter." The NUT, he asserted, "must put caution before courtesy, professional principle before politeness, and religious safeguards before everything."38 Riding high on anti-denominational enthusiasm, the teachers overwhelmingly passed a resolution "that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in schools provided by public money." The conference, however, did set a theoretical boundary beyond which it would not transcend, when it rejected an amendment demanding that "definite religious instruction" should be proscribed from "all schools supported by public funds."39 The key point of distinction was the term, "definite," which for the teachers did not connote dogmatic instruction. Through the 1920s the NUT opposed Christianity taught according to a catechism, but not a nominal Christianity conveying a minimal influence on character development. Most members agreed with Leah Manning who said England was not, and should not, become "a secular country."40

Meeting at the same time as the NUT, the Joint Federation Committee of Evangelical Free Churches and the National Coun-


cil of Evangelical Free Churches addressed the increasingly contentious issue of religious education. Like the teachers' union, the Nonconformist churches opposed "right of entry," but the Joint Federation Committee also formally objected to the state's maintenance of the dual system, and passed the following resolution:

The committee is strongly opposed to any policy of providing building grants out of national funds in aid of establishment of non-provided schools, as tending to denominationalize national education, to stimulate the building of unnecessary schools, and thereby to waste the resources available for securing the efficiency and progress of national education. 41

This resolution was passed one month prior to parliamentary elections, when Anglican educational organizations sought commitments of financial aid from the parliamentary candidates. Unable to raise enough money for Church schools through voluntary contributions, the Church Schools Emergency League solicited candidates during the campaign with a questionnaire that asked "would you support a measure to give more just and considerate treatment to denominational schools?" 42 Just prior to the actual voting the Conservative Party offered a positive answer. Point 5 of the party platform stated: "Local Authorities are encouraged to negotiate arrangements with voluntary bodies and are offered greater freedom as to


the terms of such arrangements and full financial support in carrying them out." Although the Conservatives did not win the election, their party response to the Anglican query reintroduced the controversy over religious education once again into the realm of politics.

The election results, especially in regard to the formation of a new Labour Government in June, 1929, inspired many of the educational journals to offer commentary upon the event. Not surprisingly, The Schoolmaster was most euphoric in its praise regarding the composition of the House of Commons. "The new Parliament contains, perhaps, a larger leaven of members with practical experience in teaching than any previous assembly." The Schoolmaster was particularly appreciative of the new President of the Board of Education, Sir Charles Trevelyan, who served briefly at that post in 1924 during the first Labour Government. With Trevelyan as the President, The Schoolmaster envisioned more cooperation and consultation between the Board and the teachers in and administrators of the schools. Both The School Guardian and The Times Educational Supplement expected a "continuity of general policy," but believed "that the pace will be quickened in certain directions under the new Labour Government." These journals saw that "certain direction" to be the raising of the


school-leaving age. Whereas "Lord Eustace Percy was tempted to delay the raising of the compulsory school age to fifteen years until, in the judgment of the local authorities, the country is ready for it," the TES and The School Guardian anticipated either administrative or legislative action by the government.  

During June, as the Labour Party began to form the new government, pressure began to mount for some action to be taken by the Board on the key aspects of the Hadow Report. At the end of the month the Association of Education Committees resolved that the school-leaving age should be raised immediately, and, if necessary, maintenance allowances should be given to "necessitous children" to continue at school an extra year. The Local Education Associations were concerned to know the government's intentions because their schemes of reorganization for the next three years would be affected significantly by a later age of graduation. In July, when the king's speech did not mention the school-leaving age, The Schoolmaster chided the Labour Government for an apparent reneging of a campaign promise.

45 "Labour and Education," The Times Educational Supplement, (8 June 1929): 263.  
Finally, at the end of July just before the end of the parliamentary session, Sir Charles Trevelyan announced in Commons that the Board of Education would raise the school-leaving age. "After weighing all the circumstances [the government] have decided to prepare the necessary legislation to raise the school age to 15 as from April 1, 1931." Moreover, he added, "I am at once asking representatives of the Local Educational Authorities and professional bodies to meet me with a view to consultation and cooperation." The ex-President of the Board, Lord Eustace Percy, responded with a long letter of disagreement printed in *The Times Educational Supplement*. "There is not a single large city and hardly a single county where the work of reorganization can be completed by 1931." Without willing cooperation from the voluntary schools, he added there would not be enough school places in the schools provided by the state. The ex-President called for "a reconsideration of the whole question of the relations between the State and the non-provided schools" so that the managers of these schools would freely cooperate with the local authorities to ensure a successful and financially feasible reorganization by 1931. As indicated by informative statements in educational journals throughout the first half of 1929, that "reconsideration" of relations entailed

---
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state aid to voluntary, or non-provided, schools and a statutory guarantee of denominational religious teaching in Council, or provided, schools.

During the autumn, after Parliament had resumed session, Trevelyan took measures to raise the school-leaving age, first with a Board of Education circular and then with a parliamentary bill. Circular 1404 stated two key points regarding the raising of the school-leaving age. First, the age would be raised by April 1, 1931 and, secondly, the government would provide increased funds for the local authorities to refurbish old buildings and to construct new ones.50 While the circular's promise of state aid to the localities evinced the government's acceptance of the Hadow Report in regard to Council schools, no mention of state aid to voluntary schools for reorganization meant even greater financial difficulties for Church school managers. At the time of the circular's publication The Schoolmaster knowingly announced that it would wait for the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Religious Education to see how Church interests coincided with the circular's provision.51 This report appeared in November, one month before the new Education Bill was read in the House of Commons. Because of this particular controversial issue with the related subject regarding what type of religious education


would be taught in state provided secondary schools, and also because of the sensitive topic regarding maintenance allowances for poor parents to keep their children in school until fifteen, *The Schoolmaster* predicted that the President of the Board must bring an Education Bill before Parliament.\(^5^2\)

In December, just before Parliament's Christmas recess, Trevelyan announced an Education Bill in Commons. The bill contained the following key provisions: mandatory school-leaving age of fifteen throughout England and Wales, (2) the effective date to be April 1, 1931, (3) maintenance allowances, based on need, for adolescents to remain in school until fifteen, and (4) the Exchequer to increase funding to LEAs from 50% to 60%.\(^5^3\) Although Trevelyan intimated that he wanted the bill to become law before the end of 1930, very little was stated on the bill’s details. In fact, he avoided sensitive issues such as public payment for an extra year of schooling. As 1929 drew to a close, the long-term, controversial issue of religious education in English schools erupted again in public debate after the contentious wrangle held during the Church Assembly.

The clergy assembled in November to discuss the report presented by the Church's Commission on Religious Education. This was the first Church Assembly presided over by


\(^{53}\) "Raising the School Age," *The Times Educational Supplement*, (21 December 1929): 561.
Cosmo Lang, the new Archbishop of Canterbury. After twenty-five years of leadership Dr. Randall Davidson had resigned the previous November. Unfortunately for developments in Anglican education, Lang experienced three years of ill health during his first three years as Archbishop of Canterbury. Five years ago the two archbishops had appointed the commission on July 10, 1924, and set it under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Hadow. Some of the distinguished members on the Commission included three bishops, Sir Cyril Norwood, Athelstan Riley, Cyril Cobb and Harold Macmillan, MPs, and Lillian Faithfull, ex-Principal of Ladies’ College in Cheltenham.  

"The stream of eloquence flowed on through the afternoon," reported The Church Times, "many laudable sentiments being expressed...but few constructive proposals." That the commission had presented two, not one, reports was the catalyst for so many oratorical displays which produced few positive results. The debate over the Commission on Religious Education divided along lines of support for the Majority Report versus the Minority Report. Expectedly, The Schoolmaster upheld the Majority Report, and predicted a renewal of "acute controversies...if the views of the Minority Report

---
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Likewise, The Times Educational Supplement applauded the Majority Report, asserting "the format of the main report is admirable....It reads like a judgment delivered by a great Judge in a great cause rather than a report by a body of commissioners to a departmental authority."\textsuperscript{57} In contrast to those pleasantries, The Church Times wrote "a gloomy report." The angry tone of the lead article complained that the Church was inclined to accept the Majority Report because of "unreasonable fears of a trade union of teachers."\textsuperscript{58}

Although the two reports differed in quite a few details, two key topics garnered most of the attention at the Assembly and in the educational journals. Despite differences in phrasing, both reports believed "the State should make building grants [available] for the reorganisation of Voluntary schools."\textsuperscript{59} Fulfillment of this item would require an Act of Parliament, but the one being fashioned by Trevelyan while the Assembly debated did not include a provision for building grants to voluntary schools.

On the second issue, the nature of religious education to be taught in Council schools, the two reports were diametrical-

\textsuperscript{56} "Religious Education," \textit{The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle}, 116 (31 October 1929): 703.

\textsuperscript{57} "Religious Education," \textit{The Times Educational Supplement}, (2 November 1929): 483.


cally opposed. The Majority Report read:

That there should be no repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause. We desire to call attention to the valuable work for Religious Education that can be done and is being done in many places under that clause.

But the Minority Report stated:

We recommend that Parliament should pass a one-clause Bill empowering Local Education Authorities to make such arrangements as they think fit for religious instruction for all children in the schools of their area, in accordance with the religion of their parents, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Cowper-Temple clause.

Whereas the Minority Report asserted that "Cowper-Templeism" did not meet the Archbishop's Three Principles, as enunciated by Dr. Davidson in 1921, the Majority Report emphasized the importance of friendly cooperation on the Church's part with the local authorities and the teachers. The sentiment behind the Majority Report saw the dual system and the insistence upon denominational religion as "a declining element in the national system." On the other hand, Majority Report supporters recognized "the teachers had advanced...so notably, that their views on the main question could not be ignored." The smaller group behind the Minority Report at the Church Assembly also recognized the NUT's strength, but rather than favor "friendly cooperation," these Anglicans admonished that "the dominating influence of the school...is so strong, that it overpowers the influence of both the home and the Church."

---
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Moreover, fifty years of "Cowper-Templeism" in the Council schools "has been to...endow it in this country...as a rival to the Church's religion." 62

During the debate at the Church Assembly the chief spokesmen for each side were the Bishop of Durham, Herbert Hensley Henson, and the Bishop of Gloucester, Arthur Headlam. Speaking on behalf of the Majority Report, Henson, a critic of Anglo-Catholicism and an advocate of close ties with the Free Churches, bluntly accused the Anglicans of harboring an "attitude of hostility." In fact, he believed that "there was a chronic hostility on the side of the Church against the whole process of the Council school." 63 Only a small, active minority pushed for denominational religion in the schools; meanwhile, he believed that most of the English people, as the NUT has said, were content with undenominational teaching. He concluded his speech by predicting "the bleak and ruinous victory of naked secularism" in the schools if Anglican educational activists prolonged conflict. 64

In rebuttal to Henson, the Bishop of Gloucester retorted that the source of England's religious problems was within the Council schools. "The cause of most of their religious dif-
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ficulties at the present day and the alienation of a large number of people from institutional religion simply arose from the fact that they had had an education which alienated them from it." He accused the Church's Commission of weakness because it did "not press" the cause of religious education. He implied this lack of resolve was due to Anglican trepidation before a government successfully lobbied by the teachers' union. This accusation brought the Bishop of Liverpool to his feet to protest against the alleged revelations of the innerworking of the Commission. He emphatically asserted "there was no such point at which the Commission was inclined to the view of the minority report." Unflustered, Headlam concluded that, rather than compromise on vital issues, "they should ask quite definitely for a share of the local authorities' 50 per cent. grant for the reconditioning of their schools."

Many other clergymen, besides the two bishops, spoke. The speeches were lengthy and, as The Church Times remarked, the oratorical displays continued on but with few positive results. No vote was taken on either report at the Church Assembly in November, 1929. The clergy did, however, pass two
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motions unanimously: (1) state funds to be given to voluntary schools for reorganization and (2) appointment of a committee to meet with the government regarding reorganization's impact on non-provided schools. The first resolution both reports supported, and that accounts for the unanimity within the Church Assembly. The second resolution, although garnering a unanimous vote, really postponed a definite stance by the Church on the issue of religious education. Hence, the Assembly's decision on which report to choose was postponed until next year after a committee had met with the government.

In the meantime, Church organizations began to mobilize the cause of government funding for voluntary schools involved in schemes of reorganization. In December, when Trevelyan unveiled his Education Bill, the York Education Committee passed a resolution in favor of government funding for voluntary schools. In part, the resolution read:

That the York Education Committee recognizes that the managers of the non-provided schools are committing themselves to very large expenditure in carrying out alterations and improvements to their schools as part of the scheme for reorganization undertaken by them in co-operation with the authority....therefore...assistance should be given out of the public funds to the non-provided as well as to the provided schools, in the carrying out of such alterations as are approved by the Local Education Authority.

So, as the Labour Government prepared legislation to facili-
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tate the reorganization of schools based on raising the school-leaving age to fifteen, Anglicans groped towards unity in order to ensure continued religious teaching in secondary schools and to gain for Church schools public funding made available by the government for Council schools.
CHAPTER VII
THREE FAILED BILLS, THEN THE DEPRESSION

During a fifteen month period, November 1929 to February 1931, the President of the Board of Education tried, but failed, to carry three different pieces of educational legislation through Parliament; in frustration Sir Charles Trevelyan finally resigned from office in February, 1931. The course of the third bill through the House of Commons nearly brought the government down a month earlier. As usual, differences over religious education among the various denominational interests and the teachers generated enough controversy to inhibit a smooth legislative process. Added to England's prevalent problems which impeded a solution of the dual system were the country's mounting economic difficulties. Finally, in 1931 England plunged into a depression, and the Labour Government toppled. Swamped by financial problems, Parliament and the newly formed National Government quietly set aside the religious issue, which only months earlier had confounded the legislature. Determination to balance the budget had superseded attempts to fulfill the provisions of the Hadow Report. Educational reorganization would have to endure the prolonged depression.

The prospect of secondary educational reform had still
seemed positive in January, 1930. Just a month earlier an enthusiastic and optimistic President of the Board had introduced a bill to raise the school-leaving age in the House of Commons. "Notwithstanding the plea for delay made by the London County Council," maintained The Times Educational Supplement, "it seems probable that the promise that the School Attendance Bill will become law this year will be carried out."¹ Renewing its oft repeated refrain, the London County Council stated that it could not accommodate another year of schooling by April 1, 1931. "We are convinced," the council insisted, "that the problem of the supply of teachers cannot be solved by April 1, 1931."²

The Times Educational Supplement firmly disagreed. "If London and the other great cities will go on with their schemes on the assumption that the Government will stand by the Bill which is already introduced, there should be no difficulty."³ With a reference to the case of the Wolverhampton Borough Council, the TES even contended that local authorities were "justified" in developing their schemes of reorganization based upon Trevelyan's commitment to carry the Bill through Parliament. An editorial in the journal concluded

¹ "The Supply of Teachers," The Times Educational Supplement, (8 February 8, 1930): 59.


this theme with the following declaration: "The local authorities must act on the Government's reiterated pledge and prepare for the extension of the school age on April 1, 1931." The Buckinghamshire Education Committee, however, was not impressed by the President's personal pledge. In a published statement the committee pointed out that without an Act of Parliament "the reorganization of elementary schools in the country is largely in abeyance." Even more boldly, the committee demanded that the government pronounce in favor of building grants for voluntary schools. Then in April, the Association of Education Committees resolved that "the raising of the school age should not come into operation until September 1932." For the next year the local authorities' recalcitrance was a major obstacle in the way of a smooth legislative passage. Later that year both sides of the House hotly contested the degree of political support offered by the LEAs.

That a local authority, like the Buckinghamshire Education Committee, would demand public money for voluntary schools was a stunning development. It once again reintroduced the religious issue, but this time from a different, and unexpected source. From the perspective of the Local Educa-


5 "Raising the School Age," The Times Educational Supplement, (1 March 1930): 94.

tion Authorities direct financial aid to the voluntary schools constituted indirect assistance to LEAs engaged in reorganizing the schools in their localities. Without the voluntary schools involved in reorganization, the local authorities' responsibilities would become financially burdensome, if not prohibitive. The shock of Buckinghamshire's statement was received most strongly by the National Union of Teachers.

Early in the new year the Executive of the NUT held a special public conference. As stated in The Schoolmaster, the meeting was quickly arranged to consider "the question of denominational encroachment in provided schools." During the winter of 1929-1930, as Trevelyan introduced the School Attendance Bill in Parliament, the Anglican clergy had gathered at their annual Church Assembly. The clergy had debated the two reports presented by the Archbishops' Commission on Religious Education. Although the Church Assembly had not decided definitely upon a stance at the end of 1929, the teachers viewed it as propitious to meet at the beginning of 1930 in an attempt to forestall any Anglican efforts to amend the education bill now in Parliament. In particular, many teachers were alarmed by "radical changes in the Cowper-Temple settlement" that the NUT claimed had been carried out by the local authorities under Church pressure. 7

Many of the teachers at the public conference had become

agitated by practices in some localities wherein teachers in Council schools could volunteer to give denominational religion. Speaker after speaker at the conference castigated such arrangements as "reactionary proposals." Cheers erupted when ex-President of the teachers' union, W.W. Hill, said "a teacher receiving his salary out of public funds...had no right to devote a part of his time within that contract to servicing a sectarian or political interest." The teachers closed their special meetings with a resolution that warned of "the interference which is being attempted by religious bodies...in provided schools, and...the attacks which are being made upon the Cowper-Temple Clause." For the teachers this clause, which originated with the first Education Act of 1870, meant that under no circumstances should catechetical teaching be given in Council schools. Finally, the resolution instructed "the Executive to resist any attempts by religious bodies to participate in the control of religious instruction in provided [or Council] schools."

Not all teachers at the special conference supported the resolution. A few were even aghast that Walter Bentliff would consider denominational teaching in Council schools, voluntarily given, as being put "under the heels of the parson and of the clergyman." A disdainful comment cast at Hill, as well

---

8 Ibid 13.

as others agreeing with him, was that his "spiritual home
seemed to be Soviet Russia." The primary spokesman for this
minority within the National Union of Teachers was William
Merrick. During the conference he declared that the true mo­
tive of the Executive was "to squeeze the life out of the non­
provided system." Merrick had some difficulty delivering his
speech because of the outraged cries of "No" that hailed his
accusations.¹⁰ Despite this hostility, Merrick persisted in
his criticism of official union policy regarding the volun­
tary schools. Merrick and the small minority associated with
him within the teachers’ union showed that on the issue of de­
nominational religious teaching the NUT, itself, was as di­
vided as the Church Assembly. Part of the explanation for the
division within the NUT was that some teachers, like Merrick,
were as devoted to the Church as they were to their profes­
sion. Although the National Union of Teachers officially
spoke with only one voice, through the next twelve months, as
the various educational bills floundered in Parliament, a mi­
nority called for accommodation with both the Anglicans and
the Roman Catholics on religious education.

The special public conference of the Executive of the NUT
attempted to influence, or even preempt, private sessions be­
tween Trevelyan and Anglican leaders. At the Church Assembly
held in November, 1929 the clergy had agreed to organize the

¹⁰ "Special Conference of the N.U.T.,” The Schoolmaster
Committee on Elementary Schools and Schemes of Reorganisation to act as a negotiator with the Board of Education. The Churchmen hoped that the committee would prevail upon Trevelyan to include some provisions favorable to Church schools in his Education Bill. The Archbishop of Canterbury especially hoped that the bill would "permit Local Education Authorities...to give grants...to non-provided schools in order to enable the managers...to cooperate with schemes of reorganization."\(^\text{11}\)

During January and February, when the committee met with Trevelyan, the sessions proceeded smoothly: Cosmo Lang, chairman of the committee, reported that the President was favorable to the Church’s presentation. This favorable reception was in part due to the resolution reached by the clergy at the Church Assembly which met early in the new year. Unable to reach a decision in November, the clergy resolved in February "that the general proposals of the Majority Report of the Archbishops’ Commission on Religious Education...be approved."\(^\text{12}\) The Times Educational Supplement asserted that the adoption of this report, rather than the Minority’s, would facilitate "the solution of the problem of dual control" because the Majority’s approach was not to deal "with adversaries but with allies and friends." The TES foresaw the voluntary

\(^{11}\) "Church Schools," *The Church Times*, 103 (10 January 1930): 30.

schools as participants in reorganization now that the basis for cooperation had been laid between the Church and the government. With much less ebullience The Church Times agreed, but added, "whether the conclusion can be anything but a compromise, in which the cause of real religious education is the sufferer, remains to be seen."

The Church on the basis of the Majority Report hoped to add two key provisions to the education bill now in Parliament: public funds for voluntary schools to be made available through the LEAs and the continuation of denominational religious teaching for Anglican children who transferred from Church primary schools to Council secondary schools after the age of eleven. To gain these provisions many Anglicans had become reconciled to additional public control over schools that received increased public funding. Furthermore, they agreed to use some form of the Anson By-law to remove Anglican children from Council schools for denominational religious teaching rather than to insist upon the "right of entry" for clergy into Council schools. But the Minority Report supporters found this basis for compromise defective. Athelstan Riley, a member of the House of Laity and author of The Religious Question in Education, wrote in The Church Times "all hope...is gone." Moreover, Riley suggested that "the


younger readers of *The Church Times* might cut this letter out and look at it again in ten or twenty years' time." The implication was that Church schools would soon be lost. With a similarly pessimistic tone *The Church Times*, soon after February's Assembly, increasingly adopted a critical assessment of the Church of England's on the religious question. Through the next twelve months, as the journal surveyed the vicissitudes of three education bills through Parliament, editorials shifted their praise to the Roman Catholic Church.

Through the winter and into early spring progress on the School Attendance Bill seemed to be stalled. In March the Secretary of the NUT, F.W. Goldstone, wrote to Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister of the Labour Government, to request that "precedence should be given to the Education (School Attendance) Bill in the Parliamentary programme," even over trade union legislation. But it was more than a full slate of labor legislation which had halted progress on the bill. Pressure from the various denominations, especially the Church of England, had brought Trevelyan to reconsider the provisions within the School Attendance Bill.

Trevelyan at the diamond jubilee conference of the NUT in April indicated that he had assented to Anglican petitions. *The Times Educational Supplement* in its shrewd comment on

---


Trevelyan's presence at the NUT conference remarked that "Parliamentary action on the vexed question of building grants to voluntary schools could have no chance of success without the general agreement of the parties concerned." Since the President had consented to certain Anglican demands in February, now he had to solicit the teachers' support before he could amend the education bill in Parliament. On behalf of the children in the schools, Trevelyan asked the teachers to favor local arrangements to bring voluntary schools within reorganization. "It should be possible for grants to be given for enlargement and reconditioning," he stated, "but in the return for the giving of public money there is to be a large measure of public control." At that point in the conference the teachers cheered, but they had not yet seen the Board of Education's White Paper.

The White Paper, issued by the Board in April, contained eight proposals to facilitate "complete reorganization" as envisioned by the Hadow Report. These proposals were derived from the meetings Trevelyan had held with the various denominations, certain LEAs, and some teachers. Of the eight proposals the first three were the most significant. They provided the crux of the next two education bills and, owing to the controversy that these provisions generated, they served as


the reasons for why the bills failed in Parliament. Therefore, the three items, sometimes referred to as the Concordat, are quoted below in their entirety:

Where the enlargement, reconstruction, or improvement of a non-provided school is required to give effect to reorganisation proposals approved by the Board of Education, a Local Education Authority may make an agreement with the Managers of that non-provided school to give such grant as is necessary for such enlargement, reconstruction or improvement.

Where such a grant is made the teachers of the school concerned shall become the servants of the Local Education Authority and shall be appointed and removable by them.

The managers shall, however, have the right to be consulted and to be satisfied that such and so many of the teachers of the school as are necessary for the purpose are willing and competent to give special religious instruction in accordance with the provisions (if any) of the Trust Deed and as required by the managers. 19

Despite less than complete satisfaction, the Archbishop of Canterbury asked the Church to accept the White Paper. In accepting the proposals as "common ground" between the various parties, Lang reasoned that "grants for Church schools buildings must carry with them some fuller measure of public control. That might or might not be logical," he mused, "but it was quite unavoidable in the circumstances of our English public life." 20 The Church Times demurred and labelled the pro-

---


posals "precarious beyond words." "What is the Church to receive?" the journal asked. "Money. What is the Church to lose? Religious influence." Whereas Cosmo Lang, on behalf of the Anglicans, reluctantly accepted the government's offer, Archbishop Bourne, on behalf of the Roman Catholics, flatly rejected it; for this action The Church Times found Bourne to be "perfectly consistent with the principles for which the Church exists."21

On May 19 Trevelyan withdrew the School Attendance Bill from the House; three days later he laid a new bill, called The Education Act, 1930, on the table of Commons. The new measure included the Concordat plus maintenance grants for necessitous families which had children in school between the ages of fourteen and fifteen. The estimated cost of these grants for the first year was £3,000,000.22 Both of these features would become sources of contention during next week's debates in Commons. Immediately upon the new bill's introduction, the teachers' union responded. The Executive of the NUT sent a memorandum, based on the previous April's conference resolutions, to the MPs expressing the teachers' sentiments. The Executive's stand against denominational teaching within a reorganized education system "deprecated any legislative proposals which would lessen the present tendency

for non-provided schools to be transferred voluntarily to the full control of the local education authority." This statement is most revealing, and suggests that Merrick's accusation made earlier in the year about the Executive's real intentions was to the point. A second significant statement viewed "representatives of the denominations to a committee of the local education authority" as a violation of the principle of "no right of entry." Finally, the Executive insisted that the new education bill provide a conscience clause for teachers. 23

Considering the strong influence that the NUT had in Parliament, and that some NUT members were MPs, the debate on The Education Act, 1930 promised to be lively.

On May 29 Trevelyan introduced the Second Reading of the bill. He attempted to focus the House members on the first clause, which was the provision to raise the school-leaving age to fifteen, and declared "we are going to give another year's education to 400,000 of our children." 24 The Schoolmaster, on the day that Trevelyan spoke, affirmed the Education Minister's view in its lead article on the second education bill. "The country is definitely committed to the policy of the Hadow Report. Clause I of the Bill," the journal argued, "is an essential part of that policy." The ar-

23 "The Union and Religious Instruction," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 117 (22 May 1930): 1015.

24 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 239. (1930), col. 1513.
ticle, however, concluded pessimistically: "it is to be regretted that the paramount purpose of the Bill has become involved with other issues....No Bill is now possible without some accommodation between the conflicting forces."  

After his opening statements Trevelyan addressed the confusion caused by contending interest groups. He attempted to mollify the various factions by admitting "the arrangement proposed does not to the full satisfy any opinion in this House." He added that "we must all take less than our ideal, and we must take it for the sake of the children." His method to reach a national agreement on the religious question was based on three salient points. First, he did not expect the voluntary schools to be given up any time soon. Secondly, he would provide financial aid to these schools only with a definite increase in public control. Finally, he would allow the local authorities and the voluntary school managers to make uncompelled arrangements for reorganization amongst themselves. Trevelyan hoped that the House would accept this compromise in order to achieve the provisions of clause one, but instead, he was followed by seven hours of contentious debate.

About three hours into the debate Ernest Evans, a Liberal, summed up rather well the problems surrounding The New

---


26 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 239. (1930), col. 1527.
Education Bill, 1930. Evans addressed his speech first to the maintenance allowances and then to the Concordat (provisions one through three of the White Paper and clauses two and three in the bill). He accurately analyzed that the issue of the maintenance allowances had turned the Conservative Party against the bill. Even some Liberals had reservations about maintenance allowances with a lenient means test during the current economic downturn. With only 26 more Labourites in Commons than Conservatives, Trevelyan could not afford to alienate the 59 Liberals in the House. However, as The Times Educational Supplement noted, "some Liberal members insisted that it was impossible for them, on religious grounds, to support a Bill which provided for the use of State money for denominational schools."27

This became apparent in the House when Evans proceeded to show how the Concordat was a major obstacle hindering the bill's passage. He characterized the bill, especially three subsections of clause two, as "panic legislation." He especially objected to the veto powers implied in subsection (c), which stated "the local authority shall consult the managers and shall not appoint [a teacher] unless the managers are satisfied as to his willingness and competence to give...religious instruction."28


"will be entitled to inquire of every applicant for a post what his religious views are," James Chuter Ede interjected, "in every voluntary school they do that now." Evans retorted, "every one knows that they do it in voluntary schools now, but under this Bill those voluntary schools are going to have a new relationship with the State." He interpreted that relationship to mean "they will be for all practical purposes State-aided schools." It was precisely this interpretation which compelled some Anglicans, and now even more so the Roman Catholics, to reject increased public funding if that entailed increased public control.

Whereas the official Anglican voice had stilled since the Church Assembly in February, the Roman Catholics voiced increasingly frequent protests. In Parliament that voice belonged to John Scurr. Scurr was a Labour MP, yet he threatened to vote against the government's bill on the Third Reading if amendments favorable to Catholic interests were not accepted during the Committee Stage. In demanding Catholic teachers in Catholic schools, he also defended the dogmatic ideals which many Anglicans had now seemingly surrendered.

I want to make it perfectly clear that mere facilities for the imparting of religious instruction, no matter how dogmatic that religious instruction might be, do not meet our claims at all. We regard it as the duty of the parent to see that the child is properly educated. We regard our faith as part and parcel of the everyday life of the individual, not as something in a separate compartment. Therefore, it

29 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 239. (1930), col. 1589.
becomes absolutely necessary that Catholic children should be brought up in a Catholic atmosphere, and that, our schools being regarded as an extension of the home, the teachers in those schools must be imbued with exactly the same ideas, in order that that atmosphere may be maintained.\(^{30}\)

In reaction to Scurr's Catholicism another rift in the government's slim parliamentary majority appeared. William G. Cove, a Labourite and ex-President of the NUT, responded to Scurr's challenge with similar tactics. "Just as my hon. Friend will put down Amendments, we too, perhaps from a slightly different angle, will have to put down Amendments in Committee."\(^{31}\) In Commons Cove enunciated the usual teacher complaint against denominational encroachment in Council schools. Whereas Scurr found that clause two threatened the place of Catholic teachers in Catholic schools, Cove complained that it did not afford full authority to the LEAs in teacher appointments.

He objected also to the absence of any conscience clause for teachers in the bill. Cove presented the NUT view that teachers, as public servants, should only render secular service to the state. He feared that the many recently fashioned agreed upon syllabuses would compel teachers to give denominational religious education in Council schools. "The simple Bible teaching of Cowper-Templeism no longer obtains in many areas, and I am afraid that it is correct to say that in and

\(^{30}\) Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 239. (1930), col. 1543.

\(^{31}\) Ibid col. 1571.
through the agreed syllabuses there has come into the council schools creed and dogma in the religious education of the children."

Cove’s argument for the conscience clause in Parliament was based on the memorandum sent to all MPs a week earlier by the NUT’s Executive. Its view of religious teaching in Council schools saw up to the 1920s a form "free from denominational and dogmatic influences." "It would be true to say that the main emphasis has hitherto been upon those truths which bear directly on life and conduct and which contribute to morality and good citizenship." As proof, the memorandum claimed that of 225 LEAs reporting to the government on religious teaching 43 did not even use the word, Christian. But, during the last decade, a period of reorganization facilitated by agreed upon syllabuses, the memorandum found religious teaching in Council schools to become "dogmatic, doctrinal and controversial." The Oxfordshire Syllabus was cited as one outline that confessed Trinitarianism, taught creation "out of nothing," and emphasized the Gospel of St. John.

Such complaints reveal why many Anglicans since 1870 had determinedly fought for denominational religious teaching. The religion that the NUT officially espoused was one devoid of the supernatural and which regarded God only as a conveni-

---
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33 "The Union and Religious Instruction," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 117 (22 May 1930): 1015.
ent concept to sanction ethical behavior. The Church Times accepted the memorandum's history on religious teaching in Council schools since the Education Act of 1870, but did not approve of the consequences. In the conclusion to an article on "Syllabus Religion" the journal quoted Benjamin Disraeli's prescient comment on the Cowper-Templeism established by the Education Act.

You will not entrust the priest or presbyter with the privilege of expounding Holy Scripture to the scholars; but for that purpose, you are inventing a new sacerdotal class, the schoolmaster, who will exercise an extraordinary influence upon the history of England and upon the conduct of Englishmen. 34

Despite the lengthy speeches critical of the legislation, the bill did pass the Second Reading, 280 votes to 233 votes. "Though there was never any doubt that the Second Reading of the New Education Bill would be carried on Thursday night," The Times Educational Supplement wrote, "it cannot be said that the reception given to it in different quarters of the House of Commons has been a favorable omen for its early passage into law." 35 After the Second Reading educational organizations and activists mobilized against the bill. This pressure convinced Trevelyan at the end of June to withdraw the measure before the Third Reading.

For the London County Council, the largest educational


locality in England, the reservations in May about the new bill were the same as the ones advanced in February about the first bill. Its reaffirmed opinion said maintenance grants should be borne by the state, not the LEAs; the April 1 deadline for the raised school-leaving age was too soon; and not enough extra teachers were available.36 Even before the Second Reading, the Assembly of the Congregational Union resolved that it "cannot agree to the provision for grants for...non-provided school[s] unaccompanied by full public control, nor to proposals which give statutory authority to the application of religious and denominational tests for the appointment and dismissal of teachers."37 The Christian World, an organ of the Nonconformists, declared these provisions in the bill to be "retrograde proposals" that extended "a new endowment of Romanism and Anglicanism."38 Such strong and vocal Nonconformist animosity to the bill meant that Trevelyan would not have the needed Liberal support to carry the bill on the Third Reading.

Eventually, even Anglicans voiced protests against the bill. This dissenting Anglican voice was heard during June most prominently in The Church Times and in resolutions passed


by Anglican organizations determined to save Church schools and maintain denominational religion within them. Similar to Roman Catholics, this Anglican voice rejected promises contained within the White Paper. Writing in *The Church Times*, William James Brown, Director of Religious Education for Wakefield, criticized the White Paper's eighth proposal, which allowed the withdrawal of children from classes, "if desired by their parents," in Council schools for "special religious instruction" off school premises. This proposal had been inserted in May as clause three of the new bill. In the future, Brown predicted, religious education would be given in England only if the parents asked.39 Proceeding under the assumption that "if we take the money, sooner or later we shall lose the schools," some Anglican organizations turned against the bill. In June the Church Managers' and Teachers' Association urged all Church School managers to recondition their buildings "without asking for a grant from the Local Education Authorities" and recommended that financial assistance be provided "by the diocese, with the help of the Church Assembly and the National Society."40

In the middle of June, just before the Third Reading, the National Society held its annual meeting. As led by the Arch-

---


bishop of Canterbury, the Anglican teachers' association was as indecisive and ambiguous about the New Education Act as the Anglican clergy over the White Paper at their Assembly earlier in the year. Cosmo Lang commenced the meeting with a speech that justified the nature of the compromises contained in the White Paper. Without the compromises stipulated in the White Paper "there would be no chance of any Bill getting even into, still less through Parliament," the Archbishop argued. It was therefore politically necessary to accept greater public control of Church schools and to drop the demand for denominational religious instruction to be given to Anglican students within Council schools. Still Lang maintained that the White Paper, now embodied in the bill, upheld most of their principles. He closed his speech with an uncertain, even contradictory, conclusion. His longer statement seemed to support those few Anglican activists who were determined to uphold denominational religion and Church schools, but then followed promptly with a sentence that acceded to the forces behind the bill.

I hope, however, that where it is possible we shall fulfill our own honourable obligations to meet the requirements that are made upon our schools out of our own resources, so as not to be obliged to meet the conditions of these public grants. I hope there will be a steady support of our own diocesan needs, and an increase in the income of the National Society.

I trust the proposals may result in a Bill which will enable the Church to co-operate with the State in this

---

new stage of education, and to bring into it its own traditions of religious education.\textsuperscript{42}

Not surprisingly, \textit{The Church Times} adopted a more critical perspective of the politics behind the White Paper. "The truth is, of course, that the fear of the teacher has dictated this proposed arrangement." Although the Anglo-Catholic journal readily admitted "that our sympathies in this cause are with Westminster and not with Canterbury," \textit{The Church Times} did print an empathic article explaining the primate's difficulties. "Unlike his predecessors in pre-war days," the essay argued, "he has no political party behind him." The Conservatives, who during the nineteenth century were the Church party, had taken an undenominational position since World War I. Meanwhile, according to this analysis "Liberal Parliamentarianism is as anti-Church as ever...and the Labour party tends to be secularist."\textsuperscript{43} Compounding these external problems were the internal divisions on the religious question among Anglicans, themselves. Therefore, the Church, noticeably since the resignation of Dr. Randall Davidson, had assumed a passive stance, or, as Canon Walter J. Brown phrased it, "the Church appears to be a little too eager to accept what other people have to offer."\textsuperscript{44}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[42] Ibid 190.
\item[44] "Church Schools," \textit{The Church Times}, 104 (22 August 1930): 215.
\end{footnotes}
When the government withdrew the bill in June, Prime Minister MacDonald explained that it would not pass Commons without a prolonged session. He said that the President of the Board would introduce another, less complex bill in the autumn designed simply to raise the school-leaving age. Such a bill, as The Times Educational Supplement correctly assessed, would substantially be like the first education bill which had been introduced in December, 1929. Without the Concordat the TES predicted that Trevelyan would gain the strong support of Liberals in Parliament to compensate for minor losses among the Labour MPs. Once the school-leaving age of fifteen had been made law, the TES assumed that a fourth education bill to provide financial aid to voluntary schools for the purposes of reorganization according to the Hadow scheme would be introduced.

After the next session of Parliament had begun in the autumn, pressure for the third education bill mounted. A deputation, including Leah Manning of the National Union of Teachers and representatives of the Workers' Educational Trade Union Council, met with Trevelyan in October. The delegates sought assurances that the third bill would pass through Parliament without delay. The Education Minister received the delegates supportively, and reassured them that "the Bill will be in the forefront of the programme for this Session." Fur-

thermore, he stressed "we have every intention and expectation of carrying it before Christmas." Trevelyan believed this schedule was possible because "the Bill will be necessarily short," omitting clauses about the voluntary schools.46

Trevelyan's publicized statements to the teachers' union and their associates perturbed the Local Education Associations. The excitement mounted in early November when the Education (School Attendance) Bill passed its Second Reading by a vote of 294 to 227. In an article supporting the local authorities' interests, The Times Educational Supplement warned that "the Bill cannot be carried out effectively by the date proposed." If the bill became law by Christmas, as Trevelyan promised, the proposed date of April 1 afforded the local authorities "a bare three months to prepare." Remembering the recent past, the TES sardonically quipped, that even now, "local authorities have no assurance...that the Bill will pass."47 To defuse criticism from the LEAs, Trevelyan accepted under protest a delay in the date of operation from April 1, 1931 to September 1, 1932.

In the hope that he would hold a majority on the Third Reading, Trevelyan granted another concession. Liberals, like David Lloyd George, questioned the wisdom of giving money dur-

46 "The President and the Bill," The Schoolmaster and the Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 118 (23 October 1930): 628.


ing a recession to parents to send their children to school. The Education Minister said he would allow a means test for maintenance grants. It would be conducted by the local authorities who would review an applicant’s income prior to awarding the allowance. The TES reported that the Labour Party assented to both concessions in order that this time the bill would become law.  

In response to the apparent good fortune, the National Union of Teachers sponsored a public demonstration in London at the end of November. The Schoolmaster reported "a large and representative gathering" at the rally. During the proceedings representatives of the local authorities, workers' educational associations, the teachers, and the trade unions welcomed "the introduction of the Education Bill to raise the school-leaving age to 15, and [urged] the Government in the national interest to take all possible steps to complete the remaining stages of the Bill as soon as possible."  

However, during the week of their public celebrations, the NUT convened a hurried session of the Executive. The special session was prompted by a letter received by the Executive from William Merrick and C.W. Cowen. These two members, especially Merrick, once again renewed debate over the

---


sensitive issue regarding the union's dealings with the voluntary schools. The letter claimed "there is a considerable body of opinion, inside and outside the Union, to the effect that the Executive regards Non-Provided Schools as more or less necessary evils to be endured temporarily and squeezed out gradually." For evidence the letter cited the Executive's opposition to an enabling bill in 1926, its response to the Dorset Letter in 1929, and its lack of cooperation with Anglican educational bodies. "Whilst this feeling exists in the country, in the House and in the Union, the chance of reaching an agreement becomes remote." Because of the Executive's attitude, if not its actions, Merrick and Cowen feared that the latest education bill would not pass Parliament.⁵⁰

In a speech at the special meeting Merrick demanded that the Executive clarify its position. "Are we out to eliminate every Church and Catholic school from the national system or do we desire simply to secure unity of control?" Clarification, he said, should include a definitive statement about the issues of equal public funding for all schools and the appointment of teachers for religious education with clerical approval.⁵¹

Similar to the response accorded him at the Executive meeting held in January, the reception given Merrick was dis-

⁵⁰ "Special Executive Meeting," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 118 (27 November 1930): 839.

approving. The overt rebuttal was once more led by Frederick Mander and Walter Bentliff. The former accused Merrick of disingenuousness. He claimed that Merrick did not want a clarification of policy but a change in Executive policy. For that he saw no need because in his "own experience in going about the country" he had not observed "any widespread dissatisfaction." To substantiate Mander's claim, Bentliff recounted the usual story told in the NUT about the consternation caused by denominational religion. In his rendition the crying mother nervously approached the headmaster to inform him that she must withdraw her child from the Council school. When the perplexed headmaster inquired why the mother was dissatisfied, the woman responded that she was quite pleased with the education given. But--and here Bentliff delivered the familiar and appreciated punch line--the mother moaned, "the priest said the child must attend the school." Predictably, Merrick's motion was defeated by a large majority, despite Cowen's plea that the Executive set aside the teachers' professional interests and consider first "the 2,000,000 children in the non-provided schools where reorganization would not take place, unless some help was given to them." 52

As the NUT solidified its ranks around an educational bill without any vestiges of last spring's Concordat, the Ang-

52 "Special Executive Meeting," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 118 (27 November 1930): 839.
licans and the Roman Catholics voiced their disfavor. The Standing Committee of the National Society expressed its "anxiety...at the failure to secure legislation for enabling voluntary schools to take...part...in the reorganisation of the schools." Unless there is some form of "co-operation" with the Church schools, the resolution predicted "a failure to carry out the reorganisation proposals" or "a gross and unwarranted expenditure of public money." The Roman Catholic approach was more direct. The hierarchy sent a memorandum to sympathetic MPs which pronounced that "in a really democratic nation there should be no distinction between provided and non-provided schools--all schools should be provided. For the people who demand religious education, schools should be provided; for those who do not demand it, schools with no tests for teachers should be provided." The Catholics wanted a clause added to the bill which would authorize 50% state funding to voluntary schools for re-organization. The Catholic Labourite Scurr intimated that he would be willing to vote against the government if the bill were not amended with the 50% grant.

For a third time in 1930 the legislative process was disrupted. Unable to assure enough support on the Report Stage of the bill, Trevelyan delayed discussion of any amendments


dealing with voluntary schools until after the new year. Before Parliament would resume session in 1931, Trevelyan told the House that "he was arranging for a conference of the major interests involved in the voluntary school question...to try to find a solution satisfactory to the country." As the year closed, it seemed that once again Trevelyan was shifting politically to accommodate the outspoken denominational interests. In response to this perceived shift, the National Educational Association sent a circular of protest to the Commons. The protest expressed dismay that "frequent suggestions of private negotiations are being made," and annoyance at religious interests that raised "side issues...in a somewhat threatening manner." The alignment of irreconcilable interests had formed again to defeat the bill in January.

On January 13 and 14 Trevelyan met with representatives of the LEAs, the teachers, the Anglicans, the Roman Catholics, and the Nonconformists at the Board of Education. The meeting had been called in response to Scurr's threat that the Catholic Labour MPs would vote against the government. Hence, the purpose of these meetings was to discuss the possibility of including in the bill state financial aid to the voluntary schools. The participants drew up fourteen proposals which were acceptable to the representatives of all groups except

for the Nonconformist delegation. Overall, the fourteen proposals were quite similar to, in some instances the same as, previous compromises, such as last year's White Paper.

Some of the more significant provisions, but those found unacceptable by the Free Church representatives, included the following. The first proposal permitted the Local Education Authorities to make arrangements with voluntary school managers for the purposes of raising the school-leaving age to fifteen. The fifth proposal stated that voluntary schools under the agreement would be reimbursed "not less than 50 per cent., and not more than 75 per cent. of the cost by the Local Education Authority" for reorganization. Provisions nine and ten stipulated a category of "reserved teachers" and prescribed the methods to appoint such teachers for giving religious teaching. Proposals thirteen and fourteen provided provisions for religious teaching in schools and allowed for "special religious instruction" for children withdrawn from Council schools. 57

Parliament resumed session a week later without the Education Minister having attained agreement among all parties interested in the religious question. Without Nonconformist consent Trevelyan could not support the fourteen proposals in Commons because he risked losing Liberal support for the bill.

Therefore, once the House took up the Report Stage of the bill, Scurr moved the following amendment:

[The Education Bill would] not come into operation until an Act has been passed authorising expenditure out of public funds, upon such conditions 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. 58

Despite a lifetime of involvement in labor and social reform movements and with "a feeling of grave responsibility," Scurr moved the amendment on the behalf of 41 MPs who were prepared to vote against the government unless it was added to the bill. He said that this was not a wrecking motion, but that he acted "in obedience to what one considers to be a higher claim." Apparently, Scurr set his Roman Catholic beliefs before his politics. 59

Scurr's actions caused a stir both in the House and the educational press. The Schoolmaster, in its detailed account of the debate, reported that "members were unusually excited." Canon Brown, writing for The Church Times, heralded Scurr's House speech "a notable utterance." The Times Educational Supplement correctly saw that "we are back in the old position." The amendment reattached the religious issue to an administrative reform. Trevelyan had been bedeviled with this difficulty twice before in 1930 with the two previous bills.


Now he was confronted with the problem again in that the denominational interests would not allow him to reorganize secondary education without also addressing the demands of voluntary schools.  

After Scurr sat down, Trevelyan rebutted with a speech that attempted to defeat the motion. "They had no right to make the fortunes of the children wait on the settlement of a religious controversy," he complained. The Education Minister appealed to his House colleagues to pass the current education bill first and wait until further private meetings had united all educational interests on the religious question. "The moment I can get such a general agreement," he assured the House, "I shall put up to my colleagues in the Cabinet concrete legislative proposals." Lord Eustace Percy, who spoke for the Conservative Opposition on educational issues, was unimpressed. He asked Trevelyan, "Why has not the right hon. Gentleman brought down to this House the proposals which he has put before the Conference, proposals which we all know there is an overwhelming majority in this


62 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 5th ser., vol. 239. (1931), col. 205.
House?" Percy answered his own rhetorical question, thereby explaining the political realities in Commons. "He has refused to do that simply because there is a section in this House and outside which dislikes those proposals and would like them further amended." Percy's statement referred to Nonconformist interest groups and their Liberal supporters in Commons. Trevelyan did not want to alienate them on the matter of religious education because Liberal support in Commons was vital for the Labour Government's rule.63

"The debate itself was...very restrained in tone," reported The Schoolmaster. Speaker followed speaker with strongest support for the bill shown by Liberal criticism of denominational interests, but "a dramatic and unexpected intervention into the debate was made by the Prime Minister just before the vote was taken."64 The Schoolmaster continued with a lively account of the incident.

The Schoolmaster continued with a lively account of the incident.

The fact that the Prime Minister replied for the Government increased the excitement which was spreading through the Chamber, now crowded in every part. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's intervention provided significant evidence of the fears obviously entertained by the Government Whips that they could not command a majority of the House.65

MacDonald's speech seemed to sway some Catholic Labour members who "leaned over and urged" Scurr to withdraw his amendment.

---

63 Ibid col. 238.


"but Mr. Scurr was adamant." During the House division "cheers broke out and handkerchiefs were waved," generally by Conservatives, when it was seen that Scurr had positioned himself "on the right of the four Tellers." The tally showed that the government had been defeated by 32 votes. 66

Stanley Baldwin, leader of the Conservative Opposition, questioned whether the government, in consideration of the vote, would continue that evening with debate on the bill. Percy even proposed that the House adjourn so that Commons could reconvene later to consider the bill's practical problems. He referred to the amendment's impact on the local authorities who once again faced the dilemma of whether or not to proceed with schemes of reorganization. In response to these queries, MacDonald said that "the Government would continue its negotiations and would do their best to overcome the difficulties put in their way by the Amendment." The Prime Minister held that no principle was involved in the vote. "They would go on with the Third Reading." 67

Debate on the Third Reading was brief and anti-climatic. Now that Scurr's amendment had been attached to the bill, Liberal MPs, who had supported the Education Bill on the


Second Reading, now expressed reservations. "In these circum-
stances, it is difficult to know what should be one's course," Walter Runciman admitted. Rhys Hopkins Morris, another Liberal, was more certain. "In my view, the Bill ought not now to receive a Third Reading from this House but ought to be thrown out," Morris declared. He reasoned further that "religious instruction ought to be confined to the churches and the home." Runciman predicted that associations of Free Churchmen would find the amended bill "out of the question." He was correct; in early February the Joint Education Committee of the Federal Council and National Council of the Free Churches passed a resolution asking the government to increase public control over voluntary schools.

By a majority of eighteen votes the Education Bill passed the Third Reading and moved up to the House of Lords. "The debate was for the most part a desert of dullness," wrote the parliamentary reporter for The Schoolmaster, notable only because "Lord Eustace Percy and other leading Conservatives listened to the proceedings, in order to have the satisfaction of seeing the Second Chamber carry what they had been unable to induce the First to perform." On the Second Reading the

---


Lords defeated the government’s bill by such a "crushing majority" that The Church Times predicted there would not be another appeal to raise the school-leaving age "for a considerable time." The Times Educational Supplement blamed the government’s defeat on the bill’s wording. "The draftsmanship of the Bill in the form submitted by the House of Commons was almost an insult to the House of Lords." However, the TES added that Archbishop Lang’s absence because of illness was a "calamity." No leadership was demonstrated among the clergy, and "some fifty percent. of them abstained even from attendance at the debates."71 The Schoolmaster reporter concluded differently, and assigned the Lords’ "hostility to the main principle of the Bill" as the cause. Then, writing in a personal manner, he disclosed his prejudice in the article’s conclusion.

After listening carefully to the greater part of the debate, I came away with the distinct impression that there is little chance for real educational advance until this assembly of irresponsible old gentlemen has been deprived of the power of putting barricades in the path of progress.72

Although the House rejected the bill, Lord Hailsham pledged that the Conservative Party in the House would support an education bill with a clause providing aid to voluntary

72 "A Voluntary Schools Bill," The Times Educational Supplement, (23 May 1931) 195.
schools. In the meantime, The Church Times saw "a very grave position of affair." It bemoaned the fruitless educational developments during the last two years. Circular 1404, announced in the autumn of 1929, had inspired local authorities to reorganize their schools for secondary education up to the age of fifteen. Church schools had been forced into fund drives or to limit their education to the primary level. For the immediate future Walter J. Brown advised that local authorities ought to revise their schemes of reorganization based on a lower age. 73

One day after the Education Bill’s defeat in the House of Lords, Sir Charles Trevelyan wrote his letter of resignation which he submitted to the Prime Minister in early March. He informed MacDonald that "I do not wish to be any longer in part responsible for a general policy which I regard as ineffective." Trevelyan had dissatisfaction other than in regard to educational matters. "For some time I have realized I am very much out of sympathy with the general method of Government policy." He referred to the worsening economy which he believed required "big Socialist measures." 74 Trevelyan’s resignation was an early signal that in the near future the Labour Government, including any possibility of educational reform, was in trouble. Concerning the educational matter,

73 "The Rejection of the Education Bill," The Church Times, 105 (27 February 1931): 266.

The Schoolmaster explained Trevelyan’s departure as follows:
"The compromise he effected and endeavoured to effect tempered the enthusiasm of many of his supporters, and those which he was unable to effect only served to raise fresh impediments."75

Hastings Bertrand Lees-Smith moved from Postmaster-General to become the new President of the Board of Education. Lees-Smith had been a Liberal before and during the war, and then joined the Labour Party in 1919. Despite the ominous economic signs and Trevelyan’s three failures, the new Education Minister intended to proceed with implementing the Hadow reforms. His plan was to use the Parliament Act of 1911, and have the Education Bill pass through three successive Parliaments, if necessary. But, as The Schoolmaster observed, even if the Bill became law, it could not become effective until another bill passed authorizing use of public money for non-provided, or voluntary schools.76 In the meantime, Lees-Smith encouraged local authorities to carry out local schemes of reorganization. According to Administrative Memorandum no. 83, the government would continue the 50% grants to Council schools so that LEAs could proceed with secondary education, first for three years and then for four years. By the middle of the decade the Board of Education anticipated that


76 "Notes of the Week," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher’s Chronicle, 119 (19 March 1931): 496.
Parliament would have passed the necessary legislation for four years of secondary education.\textsuperscript{77}

In April the National Union of Teachers held their annual conference at Yarmouth. Much of the union’s focus that spring reflected on the parliamentary failures during the winter. President Angus Roberts opened the conference by declaring that "those who rejected the Bill in the name of a national economy have been guilty of intensifying the gravest of all our national problems." His statement referred to the unemployed youth. Instead of having a full four years of secondary education, he said their "school has become the corner end of the next street."\textsuperscript{78} Part of his speech also dealt with the recent religious controversies. He set the NUT squarely against the teaching of purely secular education, and said "it is impossible to separate religion and education." His subsequent explanation reveals the very different understanding of religion that the NUT held in contrast to many Anglicans.

A good teacher with a real sense of vocation, who recognizes that religion is something to be lived as well as taught, cannot teach passionlessly and irreligiously. Education is a form of religion, which includes the love of truth and beauty, the making and developing of character and the capacity for service.\textsuperscript{79}

It was precisely this teaching which invoked "a form of reli-

\textsuperscript{77} "Continuity of Board’s Policy," The Times Educational Supplement, (11 April 1931): 133.

\textsuperscript{78} "The Great Yarmouth Conference," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher’s Chronicle, 119 (10 April 1931): 647.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid 647.
gion," rather than taught a religious content, that many Anglicans, of course, wanted to keep out of Church schools.

During conference proceedings a sharp division of opinion on the religious question--now a regular feature of NUT meetings--surfaced. As usual, W.W. Hill and Walter Bentliff led the majority of union members to reject a motion that sought a solution to the religious wrangling. As an amendment to the resolution which called upon Parliament to raise the school-leaving age "without delay," James Chuter Ede moved the following clause:

With that object in view, Conference would welcome a reasonable solution of the difficulties of the dual system and requests the Executive participate in any negotiations having that end in view. 80

Ede told Hill that he "should live in the realms of reality," and realize that passage of the bill without a resolution of the conflict over religious education made the bill's passage through Parliament virtually impossible. The majority of members, however, listened to Bentliff who advised "to keep this religious business out of the debate this morning," and rejected the amendment. 81

Later that spring the National Society, the Anglican teachers association, held its annual meeting. Much of the meeting was focused on the recent parliamentary events. In the aftermath of the bill's defeat Archbishop Lang admitted

81 Ibid 688, 690.
"it was not often that the Society's annual meeting was held in circumstances of greater educational confusion." Despite the "very embarrassing uncertainty," Lang reminded the members "their primary interest was with the welfare of their own non-provided schools, particularly in regard to the schemes of reconstruction." Now that public aid would not be forthcoming in the near future, he wanted to preempt an increase of school transfers to the LEAs. The Times Educational Supplement agreed with the archbishop, and claimed "with the extinction of the voluntary schools a different atmosphere may be created." The TES feared an increase in secularism because "the fact that the voluntary schools in the past have ensured by their standard of religious teaching a similar standard in the council schools is undeniable." 

To encourage Anglican educational activists not to "lose heart," Richard Holland sent out a circular to the secretaries of the diocesan boards and associations. He inspired them to "fulfill our own honourable obligations to meet requirements that are made upon our schools out of our own resources." But "that attrition still continues is revealed by the latest report of the Board," wrote The Times Educational Supplement.

---


83 "Church Central Schools," The Times Educational Supplement, (25 April 1931): 149.

While both Council and Roman Catholic schools had increased their class rolls during the second half of the decade, the Church lost 73,000 pupils. The Church Times reported that over a twenty-five year period from 1903 to 1928 Anglican schools had decreased from 11,687 to 9,842.\textsuperscript{85} Statistics issued by the Board of Education for 1930 categorized average attendance by the following ranks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Schools</td>
<td>3,672,267 (66.21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Schools</td>
<td>1,436,424 (25.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Schools</td>
<td>370,961 (6.68%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schools</td>
<td>66,350 (1.19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Society's annual financial report indicated a drop in contributions also. Whereas in 1929 £23,731 had been collected, for 1930 only £21,981 had been received. The Church Times attributed the decline to the recession, "not to lack of interest in the Society's work." The Diocese of Canterbury revealed a similar waning financial response for a fund drive. The Archbishop regretted he had written a large number of letters to people in the diocese, but in many cases he did not even receive an acknowledgment.\textsuperscript{87}

By the summer of 1931 England's deepening recession had

\textsuperscript{85} "Primary School Notes," The Times Educational Supplement, (6 June 1931): 216.
"Religion in the Schools," The Church Times, 103 (14 February 1930): 185.

\textsuperscript{86} "The Month," The School Guardian, 55 (21 February 1931): 73.

also become a financial crisis for the Labour Government. In August the Report of the Committee on National Expenditure, chaired by Sir George May, estimated that £13,600,000, including a 20% teacher pay reduction, needed to be cut from educational expenditures in order for the government to balance the budget. Moreover, the committee's Majority Report added a few other severe requirements. The government should make an immediate withdrawal of building grants, reduce the number of "free places" for students in secondary education, and definitely not raise the state grants to LEAs to 60% as proposed. 88

Such startling news, especially the proposed teachers' pay cuts, swept most other news items off the pages of the educational journals. Barely noticed was the second report of the Hadow Committee, officially called the Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School. As the TES reported, this second report was "a necessary supplement" to the first Hadow Report on the education of the adolescent published in 1926. 89 The committee's area of inquiry was on England's educational system up to the age of eleven, with a special focus on the years seven to eleven. The second report confirmed the key finding of the first in that the educational

system should have two integrated levels, primary and secondary. The purpose of primary education should "arouse in the pupil a keen interest in the things of the mind and in general culture, fix certain habits, and develop a reasonable degree of self-confidence, together with a social or team-spirit." 90

The report devoted more than a hundred pages to primary school curriculum in order to achieve that purpose, but only two pages each were set aside for religious teaching and character training. Similar to the first Hadow Report, the one on primary schools was very satisfied with Council school syllabuses. While the report stated that "the teaching of religion is at the heart of all teaching," much of the instruction was for the development of character. 91 The goal of that training was "to inculcate good manners, courtesy and consideration for others, and to develop in the children self-reliance, self-control, thrift, punctuality, kindness to animals and fair play." 92

Writing in The School Guardian, Herbert Lyde Hargreaves, the inspector of schools for the Diocese of Southwark, disagreed with the Hadow committee's assessment of the agreed upon syllabuses. Students, Hargreaves wrote, "have gained verbal knowledge about Christianity at the expense of love and

91 Ibid 155.
92 Ibid 203.
admiration for it." Moreover, he said that teaching religion as only Bible incidents and persons related to "the historic past" would cause the child "to departmentalize his studies" and not relate them to his life.\textsuperscript{93} Very little attention, especially after the publication of the Report of the Committee on National Expenditure, was given to the second Hadow Report in the educational journals.

Instead of discussing the degree of educational advance possible in England, the educational journals debated how much retrenchment was necessary. In August The Church Times published a leaflet written by the Bishop of Peterborough. The bishop declared a Christian's duty during a depression was to "heartily co-operate with all the measures which the Government (no matter what Government) and Parliament take to restore stability to our national finances."\textsuperscript{94} The Schoolmaster disagreed vehemently, and labelled the call for a 20% pay cut as "savage and ludicrous." The journal knowingly predicted that teachers would "not willingly or easily make the special and invidious sacrifices demanded of them."\textsuperscript{95}

In September, The Schoolmaster reported that about 6,000 teachers assembled in London to protest the pay cuts. Four


halls were needed to accommodate the throng which listened to intemperate rhetoric broadcasted over loudspeakers. Angus Roberts, President of the NUT, declared "the Government would find, if they went on with this thing, that it would be bad for the children and it would be bad for education; and they would discover that an embittered teacher might become a social danger." After the speeches had been given, the teachers amid loud acclamations carried unanimously the following resolution:

That this mass meeting of members of the N.U.T. and L.T.A. protests emphatically against the Government's indefensible proposals to reduce teachers' salaries; it voices the bitter resentment of teachers that they should be selected as a special class for harsh and unjust treatment; and it pledges itself to support the Executive of the N.U.T. in strong and determined measures to resist this penal and vindictive cut. 96

By early autumn, not only had Lees-Smith, the Minister of Education, stepped down, MacDonald had resigned as Prime Minister. MacDonald immediately returned, however, to become Prime Minister again in a coalition with Conservatives and Liberals. Together they formed the National Government to deal with the financial crisis. One step taken by the National Government, much appreciated by the teachers, was to reduce teachers' pay only 10%. "It is evident that the Government, at long last, has endeavoured to find a basis for the treatment of public servants...more in accordance with the principl-

ple of the equality of sacrifice."97 In a letter to the Workers Education Association, MacDonald said "it is the intention of the Government that the education system...shall come to no real harm." The Prime Minister even foresaw some "new development."98

Two months after the formation of the National Government, an election was held in October, 1931 to seek a vote of confidence from the electorate. During the campaign, much to the chagrin of educational activists, the education issue was ignored. "There has seldom been a General Election in which educational policy held so small a place as in the present contest," according to The Schoolmaster.99 Writing in The Church Times, Canon Walter Brown noted that the issue of voluntary schools was scarcely raised. Moreover, he said "in very many areas the Hadow proposals for reorganization have been suddenly dropped."100 The National Union of Teachers viewed this development and other retrenchments in educational reforms with alarm. It circulated an election manifesto which protested that "the efficiency of the education system is it-

97 "No Longer 15 per cent.," The Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle, 120 (24 September 1931): 431.


self threatened."^{101}

Both The School Guardian and The Church Times closed the year with articles that reflected on the state of England's religious life both within the schools and more generally within society. At Romford Parish Church in November Henry E. Oliviers preached on religion's irrelevancy in contemporary England. Oliviers believed that since 1870 the combination of non-catechetical religious teaching in the Council schools and the acceptance of biblical criticism in society had undermined England's long-standing, traditional understanding of the Bible. "We are living in a day which does not take [a] violent line against the servants of Christ," concluded Oliviers, "because people feel that what the Christian Church stands for is anyhow disappearing before the march of events."^{102} The Church Times confirmed Oliviers's thesis that secular interests were gradually eroding the traditional content of Christianity. The article incisively satirized a church that was "crowded to capacity" when a special service on "The Sacrament of Beauty" was held. The service's purpose was "the education of public opinion in regard to the need of the preservation of natural beauty in town, suburb and country." This aim was not much different than what NUT leaders wanted as the goal of religious education in the schools. "The para-

---
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dox is simply," concluded the journal, "that, in the main, where the Gospel is most faithfully preached the people are not interested, and, in the main, where the people are attracted the Gospel is not so faithfully preached." 103

The year 1931 began with the defeat of Trevelyan's third education bill in Parliament; it ended with a depression. Swamped by the world's economic problems, England's goal for educational reorganization was lost as the year closed. Securing secondary education for all English adolescents seemed uncertain in the immediate future, and that same indefinite fate held true for the Church's role in national education. As a guide to the dim future, the two archbishops called a day of prayer for January 3, 1932. The petitions were "a way through the economic difficulties," and "a revival of true religion." Cosmo Lang and William Temple believed that the latter petition addressed "the need that lies behind all other needs." 104


CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Trevelyan’s resignation as Education Minister after the failure of his three bills betokened more than the incompetence of the Labour Government’s education policy. With the outset of the Depression it marked the temporary end of further educational reform by the government. But, more than that, it denoted the country’s inability to add a religious amendment to the Fisher Act. Through the 1920s the abortive attempts to amend in a religious direction 1918’s secular piece of educational legislation constituted the primary story in the nation’s educational history. Without a resolution to the thorny religious question, as shown by Trevelyan’s valiant failures, further secular educational reform was impossible.

Although significant, this theme, which centers on Church-State relations, and thereby constitutes the first area of analysis as defined by Charmian Cannon,¹ is really only a part of the history of the religious question in national education. The second and third areas of analysis, defined by Cannon in her article as the schools and the influence of re-

igious teaching in society, comprise the other significant story in England's educational development during the inter-war years. This dissertation has examined only part of that period, 1918 to 1931, and through the voice of Anglicanism has considered the religious question in institutions other than the political. In this study I have been especially interested in addressing the Anglican concern that during the first half of the twentieth century England was abandoning its traditional Christian heritage and was becoming a secular society. Anglican apprehension on this matter centered on what outcome would be improvised for the Church's role in national education and religion's place in the schools. On behalf of that assessment this dissertation has ascertained some evidence.

This is shown, first, at the beginning of the period under examination when the Fisher Act was passed. During 1918, as Herbert Fisher, President of the Board of Education, maneuvered the bill through Parliament, he successfully sundered the religious question from the legislative process. An examination of both the debates in Parliament and the bill's clauses shows little evidence of religious sentiment or content. Fisher was even able to perform this feat with the public blessing of the Church hierarchy and the acquiescence of Anglican educational associations. In part, this process, especially in Fisher's case, was an attempt to avoid the religious uproar that had exploded in 1902 over the Balfour Act.
Subsequent events, however, show that the Fisher Act serves as a convenient dividing line between the older days when the religious controversy was fueled primarily by denominational animosity to a newer time when the contending educational parties arranged themselves according to what many Anglicans insisted was the issue of secularism. Of immediate consideration here is Fisher's failure to carry a second bill that addressed Anglican religious concerns through Parliament. During 1918 Anglican educational interests had remained quiet on the religious issue and openly supportive of Fisher's legislation, with the understanding that the Education Minister would promptly carry through Parliament a second bill that directly addressed religious education in English schools. Although Fisher tried with his proposals in 1920, he did not succeed. And what was Fisher's failure at the beginning of the decade became Trevelyan's failure at its end. Part of the explanation for Fisher's difficulties relates to England's worsening economy as the new decade opened, during which Fisher could not even implement proposals from his own bill. But, also very important, was the Anglican inability to generate national support for the Church's educational agenda.

This was shown most clearly when Thomas Davies' Amending Bill did not receive a second reading in the House of Commons. Although this bill provided for the Anglicans' two main concerns, some form of state relief for the Church schools' financial burden and a statutory guarantee of religious teaching
in all schools, many Anglicans believed that Davies's bill gave too much control of the Church schools to the local authorities. During 1922 and 1923 this fear manifested itself in numerous resolutions in associations such as the National Society against the Davies' bill and in the founding of organizations such as the Church Schools Emergency League, designed to sustained Church schools within the existing dual system.

Davies' Amending Bill failed not only because of minimal Anglican support, but also because of the teachers' union's opposition. A comprehensive understanding of twentieth century educational developments in England, including the religious issue, cannot be made without reference to the National Union of Teachers. During the 1890s the NUT was gaining in prominence, and, after the Nonconformist uproar over the Balfour Act, replaced the Free Churches as the main foil to Anglican educational interests. The power of the NUT, as an organized interest, was demonstrated throughout the 1920s during contentious matters such as Davies's Amending Bill, the local enabling acts, and Trevelyan's three failed bills. This development involved more than just a change in activists; it shifted the debate over religious education from one about what type of denominational teaching should be given in what schools to one debating whether any denominational religion should be in the schools.

Debates within the National Union of Teachers at the de-
cade's close are informative in this regard. Two sides had formed around the sensitive issue concerning whether the leaders in the union did not have as their hidden agenda the expulsion of the Church's role in national education and the elimination of religious teaching from England's schools. This internal debate was always officially resolved in favor of definite religious instruction but against dogmatic religious teaching. Therefore, it is important to understand what was meant by the terms. "Dogmatic" usually referred to the teaching of Christianity according to the creeds of a given denomination. Becoming increasingly evident during the 1920s, "definite," as used by the NUT, meant a Christian morality not based upon orthodox Christianity's teaching of a theistic world view. Whereas the NUT readily accepted the Christian precepts of Jesus the Teacher, it balked at Christianity's teaching of Jesus the Christ. Part of this opposition to denominational religious teaching was due to the union's concern to maintain itself as a professional organization against clerical intervention in the schools, but NUT statements also reflected the inroads of biblical criticism. In the nineteenth century simple Bible reading, as formulated by the Cowper-Temple clause, had become the agreed upon solution to the religious controversy because some teachers might be Unitarians, but during the 1920s this device was now also resorted to by teachers who may not have been Christian except in regard to their ethics.
It is important to realize that during the 1920s the Church did not present a united front on the two aspects of the religious question: the role of the Church in national education as represented by the Church schools and the place of religion in the schools as represented by the demand for denominational religious teaching. Divisions among the Anglicans appeared early in the decade when it became apparent that Fisher would be unable to appease appeals for a second, decidedly religious, education bill. Under increasing financial difficulty to preserve Church schools and faced by government inaction even with Conservatives in power, some Anglican educational activists argued that Church schools should be transferred to the Local Education Authorities. They had become resigned to the NUT's demand for an unified system of state education. This position, as shown by the acceptance of the Majority Report at the Church Assembly in 1930, became the dominant Anglican voice in education at the decade's end. To compensate for the surrender of Church schools, these Anglicans petitioned the government for religious teaching in all English schools. Quite often, this meant religious teaching based upon a syllabus agreed to by educational interest groups which did not adhere to all Anglican creeds. For those parents who desired denominational religious teaching for their children, the Majority Report called for special provisions to be arranged. From what the Church had expected in 1918 for its support of the Fisher Act, much of that vision had been
surrendered by the Majority Report.

This is why a minority of clergy within the Church Assembly held tenaciously to their opposition of the official Church position on national education as it developed through the 1920s. Very bluntly, spokesmen for the minority accused the Church of yielding too readily to external pressure from the NUT, the LEAs, and other denominations. Although only a minority among the clergy, usually found among the lower ranks, the minority position of holding onto the Church schools found considerable grassroots support among the laity. Although these Anglican enthusiasts prevailed in the National Society and their letters covered the pages of Church educational journals, their sentiments did not prevail in the country. Therefore, as the English economy slackened a second time during the decade and contributions for the schools dried up, Anglican supporters of the Church's Minority Report sullenly acquiesced in the hierarchy's acceptance of the Majority Report. The Church's inability to articulate a strong, united voice on the religious question became obviously evident by the reduced role the Anglicans assumed during Trevelyan's three attempts to carry an education bill.

Anglican divisions did not come only from practical considerations about the future of Church schools. The other aspect of the religious question was the teaching of religion in the schools. Consideration of this matter by the Anglicans
raised the topic of religion's essence, and showed that, just as the teachers were divided on this topic, so too were the Anglicans. Within the Church liberal Anglicans and Anglo-Catholics divided as to what kind of religious teaching in the schools should be given. While the latter appeared most prominent on the issue of religious education in Church organizations, the liberals did exert considerable influence. The liberals' augmented importance on the religious question was attained because their understanding of modern Christianity coincided with what the NUT wanted taught in the schools. The liberal Anglicans, as represented by Ernest Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham, preached a non-supernatural Christianity which corresponded with the NUT's disposition to teach a Christianity consisting solely of moral precepts. The melding of these two within an apparently religiously indifferent society during the 1920s put the Anglo-Catholics on the defensive. Through most of the decade the High Church position could only present its teaching and complain that the English people, including those receiving religious education in the schools, had become indifferent to the message. Apparently, then, Anglo-Catholic polemicists had admitted that, even despite their efforts, English society was contentedly secular. Sermons conceded that other interests exercised more potency in society than the Gospel message whether preached in the churches or taught in the schools.

A consideration of the Anglican versus the NUT under-
standing of religious education and its place within English society brings this dissertation to address Cannon's second and third areas regarding the religious question. The story of English education during the twentieth century, as maintained in this dissertation, is more than one of Church-state relations. Although that, in itself, is important, an examination of the schools (Cannon's second area) and the schools' influence within society (Cannon's third area) is necessary to evaluate the role of the Church and the place of religion within England. Since the scope of these latter two areas is large and difficult to handle, I have chosen to speak through the Anglican voice regarding the issue of England's secularization during the twentieth century. Here I have presented the Anglican allegation of a "post-Christian" England through the debate centered on the religious question. Both the teachers' union, seemingly representing the side of secularism, and the Church's educational associations, seemingly representing the side of orthodox Christianity, treated the schools as the institution to shape the future England. Therefore, the statements uttered and the actions taken by the two sides concerning the schools offer partial evidence of England's prevailing values. To complete the picture it would be necessary to make a correlation between what was taught in the schools and what values prevailed in society.

This dissertation closes in 1931 when the story of the religious question is not complete. A completed account would
take the story to 1944 when Parliament passed the Butler Act which provided for religious education, including denominational teaching, in all schools. To some extent the Butler Act provides the answer for Cannon's second area, that religion would be part of national education, but it does not lend much evidence to address the third area. For that, as Cannon suggested, a study of the social impact of the schools' religious education would be necessary. Some studies, such as the one conducted by the Society to Preserve Christian Knowledge, were conducted in the early 1950s. Furthermore, a survey of this topic across three decades, rather than just one, would present a better perspective regarding the Anglican contention that England was becoming a secular society.

\(^2\)Ibid 144.
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