UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_150447
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 370.4 Accession No. 801.732

Author 1.49F J.J. Findlay

Title The Foundations of Public Finance

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

VOLUME ONE

AIMS AND ORGANIZATION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

HISTORY AND ITS PLACE IN EDUCATION: With Special Reference to English Schools and Colleges

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

THE SCHOOL: An Introduction to the Study of Education

PRINCIPLES OF CLASS TEACHING

THE CHILDREN OF ENGLAND: A Contribution to Social History and to Education

AND

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION: A Survey of Principles and Projects

VOL. I. The Aims and Organization of Education

VOL. II. The Practice of Education

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

A SURVEY OF PRINCIPLES AND PROJECTS

BY

J. J. FINDLAY

HONORARY PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

VOLUME ONE

THE AIMS AND ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION

SECOND AND REVISED EDITION

LONDON

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS, LTD.

10 & 11 WARWICK LANE, E.C.4

1928

Printed in Great Britain for the UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS, LTD.,
by HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD., London and Aylesbury.

PREFACE

I HOPE this book will be read by two sets of people: by my fellow teachers first of all, such as have been good enough to read what I have written or edited in earlier years: to them this exposition is a reshaping of ideas, following up the advances that have been made (especially perhaps in sociology) since we have begun to reap the fruits of the movement referred to in Note II. A writer is seldom able to assess the merits of his own work: I shall be curious to learn how far, in either of these Sections, I have actually forged ahead.

The ground of Section I has been trodden and retrodden ever since men have written books on education, and I have therefore cut down the exposition to the smallest dimensions. In Section II new ground is broken: so far as I am aware, no student in this country has hitherto sought to elucidate principles of organization in a comprehensive scheme. The exposition will certainly be found defective, but it will at least serve as a challenge both to students of politics and to students of pedagogics. The general plan had been in my mind for a long time, and had in fact been published in a book now out of print[1]: the conception was due to the example of teachers in Germany, whose *System der Pädagogik* usually paid attention to this field, in contrast to corresponding books on Principles of Education by English or American authors. But the right foundation for these studies has to be sought in social and political theory, and it was only after wide reading in sociology that the ground seemed to be firm under my feet. And I should add that these inquiries into

[1] *Outline of Education Courses*, by Sadler, Findlay and others (Manchester University Press, 1911).

sociology were not begun with the intention of bringing education into relation with politics, but to find a more philosophic basis for doctrines (which will be discussed in Vol. II) concerned with corporate life within the school. The basis for Section II in the theory of Institutions (Chapter VI) was a by-product, so to speak, of investigations into problems which concern the teacher rather than the organizer.

This first volume is therefore written for laymen as well as teachers, and the publishers issue the two volumes separately, for, although they will present a connected argument, the themes dealt with in Vol. I concern the general public interested in education as much as those who engage in teaching. Many of the pages are encumbered with cross-references to other parts of the book, and will, I fear, cause irritation to some readers. If, however, my insistence on the need for ' system ' (p. 2) is warranted, I shall be pardoned for an anxiety to hold the threads of the argument together.

I am greatly indebted to proof-readers, to colleagues in the Faculty of Education, Mr. and Mrs. Ewing, Miss Hindshaw, Dr. Jackson, and Dr. Olive Wheeler, and especially to Professor Cavenagh of the University of Wales. If acknowledgment of help were extended it would be dedicated to a host of friends. For a book like this is the outcome of a life's experience: my teachers during sixty years (home, school, university) stand foremost in grateful memory, and then one's colleagues and one's students, teachers in fact though not in name, for " iron sharpeneth iron." Education, to those who give their lives to it, is a joyous adventure, just because the teacher is ever a learner.

Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.

J. J. FINDLAY.

May, 1925.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A systematic study, 1—Education as a technical term, 2—Child, student, educand, 3—Minors and adults—Adult Education, 4—Defectives, 5—Five large themes of study, 6.

SECTION I. THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER II

A FIRST VIEW

Comparison with other professions and trades, 9—Ideals spring from 'the trivial round,' 11—Board of Education's *Suggestions*, 14—Human nature can be altered, 15—But can the nation or the race as a whole make progress?, 16—The eugenist's answer, 17—His contribution to social welfare, 19—He reinforces popular opinion as to variety of inherited capacity, 20—Intelligence Tests—Danger of unwarranted conclusions, 21—Individuality as an aim? 22—The living past—A labour of Sisyphus, 24—True conservatism, 25—A first and indispensable aim for teachers and schools, 26—But only the threshold, 27—The dilemma when ideals for the future make their claim, 28—An eternal conflict, 29.

Some Ambiguous Terms, 31, 32.

CHAPTER III

THE SUPREME AIM

Summary of Chapter II—Aims spring from one's philosophy of life, 34—The inner life and the outer, 35—The 'self' and the 'person,' 36—The movement of the inner life—Affords the pivot for educational aims, 37—Community and individual again, 38—The great educators, 39—The new psychology, 40—scholar and teacher, 42—Illustrations: humanistic studies, 43—Science, 44.

CHAPTER IV

CONSTITUENT VALUES

a. The body-mind—Appetites of sustenance and sex—The Freudian exaggerations—The old heresy and the new 46

b. Art: a definition—language an institution also 48

c. The Institutions of Society: Morals—Conduct three parts of life?—Conventional morals—Moral freedom 50

d. Intelligence—Faculty training and Intelligence Tests—Relativity of truth—conflict and harmony 52

CHAPTER V

HARMONIOUS DEVELOPMENT

Parallelism between child and race, 57—Extended period of helplessness, 58—Difficulties in applying the theory, 59—Old heads on young shoulders, 60—All stages equally important, 61—Each stage should benefit from the earlier stages: illustration from play, 62—The infant: harmony and happiness, 63—'Introvert' or 'extrovert'?—Consolidation, the preface to childhood proper, 64—Distinctive features of childhood—William James and John Dewey, 65—Illustrations from music—And manual activities, 66—Dividing line between primary and secondary schooling, 67—Psychology of adolescence, 68—Anxiety of great educators, 69—From eighteen to citizenship at twenty-one, 70—Immense varieties of capacity and types of capacity, 71.

SECTION II. ORGANIZATION

CHAPTER VI

THE INSTITUTIONS THAT FOSTER EDUCATION

Education and politics—Value of historical studies—And of comparative education—Eight institutions 75

Family—Its critics—As buttress of individualism against state control—As an opponent of schooling—Relies on tradition. 77

Class—The parents' use of wealth—Home schools and private schools—Democracy and class—Classes should exchange benefits 84

Religion—Homogeneity—Toleration—Comprehension 86

Vocation—Technology—Apprenticeship—The professions—Other vocational corporations. 89

Culture—Distinct as an institution from teaching—A valid claim—Corporations which represent culture—Indirect influence 92

Teaching, the double rôle of the teacher—The expert in contemporary theories of politics 95

The State (*Nation and Locality*)—The true basis for state claims—Not financial—But moral, i.e. social—A doctrine of abstinence—Could not be applied in the nineteenth century—Functions in the Act of 1918—Nature of state supremacy—Locality: historic basis—The children of 'Billington' versus the nation—Basis also in social psychology—Proposal for local provinces—Is local sentiment diminishing?—Diverse areas of local life—National and locality authority on an equal footing—Arrangement of subsequent chapters . 97

CHAPTER VII

SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED IN TYPES

Varieties in ownership—The parent as teacher—The home school—Isolated homes—Family tutors—The P.N.E.U.—Private tuition—The private school—Competition—Adam Smith's view—The proprietary school, an outcome of joint-stock laws—Valuable in their day—Now replaced by trusts . . 110

Endowed and trust schools—The traditional type of ownership in primary education—The 'society' schools—The religious controversy—A long-standing quarrel throughout Northern Europe—Three or more methods of compromise—The single school area—Endowed Secondary Schools—Voluntary effort—State schools and colleges (national)—A change in opinion—The education of state employees—Army, Navy and Air Force—State departments and research—Schools owned by local authorities—Semi-local colleges—Other features which define a school, viz. :— 117

(A) *Schools for Defectives (Physical, Mental, Moral)*—Three motives—Physician and teacher—Need for psychology—Segregation from primary schools—Prisons, reformatories, industrial schools—Many defectives when restored need after-care—And a vocation 128

(B) *Gradation by Age and Attainments*—Four periods—Wide allowance for individual variation—The legal definitions—Limits for compulsory attendance—Change in Adult Schools 132

(C) *Differentiation in Terms of Curricula*—Divisions within a school—Vocational or general 138

(D) (i) *Boarding or Residential Schools*—The sociological principle—Popularity of boarding-schools—Selection of teachers—Types of schools for poor children—Caldecott community and other experiments 140

(D) (ii) *Part-time Education by Non-professional Teachers*—Sunday-schools, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides—Their province 144

(D) (iii) *Part-time Education in Separate Subjects of Study*—Evening Classes, Continuation Schools, Extension Courses—Private enterprise active—Correspondence teaching—Its use for soldiers and sailors—And for scattered populations 145

(D) (iv) *Part-time Education and Industry*—The underlying principle—A great opportunity missed—A new outlook 147

(E) *Differences based on social upbringing* 150

(F) *Differentiation by Sex :* Four types—Women's point of view . . 150

CHAPTER VIII

TEACHERS : PROFESSIONAL AND LAY

Public opinion and status, 153—The early days, 154—Teachers' Registration Council, 155—The study of education : new arguments for it, 157—Summer Schools—The three conditions of registration, 158—The Council as Authority for registration, 160—Power to tender advice, 160—The Consultative Committee, 162—Advice to L.E. Authorities, 163—Non-professional teachers—From other callings, 164—Many fields for the amateur, 166—How to draw the line between lay and professional service—A teacher can qualify also in a second profession, 167—Variations in teachers' attainments—Wider than in other professions, 168—Partly due to class distinctions—Which delay professional unity—Mr. Trevelyan's forecast, 169—University degrees—Academies of Art and Technology, 172—Wastage of personnel—The indenture system for Training Colleges 173

CHAPTER IX

THE ECONOMICS OF EDUCATION

Education cannot be bought and sold—But accounts should be examined—Items in revenue and expenditure 174

Endowments—Are distrusted in some quarters—Can be defended—Public control of trusts—Some gifts are embarrassing 175

Subscriptions. The amount is large—The subscriber in relation to public oversight—Voluntary help welcomed for rate-aided schools also . . 178

School Fees. Contrast with other professions—Education service partly 'socialized'—But not run at a profit—Or to be cheapened by becoming a public charge 180

Rates and Taxes. Public money tends to compete with 'independent' schools—Mr. Frank Roscoe's proposal—Competition for power between Central and Local Authorities—The principle of Grants-in-aid—The crisis of 1920–1 . 183

Expenditure: (*a*) *Salaries.* Choice of incentives to efficiency—The Burnham Committee's principles—Tentative suggestions for amendment . . . 187

(*b*) *Medical Service.* The school an excellent *venue* for the oversight of public health—Only in part a charge on the education budget 190

(*c*) *Clerical Work in Schools*—A burden that could be lightened . . 191

(*d*) *Scholarships: Payments to Scholars.* A distinctive feature of British education—Not always a help to a school budget—Free places may be awarded at a loss—Maintenance scholarships—Contrast with America . . . 193

Surplus or Deficit. Contrast between private and public schools—Conditions attaching to Grants-in-aid—This condition should not dry up the fountain of philanthropy—On the contrary, the demands of the school are insatiable . 197

CHAPTER X

THE OVERSIGHT OF SCHOOLING

Admission, progress, discharge, 201—Attendance—The rota committee—Families on the move, 202—Rules of conduct, 203—Health, 204—Progress in attainments, 204—Leaving certificates—The teacher's share, 205—Powers of inspection, 207—Raise the professional standard—A changed situation invites a new attitude, 208—Teachers still afraid—The inspector as adviser, 209—Authorities must have information—And cannot abrogate their power, 210—Criticisms of the examination system—It restricts the syllabus, 212—The methods are faulty—Uniformity versus elasticity, 214—Alternative plans in U.S.A. and Germany, 215.

Psychology to the rescue? 215—What Intelligence Tests can, and cannot, do—Comparison with health tests, 216—They may overstimulate the candidates, 219

CHAPTER XI

ADVISORY AND REPORTING FUNCTIONS

Beginnings of authoritative advice in England—Grounds for extending it—The scholastic tradition unfavourable—Limits—Propaganda . . . 222

CHAPTER XII

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES, THEIR COMPOSITION AND DUTIES

The principle of representation, 226—Illustrated in the Act of 1902, 227—The official is representative, 228—The three functions of Authority, 229—Administration and execution—A glance at the past, 230—Five forms of Authority, 230—The teacher as Authority—In the private school, 232—In public schools customs vary, 233—In universities, 234—Assistants, or colleagues? 235—Managers and governors—Needed for two reasons, 236—Each school has a life of its own, 237—And has external relations—To family and locality, 238—From parents' evenings to parent representation, 239—New attitude in the Act of 1918—A growing movement, 240—Governors in boarding-schools, 241—Representation of other institutions, 242—The underlying principle, 243—Duties of managers, 243—Sometimes they appoint the teachers, 244—Self-governing Authorities, 245—Ancient tradition of university corporations—Their sphere has extended beyond the university walls, 246—Local Education Authority —*May* or *must*, 247—Devolution, 248—The national authority—Parliament, Privy Council, various Departments of State, 249—Composition of the Board of Education, 251—Qualifications of its staff, 252—Its range of duties can scarcely be specified—Supremacy, 253—International education—Scotland, Ireland and the Dominions, 255—Europe, 256—The League of Nations as educational bureau, 257—The organizer and the teacher, 259.

NOTE I

JUVENILE UNEMPLOYMENT 260

NOTE II

THE TREND OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION 265

INDEX 270

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE design of this book is to present an ordered sequence of thought, a treatment which can properly be called systematic, or (if we like to be pretentious) scientific. This endeavour is, in fact, the chief end to be kept in view by anyone who hopes to profit by the study of Education: a book on principles just helps to put one's mind into shape; the conclusions, the advice offered at times by the writer, may not be acceptable to the reader, but that is a matter of small importance. The test of value, either to a young teacher setting out on his life's work or to an older man or woman who has had more experience, lies in the help it renders the mind in seeing the parts of our problem within the entire region. Incidentally no doubt other objects are attained:— information is afforded on many topics with which teachers and the public in our day should be acquainted; and this not only because such knowledge may be of worth, but because current ideas about education are the expression of a social consciousness, a way of looking at life and at school which is in the air. The Act of 1918, for example, or the Dalton Plan may or may not be of abiding worth; but the welcome they have received in Great Britain is evidence that they accord with certain

points of view which obtain in contemporary ways of dealing with the young. Mere information on such themes is pedantry; if, however, we can fit the knowledge into an ordered scheme of reflection we are building up what we call a *system of education*. One ought not perhaps to speak of it as a building, for the structure cannot be fixed in form: on the contrary, it is a development, it grows and alters its shape as a part of our entire mental development. By every new experience, from men and books, from the world outside of school and inside, the system is modified; we discard and take up as the game proceeds. The capital point is to keep in view the coherence of an intellectual plan from which nothing really vital to educational activity is excluded. Hence the only way in which I, as the writer of this book, can be of service is to set down my own system as it stands at this stage in my own development. I have made partial sketches of the kind in days gone by. I do not propose to revise them: as they stand they continue to afford help to those who are good enough to study them. What I now offer is a more comprehensive handling of the whole field, brought up-to-date; everybody's 'system' has been knocked about a bit since August 1914.

Let us begin by clearing away one or two hindrances to the perspective. We must use our term 'education' with some precision. In a sense it is true that all experience is educative: we can admit that children learn as much out of school as they do in school, but for the sum of the processes that influence development, we had better use the term environment or *social environment*. Education, as understood, say, in Acts of Parliament, is a *specific* form of environment, of influence: a *deliberate* form, arranged by adults and organized on plans designed to improve the capacities and enlarge the outlook of the

young. This limitation in definition must not be taken as depreciating the importance of what happens to our scholars apart from school. On the contrary, we constantly have to bear in mind that school influence is all the time being aided or thwarted by other kinds of influence: we make the limitation simply because it is necessary to clear thinking. We define education in terms of the corporation which we call school[1] because with such a definition we get something which is manageable. Professor John Adams has sought to introduce the term *educand* to signify anyone who is subjected to the process of education; and there is much to be said for his proposal, since it brings into clear relief the distinction between a human being open to all the winds that blow and one who is expressly submitted to the process we call education. I only hesitate to follow his example because new-fangled terms meet with resistance. We had better speak of scholar (*pupil*, *élève*, *schuler*) and this is certainly a more sensible term to adopt than its competitors 'child' and 'student.' Unfortunately 'scholar' has been appropriated to signify the few educands who compete for scholarships (p. 193): hence confusion may be created if we speak of all educands as scholars. I shall in this book use several terms indifferently to denote those who are subject to education.

How soon does a young person, child, educand, scholar, student, cease to be subject to education? Here, again, definitions and limits may lead to confusion. For the most recent type of school which presses itself on public regard and claims public maintenance is concerned with Adult Education—with the needs, that is, of persons who have reached maturity, after a period, more or less prolonged, of conventional schooling. In its origin

[1] Including all types of academy, from the nursery class to the university and the adult class.

the Adult Education movement was designed to help people whose schooling had been scanty or had perhaps been wholly lacking: the meetings conducted in this behalf were called Adult Schools, and the pursuits followed by the scholars were similar to those found in the primary schools. At about the same period (since 1825) we witness the rapid growth of Mechanics' Institutes, where working men, largely on their own initiative, sought in mature life to supply needs which had been neglected in childhood and youth. After another forty years the Universities began to take a hand in such endeavours, 'extending' their teaching to towns like Nottingham and Newcastle, where a real enthusiasm for popular teaching to adults had been aroused. While at first the needs of artisans had been considered, the idea soon spread to other classes: during the '80s of the last century University Extension Courses, attended chiefly by women of the middle class, became popular: the idea of education as a feature in a developing life, regardless of age limits, became more familiar and has at last been admitted into the public scheme of organization, although the narrower use of the term, both in law and in common usage, limited to the needs of the rising generation, is firmly lodged in our ordinary speech.

For the distinction between adult and minor is based on intrinsic phenomena which confront everyone: the minor, whether or no he has reached the legal age, is dependent on the adult community, and looks to his elders for guidance if not for support. He is subjected to schooling just because he *is* a minor: when he escapes the tutelage of his elders and shares public responsibilities with them he ceases to need education in the sense in which we commonly use the term. He may thereafter attend classes, read books, frequent the concert-hall or theatre for the benefit of his mind and heart, and such activities, including

physical exercises, may be arranged for him, just as are the municipal libraries and parks; here the distinction between environment and education becomes finely drawn out and depends upon the point of view of the adult who seeks the experience.

There are unfortunate groups in the community who, while adult in age, are deficient in capacity: some have permanent physical defects which prevent them from pulling their weight; others suffer from mental and moral disabilities. All alike are a charge on private good-will, or on the body politic, and are now regarded as coming within the scope of education as well as of charity. Thus regarded the entire community may be divided into three parts, the first two being persons of normal capacity, (i) minors, (ii) adults, and the third (iii) comprising all, whether minor or adult in age, who are defective; education, as treated in this work, is the provision made by the second group for the welfare of the other two. There is, of course, an immense gulf between the first and the third: we educate the normal child in the confident belief that he will remain normal and be able in due course to hold his own; in the case of some defectives we entertain a like hope, but many of them cannot apparently be either educated or re-educated. We say 'apparently,' for it is the height of presumption to assume that our present knowledge of human nature, physiological, mental, spiritual, is the limit of what may be achieved in years to come. This caution seems to be especially needed as regards the unfortunates who appear in the courts of justice and are imprisoned as injurious to their neighbours. We notice this problem in Chapter VII; for the moment let it be taken for granted that it falls within the province of organized education.

With the scope of our study thus defined we can mark

off the sequence of themes which will engage our attention. The processes of education are conducted day by day in schools[1]: land is secured, buildings are erected, teachers are chosen, scholars are summoned; authorities and their agents administer the proceedings. We comprise all such activities under the term *Organization*, as treated in Chapters VI to XII below. From this middle point other themes are suggested. On the one side we have a preliminary question: what is all this activity *for*? What purposes have you in mind when you scheme and agitate to set the schools in motion? Motives and ideals should at least receive a passing notice; even though the educational edifice is so firmly established we shall do well to examine the foundations. Let us not, when arranging our systematic theory for education, attempt to bring teachers and children together until we have some notion of what may result from their intercourse. Inquiries in this field are usually treated under the rubric *Aims of Education*, and will engage our attention in the next four chapters. When the objective is determined, and when the community has organized a plan for education, the actual business has not yet begun: school-keeping only begins when teacher and pupil meet. This third division of a 'system' may be designated the *Practice of Education*, comprising an inquiry into the social or corporate life of school, and into the pursuits (technically called curricula) with which the young folk are occupied. And since these pursuits, although discreetly chosen, may miss the mark unless they are conducted with good sense and skill, a final chapter will be devoted to procedure within the classroom. Thus the system of Education as here set out comprehends five topics, of which the first two (Aims and Organization) are covered in the present volume.

[1] For definition see pp. 32, 110.

SECTION I

THE AIM OR AIMS OF EDUCATION

". . . In the writer's view (1) a theory of the End or Purpose or Value of social life is one thing and a theory of its actual conditions another. Dealing with the same subject-matter, they are intimately connected but must never be confused. That a thing is good is one thing, that it exists or will exist is another. But (2) both inquiries are not only legitimate but necessary to the full understanding of social life, and (3) the question of supreme interest is the relation between their respective results. It is only when we have a clear appreciation of the End, and unbiased description of the facts, that we can describe finally how far the End is realized in the facts, or how far appreciation of the End is an operative condition in the actual movement of society."—Hobhouse, *Social Development*, pp. 12, 13.

CHAPTER II

A FIRST VIEW

Books on education may be usefully compared with manuals written for other professions—especially on the the theme now before us. In medicine and in law, for example, very little space is allotted to aims: something is said about ethics in relation to professional etiquette, but, for the rest, it is taken for granted that everyone knows what a solicitor or a doctor should achieve; discussion about ideals or function seems impertinent, or at least not pertinent. Exponents of Education have usually adopted a different line of treatment; they spend much time on ethics and philosophy and sometimes elaborate an extensive range of 'values' in professional practice. There is only one justification for this exposition: while in law and medicine there exists a common ground of agreed opinion, a rough-and-ready philosophy of behaviour, no such agreement can be found as to aims or ends in the profession of teaching. But, surely, it will be said, this is a gross overstatement; are we to accept the position that the whole body of persons, lay and professional, engaged in caring for children and students, are working in the dark, setting up schools all over the world without any definite idea of the end in view? The dilemma is resolved so soon as we admit that teachers and schools, although bound together more or less in a profession (Chapter VIII) are a most heterogeneous company; they are split up into variegated types, each of which has its own views and purposes: and the only common bond is their devotion to the young, to the rising

generation. Now each of these types has its own tradition, its own ideals; these traditions and ideals embody an ethic, a view of conduct as a whole which settles in a rough way the end or aim assumed by the organizer sitting on a committee and by the teacher on taking a post in a given type of school. Few persons in any walk of life pursue a systematic train of argument before adopting it: they rarely think out a theoretic scheme, such as this book offers, beginning with aims and concluding with practice; actions here, as elsewhere, are the sequel to the ebb and flow of experience, conscious and unconscious. Whatever may be said in textbooks or on platforms about educational ends we have to get on with the job; we must work under the direction of school principals and of committees, we must co-operate with colleagues: why distress our minds with remote problems raised by the moralist and the psychologist? There is something to be said for this point of view: it is the protest of the practical man. Jung[1] would perhaps call him the extrovert, over against the theorist, the introvert. He is reluctant not only to discuss first principles but any principles at all, unless he is convinced beforehand that his daily work will benefit by attention thereto. This reluctance is certainly justified when a teacher is faced with the immediate problems of the class-room: the theoretical teacher, so-called, who is dreaming of individuality or freedom, or even of the latest theory of intelligence, when his boys need help in solving quadratic equations, is out of harmony with his environment.

And yet we have to account for the fact that many of the wisest men, alike in ancient and modern times, have thought it necessary to meditate on this theme, and an explanation may be sought in distinguishing two types of calling or employment. There are all the accepted and

[1] *Psychological Types*, chapter xii.

necessary functions concerned in keeping life going, the individual life and the life of society. The two professions mentioned above are here classed with the industries and trades; no anxiety about aims obtrudes itself when a man sells tea or makes steam-engines, although he may find, if he likes, thorny problems of ethics lying in wait for him. But since life is more than meat, since men, and the community of men, find desires and interests that carry them beyond the normal fulfilment of the daily round, a number of occupations have evolved that stand apart from the solid ground of necessary function. Such are the callings of the minister of religion, the artist, and the teacher; we may add to them, if we like, the journalist, the politician, and the groups who are vaguely called social workers. Mankind needs help from such workers partly, as we have said, because man is not content, like the animal, to complete the round of his existence from birth to death; the plea, for example, of what is called *education for leisure* is based upon necessities which have evolved as the race finds time to give play to thoughts and sentiments extending beyond the "trivial round, the common task." Furthermore, experience shows that our cleavage between the necessary functions and the extra, additional interests of life must not be pressed too far. For the purposes of thought, and to some extent of practice, it may be well to separate religion and art from trade and industry; it is necessary that the physician, when restoring his patient to health, should ignore the ultimate problem whether either his own or his patient's life is worth preserving; but, since the man who toils at the daily round is the same man who, after the toil, gives play to the freedom of his inner life, we see that the concerns of art, of education, of religion may suffer if they are relegated too much to a separate compartment and handed over to the exclusive charge of a professional

class or caste. Thus, your merchant middleman performs a necessary function, but he is an enemy of society if he is unjust and grasping; if, that is, his conduct of this business of exchange is not informed, at the back of his mind, by desires springing, at long last, from his convictions as to the ultimate ends of life. I instance the trader because the relations between ethics and economics are in this epoch acknowledged to be both very important and very difficult to handle; but similar relations can readily be traced by the reader in every calling which men pursue.

Now this contrast between normal occupations which sustain the community and the extra employments concerned with progress and with ideals leads to an uncomfortable situation on both sides. The man of the world who provides us with bread and butter tends to distrust what he sometimes calls the unpractical persons who speak of a better world; to continue our quotation from Keble:

> The trivial round, the common task
> Would furnish all we ought to ask,
> Room to deny ourselves, a road
> To bring us daily nearer God.

Since our every-day life involves us in all the problems of morals and art and religion why set apart special professors who are exempt from the trivial round and therefore on that very account are likely to go astray and to lead us astray? Are there not risks involved in carrying to such lengths the principle of the division of labour? Indeed there are! False prophets, swollen with spiritual pride, degrade the offices of religion, pedants make a fetish of learning, the cults of artistic vanity often lose touch with the sensible world which it is their mission to interpret (Chapter IV), and those entrusted with the care of children can all too easily be infected with such vices.

If, then, these callings are to be classified apart from those designed to carry forward the every-day business of mankind they need at the same time to keep their feet on the solid ground. The separation may be a practical necessity, but it is only one of emphasis. The aims and ideals which we profess in our temples and schools and academies are a snare and a delusion unless they can be squared with the purposes of common human nature. The situation, in fact, is an illustration of the lack of harmony which we discuss below.

And the professors, artists, clergy, teachers also feel uncomfortable—at least they should. For they too are men; pursue as they may, and indeed should, their ideal to the uttermost, they are still one with their kind; and this sense of unity works out into practical policy. They discover modes of discharging their function which, by disguising its ideal nature, will rank them among the more accepted and humdrum callings; they organize in groups which follow a routine and occupy a recognized place in the social order. Thus the clergy attend to burials, marriage and baptism; the artist becomes builder or craftsman, producing a structure which is useful, although he pleads for some element of the ideal to be included. And the teacher, he too deprecates the attempt to exalt his spiritual functions; he would fain "put off the prophet"; he is willing to be called a pedagogue, a child-minder and nurse; or, at best, an instructor imparting useful knowledge. It is only, indeed, by some such compromise that a large body, average men and average women like their fellows, can conduct their professional life. They will not, or should not, deny the exalted nature of their function, but they keep it in the background, claiming for themselves, in matters of the spirit or of the ideal, no more and no less than George Herbert's servant

who "makes drudgery divine." In the teaching profession our own epoch has witnessed the working out of this compromise with great precision. The organized bodies of teachers place themselves alongside the rest of the professions and trades; they make no special claim to advance moral or spiritual progress beyond what is attained through "the influence of a good home and interests outside school life." [1] They are certainly set apart from their fellow-citizens in the belief that, by exercising oversight of the young, a finer prospect of advancement in grace and virtue will be achieved, but they make no claim either in moral qualities or in spiritual insight other than that witnessed among reputable men and women in many walks of life. They certainly accept obligations as regards what is called the Training of Character, but their efforts in this direction are determined by the distinctive conditions under which groups of scholars are brought together to pursue a common life in class-room and play-ground. If, for example, the reader will turn to the volume issued [2] by the Board of Education, he will see how all the means described for the formation of character spring from the social situation created by placing a staff of adults in charge of a company of other people's children. The teacher's success in employing these means does not depend upon exceptional qualities as a reformer in morals or a pioneer in social progress, but upon his understanding of child-nature and his enjoyment of a life spent in the society of the young.

So much being granted, it still remains true that education is to be classed with those callings in life where emphasis is laid upon the advancement of mankind, upon progress in the fullest and highest sense of the

[1] Board of Education: *Suggestions to Teachers*, 1926, p. 5.

[2] *Suggestions*, as above.

word, rather than callings which are concerned with keeping life in being. Teachers are concerned, with the artists,[1] the clergy, social workers, and the like, in *the improvement of human nature.* It is a necessary article of their creed that human nature[2] can change, and that such change can be effected by the contact of mind on mind, and by efforts designed expressly to achieve it.

All the institutions of culture since man began to realize himself have been based upon the inner conviction that the individual can not only maintain himself in health and sanity, but can be altered, amended, can grow in sentiments, tastes, aspirations: apart from some faith of this kind (whether or no it is consciously felt as an inspiration) the teacher's intercourse with his pupil becomes repulsive. At this point, however, we need to inquire further, for, while educators have always admitted an obligation as regards the single individual, they are by no means so clear when contemplating the fortunes of mankind as a whole, or of separate classes or nations within a community. Until recently this aspect of educational aims was seldom faced either by educators or moralists, although Plato was an illustrious exception. Educational theory concerned itself almost exclusively with the single pupil, and ignored the problems of corporate life and social contacts simply because the thoughts of men were not open, as they are in this epoch, to a vista of social development. Theology bade men

[1] Some artists would repudiate our company. All they seek, if we accept their own account of themselves, is to practise their art. But Browning, a prince among artists, knew them better:

> God uses us to help each other, so
> Lending our minds out.
>
> *Fra Lippo Lippi.*

The clergy, too, might well emphasize their spiritual office apart from social service; and many teachers think of scholarship more than scholars.

[2] Compare John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct,* pp. 106–125.

look for a better world 'beyond the grave'; the historian pointed sadly to the 'decline and fall' of ancient empires, although hopeful at times that our own civilization would meet with a better fate. But when, early in the nineteenth century, the philanthropists and politicians embarked on schemes of universal education and other plans for social advance they were committing themselves to a creed of progress which was presently submitted to sharp criticism. They did not appreciate the issue, but took it for granted that if the individuals of one generation could acquire knowledge and practise virtuous habits these would somehow be transmitted to the next: just as 'the iniquities of the fathers' had been 'visited' upon the children, so might the virtues be handed down. We cannot now share the optimism of the generation for whom Harriet Martineau wrote in her *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, for since her day the whole story of evolution has been handled from a new standpoint. Darwin's researches first of all set men to seek for laws affecting the improvement of animal breeds, and presently, under the leadership of Francis Galton, to treat the problem of human progress from the standpoint of the biologist and the breeder. Exhaustive research has been expended on the propagation of both plants and animals in order to ascertain how 'characters' are inherited; biologists have disputed much as to the interpretation of results, but, so far as any conclusions can be accepted as final, we may on the whole adhere to the negative dictum associated with the name of Weissmann, viz. that acquired characters are not inherited (the few exceptions in the human race, alcoholism and the like, need not detain us). Putting the thesis in positive terms, as applied at least to the higher animals:—the young are only endowed with racial qualities and character handed down through their immediate parentage from a remoter ancestry:

hence (the eugenist sometimes concludes) the progress of the species depends upon the selection and mating of the best specimens.

Looking back, it is remarkable how the entire problem of eugenics has been ignored as affecting education, although the practical breeder had always taken it into account in the training of animals. The stock-breeder, e.g., aims at cultivating definite points in a breed of poultry; he does not neglect to house and feed them with due care, so as to maintain them in good condition, for their immediate well-being will repay him both in commercial returns and in higher satisfactions. But, since his main purpose is to care for succession, i.e. for the *progress* of the species, he mates and excludes from mating with the sole idea of securing a progeny endowed with just those points which in his eyes constitute the progress of the species. And, in conducting this scheme of supervised selection, the breeder follows the principle of 'natural selection' which first Darwin elaborated in *The Origin of Species*. The eugenist, thereupon, bids us trace the operation of similar laws in the progress of mankind; he traces the succession of stocks in families of distinction and contrasts these with the calamitous results of indiscriminate mating in degenerate stocks, such as that of the notorious Jukes family. He avers that until modern times the rise (or fall) of powerful tribes or nations was due to causes (some natural, some designed) which eliminated (or alternatively, fostered) the inferior stocks. He points to many conditions in our modern humanitarian civilization which encourage dysgenic marriages. If these, he says, multiply in any race at the cost of 'good' families that race is doomed, in spite of any theories of progress based upon belief in environmental agencies.

These conclusions are not to be lightly dismissed; the evidence is too strong. I, for one, am prepared to

believe that if some superman were to possess powers (exercised without the knowledge of his inferiors) adequate to control the mating of our species, he could reproduce and establish in mankind a whole cohort of desirable 'characters,' physical, mental and moral. But, since no one proposes to interpolate such a *deus ex machina* into the working of the universe, the biologist has to content himself with making applications of eugenics more consonant with the facts as we have to face them; these are, at any rate, sufficiently important to demand close attention from the student of education. The positive recommendation only concerns those who deal with mental defectives or idiots: they must be segregated so as to prevent the propagation of dysgenic characters. Beyond this the community can do nothing to control the course of racial progress positively, except it be to bring the adolescent under such wholesome influences as will lead young men and women to respect the functions of sex, and to recognize courtship and marriage as factors in the welfare of humanity as well as in personal and momentary well-being. To say that attention to such considerations is not likely to affect consciously the choice of a mate is beside the mark; all considerations touching upon sex are treated by the young with reserve and should be allowed to take effect chiefly in the subconscious. What racial well-being demands is that each sex should be so influenced in forming estimates of desirable qualities in the other sex as to look for and select, albeit without reflection, *these* qualities. Romantic love is not going to be banished by the eugenist; indeed, he would be a short-sighted biologist who would venture to rule out 'romance' from the list of desirable 'characters' in man or woman! But we now know enough of the workings of the human mind to recognize that choice, although

to all appearance 'free,' is governed largely by memories and suggestions of which we are unaware: *if*, then, the educator can implant wholesome ideas from childhood onwards about these delicate matters of sex, he is approaching, as nearly as human agency can approach, to the control of racial destiny. I emphasize 'if,' since it is far easier to admit the eugenist's demand than to satisfy it.

On these two recommendations all thoughtful persons are agreed, although they differ as to the proper modes for carrying them out: we are confronted with a much more thorny problem when asked to view the entire course of human evolution from the breeder's standpoint. If he accepts this view, the educator is driven back upon that individualistic attitude which, as we noted, was characteristic of the schoolmaster in the old days: he will still believe that education may do much to increase the happiness and efficiency of the single man, but he will only look for advance in the human species as a result of suitable mating.

Now, as regards the individual child, the eugenist stands on firm ground; you cannot "make a silk purse out of a sow's ear": education, whether scholastic or other, cannot so change a man's inherited nature as to obliterate the limitations of native endowment. The converse is no less true, and equally important to bear in mind: talent will forge ahead and play its part in spite of the thwarting influences of bad environment and of mean schooling. Since Galton's death great progress has been made, by means of Intelligence Tests and otherwise, in measuring and recording many qualities or 'characters' which are fixed or given from birth. These are unalterable; the educator can only achieve results with his pupil on the basis of these data; in common parlance, Nurture cannot expel Nature. But, then, why should the educator *want* to make such transformations? The infinite variety

in temperament and capacity corresponds to an infinite variety of functions which human beings discharge. The only doubt would arise if, among the inherited 'characters' or types, the psychologist were able to identify tendencies which would rank certain individuals as vicious, and therefore by their very constitution unfit to live among their fellows. Leaving out of account those dysgenic characters to which we have alluded above, due to inheritance from a feeble-minded stock, there is no evidence that anti-social or wicked behaviour can be diagnosed as a 'character,' which can be isolated as an element due to inheritance, and therefore incapable of influence either by the will of the subject or by environment.

The investigations of Binet and his successors have laid a foundation for the understanding of individuality which is already exercising a potent influence on the teacher's work; they have only made a start, and it seems likely that much of their work will be revised so soon as further advance is made by the pathologists in research on the unconscious mind. Meanwhile, the teacher has to keep resolutely clear as to the foundation principle on which all tests of intelligence and capacity are based: they measure and record unalterable factors provided by inheritance; just so far as the diagnosis fails to separate elements of heredity from qualities due to environment, just so far will the value of the conclusions diminish.

It is all the more necessary to keep this principle in mind since in some quarters the results of investigation are interpreted in a spirit of class or of racial prejudice, sometimes even on behalf of sex antagonism. Persons of superior scholarship or of fortune are led to assume that the distinctions between classes in western civilization or of castes in the eastern world indicate distinctions in inherited characters. The evidence presented by

Galton is taken to imply that membership by birth in a distinctive group—intellectual, artistic or noble—is *ipso facto* a warrant of inherited power, and conversely that membership in a class of lower social grade or in an inferior race can be assumed to mark a lower calibre. The educational inference from such judgments readily follows: these families or classes, it is argued, merit special attention both in education and in other forms of nurture, so that they may render back to the community a measure of service proportionate to the high qualities with which they are endowed. Briefly it must be replied that there is no scientific evidence, in the records of any homogeneous community such as Great Britain presents, to warrant this social prejudice. (I do not extend the discussion to foreign peoples, because it would carry us beyond the bounds of our study.) What Galton proved is that a good stock of human beings, if well nurtured, will breed 'true,' just as a sound strain of animals will repeat the characters of ancestry; he did not show, nor attempt to show, that the sources from which desirable characters spring are derived from any one rank or class. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence (especially in democratic countries, where passage from class to class is made easy) that variations in capacity, so distinctive of mankind in contrast to the limited variability of other species, are to be witnessed in all ranks, in all classes and in all races. Whatever claims may be advanced for providing better nurture for one class than for another, these are not buttressed by the researches of biologist or psychologist.

We have now got all the help we can from eugenics; we accept fully the great fact of inheritance, as (in J. A. Thomson's phrase [1]), the first determinant of life, and, therefore, the first fact from which aims of education are to be traced. Positively the eugenist bids us help the

[1] In his *What is Man?*

young in matters of sex and marriage; negatively he warns us that our hopes for progress must be bounded by what we can effect with the individuals of the present generation, here and now under our direction. Whatever happens to posterity, we can render some help to the young as we find them about us here and now. We get back, in fact, to the attitude of earlier generations of schoolmasters (p. 112) who had little concern with education on the large scale, either for the present multitude or for the future race, but kept their attention on the individual pupil. This attitude has been strongly reinforced in recent years by reaction from the pressure of institutional life, alike in the State and in many of the operations of trade and industry. In education a striking illustration was afforded in Professor Nunn's masterly exposition of *Data and First Principles*: he roundly declared that "Educational efforts must, it would seem, be limited to securing for everyone the conditions under which individuality is most completely developed." And the reforms now attracting so much attention under the names of Dalton and Montessori are meeting with wide acceptance by virtue of appeal to the same trend in opinion. This movement in thought answers both to common sense and to psychology; a protest against the collectivism[1] of the middle nineteenth century is needed and must be maintained. At the same time I am not prepared to admit that the dilemma of "the one and the many" can be used to provide a basis for the aims of the educator, any more than for the aims of any other social worker. Individuality, as I see it, is not an aim, but a datum, a bedrock fact; the physicians, for example, may organize public health for millions, but the organization operates, or fails to operate, in the single life, and

[1] I take the term from Dicey: *Law and Public Opinion in the Nineteenth Century.*

with countless variations in each of the multitude. The advertiser and the politician, equipped with the loudest of loud speakers, cannot reduce their clients to the level of factory products. But sociality is equally a fact, a datum of all organic life; while the responsibility of a man to himself, his right and duty to assert himself, has to be maintained, it is no less evident that the type, the class, the city, the universe of society confronts our minds and that our consciousness of fellowship increases with the passage of time side by side with our inner experience (Chapter III) of the expanding self. It is equally dangerous to stress individuality as to stress sociality. It is indeed fatally easy for a man to reinforce his egoistic impulses, to develop his lust for power and his claim to indulgence by appealing to a philosophy of individualism. Certainly Professor Nunn's book gives no warrant for such degradation of the teacher's office, but there is evidence enough that men are all too ready to exaggerate their own value, denying to the *alter* an equal claim to development.

We cannot, therefore, find an aim for education in the dilemma between *ego* and *alter*, since the aims of life, its purposes and ideals, are only to be discerned as we seek for some goal which both the one and the many are to achieve. Granted that the individual is precious, that the many, in Church and trade and State alike, are precious, what are they here *for*? Here is still the unanswered problem, and, though we may be unable to solve the riddle, let us envisage it as clearly as may be. The positive help that we secure from pointing the contrast is to be delivered from the superstitions of collectivism. Whatever our aims may be we do not achieve them wholesale; the biggest of schools, the most comprehensive scheme of regulations only achieve their purposes so far as the single life of scholars, one by one,

is actually moulded by the machine. That teachers and organizers should keep this fundamental feature in mind is all to the good, and educational theory should never leave it out of account.

The antithesis will meet us again when we enter on subsequent Sections dealing with the organization of education and with school and class management; meanwhile, let us pursue our inquiry from the point where we diverged (foot of p. 21).

Since Nature (heredity) cannot serve as a criterion for progress, we are thrown back upon Nurture, upon environment. The child when placed in our hands is not a *tabula rasa*, a blank sheet on which we are to inscribe our teachings; far otherwise, he is a storehouse of memories and sympathies, of family traits, national idiosyncrasies, of a *Living Past*[1] which stand ready to be united with, and interpreted by, the events and circumstances of the present. Here, as it seems to me, is one of the leading ideas which may guide the educator, and it is a question not so much of progress as of maintenance and of renewal. Just as the physical sustenance of man and his development in bodily powers depends upon the energy of the sun, daily expending heat and light on organic existence, so our mental and spiritual advance relies on the perpetual renewal of human energy through social experience. If for a moment these influences are relaxed, if man ceases to care for the nurture of the young, then the race "falls back into the beast." The Past cannot be inherited except through steady effort and discipline, a very labour of Sisyphus. Each new generation has to reshape for itself the whole structure of conscious thought and feeling, of adaptation, which a million years of struggle and hope in our ancestry have put at our disposal. Here, as I see it, is the first, unvarnished fact about

[1] F. S. Martin, under that title; comp. Nunn, loc. cit. chap. iv.

existence that provides an aim for schooling; children come to school and we teach them because without schooling they would 'go under.' Granted that we find no ideal of perfection, either for the single life or for the community, granted that progress, even if discerned at all, is so very slow that it can be dropped out of the account, none the less the wheels of life must run just to bring the youngster to the point which the father and mother have reached. Let us be as idealistic and progressive as we please in our visions of the future, or as sceptical as our temperament will permit, we stand on common ground when we cherish in children all that we find of worth in human experience as it has gone from strength to strength. This is true conservatism, transcending the bounds of party or nation: it informed the policy of elders, parents and priests, ages before the schoolmaster came upon the scene: it dives beneath those matters of curriculum to which we so zealously attract the child's regard. Through a thousand channels of suggestion and control this impulse keeps contact between the unconscious memory (the *mneme* of Semon and Professor Nunn) of the separate life and the current experience of the world of here and now. If the reader will contemplate for a moment the helpless incapacity of a newborn child and then mark its changes at one, five, fifteen, twenty years an impression will be gained of the scope of this operation: paralleled, if we like to make the comparison, in the animal world, but the difference is immense and comparison may easily mislead us. And, be it noted, that in civilized times the strain of this endeavour has increased with the centuries. A schoolboy of the present age knows far more in many fields of learning than ripe scholars could profess in earlier times, and he acquires this knowledge with less discomfort: it is true that he may be deficient in some fields

of experience, e.g. in music and allied arts, in which boys of ancient Athens would surpass him. Our only point at the moment is to realize that these acquisitions, in science, languages and the like, are brought to his attention just because they now belong to the world in which he lives: he cannot inherit them; all that his ancestry provides is capacity, more or less, for uniting himself to them, so that he can 'carry on.'

I am satisfied that in some such terms as these we must describe the ordinary function of the ordinary teacher: it is a distinctive function separate from that of any other social worker, since it is concerned exclusively with the welfare of the rising generation. The others—clergy, artists, statesmen—are concerned with progress, with the next steps; the teacher comes along in their wake and confirms the advance, consolidates the position, so that his young charges, when grown to years, can advance a further step, if they are so minded, in social evolution.

The novel feature presented by our modern world appears not so much in the rate of progress as in the method. The eugenist, with his analogies between man and brute inheritance, cannot help us here. For man has become a designer; ever since he became conscious of himself, as individual and as community, he has taken steps, as the biologist points out, to shorten the process of racial evolution; he utilizes the social heritage, which is *extra-organic*[1]—which stands, that is to say, outside of the natural scheme of things. Here, for example, is a lad who intends to be a carpenter. He has no innate carpenter-faculty; he has just so much of those racial memories relating to tools and material as mankind has fostered since hands were first adapted to these ends; but we can place apprenticeship and technical instruction at his disposal and make him in a few

[1] J. A. Thomson, loc. cit.

years a master of his craft with powers far beyond those even of a mediæval workman. Our argument is, that since we can do this, we must do it, and schooling looms so large in our world because we have acquired, more or less, the arts by which the young can learn. There is still some flippant talk about 'the failure of education'; some arm-chair critics question the need for careful training and equipment in pedagogic arts. The plain fact is that the social fabric, livelihood, culture, moral and spiritual life, all depend for their sustenance upon the foundation laid in early years. Put boys and girls in the hands of stupid or indifferent teachers, and you simply deprive them of so much power and excellence necessary to enable them to play their part in the world in which they find themselves. You cannot control their ancestry, or many of the forces, good or bad, which environ them in the home and on the streets: so be it; but you *can* provide nourishment, suited to our day and generation, within the area of education, and it is therefore the first and the direct purpose of schooling to see that this provision is made.

Our philosophy of education would be greatly relieved if we could stop at this point and pass on to the next Section, where we consider how this aim is to be realized for the multitude of the nation's children. I have said that this view of aims for education, conservative in the best sense of the word, satisfies the ordinary teacher in the ordinary school. And yet it does not satisfy, because the ordinary teacher, however much he may regulate or repress his inner life in order to work with his fellows, has ideals and hopes which are extra-ordinary. The Living Past has evolved in the ebb and flow of conservatism and progress, transforming the old into the new; he himself, and all his comrades who care for the young, teachers and administrators alike, are made so that they desire not only to 'carry on' but to advance. We saw at the beginning

of this chapter that many aims have been set down in text-books of education, and we attributed this diversity to the difference between a static world whose men follow clear-cut occupations and a dynamic world where the self-sustaining energy and outlook of social workers leads each man to follow his own star. He will seek for the betterment of his kind on principles which seem valid to himself though they be the scorn of all around him. Are we to confine him, just because he is a teacher of the young, within the limits of conservatism, appointed solely to adjust relations between the old world and the new? He rebels against this injunction on two grounds; firstly, because he is a man, unique in himself; and he cannot suppress his individuality: secondly, because he knows that the voyage on which his pupils are embarked is a spiritual adventure, for which the past indeed provides equipment but cannot give complete direction. Unless the pageant of life be reduced to a game of chess in which he and his pupils are pawns he will search for an end to his endeavours that will give both him and them some sense of contact with the future. We trace to sentiments of this kind those passionate pleas on behalf of freedom and individuality which are heard in every teacher's conference and provide the stock-in-trade of the educational reformer. We examine our pupils' endowment, we modify their environment, not as laboratory experts working to a set design but as attendants on a self-governing organism that weaves its own web and fulfils a destiny beyond our ken.

The reader will see at once that we are hung on the horns of a dilemma! For, since every teacher is a personality, there will be as many aims for education, as many ideals for the development of the young, as there are teachers to foster the ideals. And so there are: one teacher is a devout Catholic, convinced that the only road

of salvation for the young lies in obedience to the sovereign control of his creed; a fellow-teacher is passionately devoted to natural science, and rests his hope for education in the fearless search for knowledge. How can two such minds, looking at experience from opposite poles, be yoke-fellows? And yet the necessities of the case compel them to fall into line and act under forms of agreement which may reconcile their inner views with the common purposes of a profession.

This tragic situation—for it has all the elements of great tragedy—is not resolved, but is seen in clearer perspective if we recognize it as an example of an eternal conflict, witnessed in every walk of life. In religion and morals it takes shape as war between free-will and fate; in politics it presents us with the individualist, in conflict with government; it touches the child at every turn of life, and to the end of it. So much being granted we find ourselves in the company of all good men who are united by desires for progress, but are isolated by the barriers of personal outlook and vision. Since no common formula can be found, except in the vaguest forms of words, to unite the idealists who work among their adult fellows, why should the teacher of the young seek for such a formula? Why not let him rest content with having performed an adequate service when he has introduced the young to the field of battle, and leave them free as to the future? If we like we can join with Herbart in declaring "the one aim of education is morality," or discourse (p. 14) on The Training of Character; so soon as we come to grips with such expressions we find how little they avail us to bridge the gulf between man and man, between school and school.

I, for one, am not distressed to find this baffling enigma confronting our educational philosophy. What the encounter affords me is a recognition of the limitations

imposed upon human vision. If, indeed, we knew the course of progress, we were gods rather than men. In any event, new integrations are needed.[1] None of the institutions which aim to capture the child can gain all that they seek; but, when once the grounds of disagreement are disclosed, plans for co-operation, fitted to each situation, can be adopted, not absolute or final, but as the next step in progress. Succeeding Sections, where we consider the Organization and Practice of Education, will illustrate the working of such integrations. The school, when all is said, is not an appropriate *venue* for a new gospel (p. 12); the reformer can only ask that our children should be so educated as to remain sensitive to the intimations of adventure. For, in the nature of things, any plans for reconciliation between these mighty opposites are provisional, since the young, on whose behalf our agreements are contrived, will before long take matters in hand themselves. Those of us especially who hold by freedom and individuality may cease to be so solicitous even on behalf of *that* dogma. If we really believe in freedom, as a quality inherent in human nature, we shall look for it to assert its sway, though thwarted at many points. The psychologists confirm this expectation, describing to us the course of contrariant impulses: any excessive pressure, whether in custom, morals or religion, provokes the young to beat up against the wind. Let us rely on this resilient quality in those who are to follow us, asking only that "the path to freedom in the school" shall not be wholly barred.

We need not, then, attempt to draft a prospectus of aims and ideals which we can certify as adequate to carry forward the traditions of the past to the consummations of the future, but we should explore the foundations further, and see how men strive for unity amid the diversity of values and of institutions.

[1] Follett, *Creative Experience*, chap. iv.

SOME AMBIGUOUS TERMS

It may be well here to indicate the sense in which a few terms are employed, since these will frequently recur throughout the book. And by taking them in order I can show the plan followed in succeeding chapters.

Institution. "The whole or any part of the established and recognized apparatus of social life. This would include actual laws and customs." (Hobhouse, *Social Development*, pp. 48–50.) Compare also MacIver, *Community*, chapter iv. I would ask the reader to keep this term separate from various words used to denote groups of *persons* who support one or other of men's institutions: *group* is the most vague and general, and I prefer it as less ambiguous than *Association*, which Hobhouse and Maciver adopt. I prefer *corporation* at times, indicating a *juristic person*. Every individual is concerned to maintain various institutions, and to modify them; he does so by joining with other persons in group activity.

Organization. Institutions are abstract: they take concrete shape through the process of grouping persons together on their behalf; they stand for customs, sentiments, ideas which many share; but, until actual persons take action to realize the force of an institution we get no further. This process we call organization. Groups may be highly organized, and then we call them by various names, differing according to the institutions, one or more, which they embody (Chapter VI). To the sociologist civilization is viewed as the evolution of complex organizations to meet the demands of institutions old and new: and man shows an increased capacity to throw himself, on one or other side of his personality, into these activities, with evil as well as good results to himself.

Authorities (*with a capital A*). When a group is well organized and is viewed in its executive aspect it is often called an Authority, as in the L.E.A. Other terms are Administration, Government (capital G), Staff, etc. Sometimes those who give orders are separate persons from the agents, those who execute them; the latter are then called officials, or abused as bureaucrats (Chapter XII). There are two other activities of group life, preliminary to the actual performance of work. First comes *deliberation*, or discussion; this again may be organized or may only proceed informally. When organized it may become a parliament (the name, I suppose, meant originally a talking society where certain

institutions became articulate and let the monarch, as executive, know their mind). Secondly, legislation, the making of rules, laws, statutes: these may only be resolutions in a minute-book, or a 'gentleman's agreement' of which there is no record; they are common acts of mind, carried into execution in due course. The constitution of Authorities becomes, therefore, the central problem of organization, for they represent institutions (either on democratic or other principles); their powers and duties spring from the force of the institutions for which they stand.

In this book schooling and education appear as institutions derived from and resting on many other institutions, some of which have a special interest in fostering education (Chapter VI). Thus, education as an institution stands in the middle of a series; it acquires its power from individuals who share the aims of education and seek satisfaction, not only in the solitude of individuality but in the co-operations of group life. When we have taken stock of these aims, in Section I, we begin a survey of organization by seeing what institutions are specially concerned to foster and create the institutions of education. This gives the clue to the Authorities needed if the organization is to proceed harmoniously. The sequence—Aims, Institutions, organization by Authorities—is witnessed in every sphere of group life.

Employing the terms as used by MacIver and Hobhouse, the Authorities are one type of Association and they establish another type, for which the generic name is School (p. 3).

CHAPTER III

THE SUPREME AIM

LET us review the ground so far covered. Observing that man is a species evolving through physical heredity we recognize an obligation to foster in the young (by the teacher's aid or otherwise) a healthy attitude toward sex-relations, and hence we may properly include attention to this theme among the aims of education (see Chap. IV (*a*), below). If, however, racial progress were of no concern, the individual, as we find him in the presence of comrades and teachers, is rightly regarded as the centre point in all plans for schooling; eugenics can do nothing to help him at the moment. Although we decline to accept the mere concept of individuality—or, for the matter of that, the complementary concept of sociality—as a key to our problem we see it in clearer perspective when we bear in mind that, whatever be the goal of education, it must be sought in the single life, rather than in theories of mass production, or collectivism. Education, viewed as Nurture rather than as Nature, exhibits each individual as the embodiment of a Living Past (p. 24, above); we acknowledge the force of those conventional views about schooling which stress the importance of maintaining tradition; from this standpoint education seeks to shorten the recapitulatory process, equipping the young with the *mores*, the arts and science which will enable them to 'carry on.' But since life, in all its manifestations, is not static but dynamic, any further reflection meets the barrier which confronts the teacher along with all social workers; while we should aid the

young to use the past in the service of a momentary present, the future looms before them and us; educational theory may seek to evade this issue, but it pursues us like *The Hound of Heaven.*[1]

It is obvious that we are here confronted with issues that have no exclusive concern with places of education; they spring from our philosophy of life, by which I do not mean the wisdom of the academy, but from those ideals or ideas which every man entertains about himself and his universe. Even if one is little inclined for introspection, and seldom sits apart to meditate upon the drift of life's current, impulses that well up from forgotten or neglected sources are always at hand, to check or deflect the course one follows, and it is to such impulses that the appeal must be made if a reference to ideals is to be effectual.

We saw at the outset that a teacher rarely sets outs in deliberate thought to arrange a theory of education based on his philosophy of life; but those who expound principles of education are compelled by the nature of things to rest their case on their philosophy. We study the Great Educators not only because they have been eminent practitioners in the art of teaching but because they exhibit their practice in the light of more fundamental truths: the recent work by Gentile,[2] *The Reform of Education*, is a conspicuous example. And while, since every man constructs his own philosophy, these expositions are never transferred *in toto* from the mind of the master to the mind of his disciples, they at least serve as a challenge, inviting the student of education to test the coherence and validity of his own rendering. Now I will take the reader into my confidence and confess that I write this chapter with reluctance, not so much from a

[1] Title of Francis Thompson's poem.

[2] English translation. Published by Benn Brothers, 1923.

sense of modesty or lack of equipment, although I might well plead for forbearance on that ground, but because the task in itself *is* the most difficult of all those to which a student of education has to turn his mind. The difficulty is partly one of expression; language fails, and hence the poets are commonly our best interpreters. And this expression must be both concise and definite: it must have relation to the style and accent in which the present generation is feeling its way to a finer sense of values. All I can attempt to do, after such reading and converse as opportunity has afforded me, is to give a personal impression, without attempting any exhaustive analysis.

The foundation of all discourse on these themes seems to rest upon a distinction between the inner life and the outer. Some psychologists speak of this inner life as 'the self' that finds subjective interests in one's own thoughts, feelings and intuitions, over against an outer, objective world which from every quarter plays upon the self, but cannot in the nature of things be identified with the inner life. An illustration will show how sharply everyone makes this severance. A company is sitting at table, chatting about the weather or the latest music, in fact, about public or external matters; if one of the company suddenly refers, let us say, to 'the judgment to come' as in the classic instance of Paul and the Procurator Felix, or upon private habits and images usually tabooed in polite conversation, this change is felt as an intrusion; we laugh it off, as the humorists very properly do when they handle great themes in public print. Now the boundary between public and private, between inner and outer, varies greatly with the occasion and the individual; but the distinction seems to go to the root of experience. Instead of speaking of 'self' or inner life, we might use the term 'spirit'; unfortunately,

however, the spiritual life is often conceived as something cut off from the objective world, and flourishing in some ecstatic realm where mundane affairs are contemned : in the popular mind reference to spirituality is often confounded with proposals for converse with the dead. In speaking, then, of the human spirit, it will be understood that the reference is to the self, the inner life. And, to dwell for a moment longer upon terms, I do not identify this inner life with personality,[1] for this term has relation to the appearance (which is at times a mask, *persona*) presented by the self to society ; "one man in his time plays many parts," and it is common for egoistic natures to attach value to the impression their personality makes in this or that company, at the expense of inner development. It is all the more important that teachers should bear this distinction in mind, for the importance of play-acting is now widely recognized ; the drama, to the actor at least, is the partial assumption of another personality ; to act Shylock you must be Shylock, without ceasing to be Henry Irving.

Now, since the inner life, this self, alters from day to day, we can regard progress, in a word, as the advancement or enrichment of this inner life (we are thinking only of the individual). This advance is sometimes called self-realization ; sometimes, as with Socrates, a great step is taken in a finer awareness of the self, (*γνῶθι σεαυτόν*). Clearly such advance is conjoined with intellectual power (p. 52) ; achievements are possible, for example, in the inner life of a scholar, that are denied to the barbarian. But the psychologists warn us that this self has an unconscious as well as conscious relation to experience, and the barbarian who relies on his intuitions may be leading a more effectual life than the scholar who

[1] Compare Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 590. I find his definitions very serviceable.

seeks to reduce his experience to logical form, but fails to achieve harmony. Conjoined also is this advance with refinement of feeling, with increasing mastery over tools, with heightened power over the world of things and events. And yet advance in knowledge, in refinement, in control may be obtained without progress of the spirit. This progress, so far as words can forecast the programme, concerns the relation of subject and object; relations between the self, separate and finite, a body-mind, which can measure and record, forget and recover:—over against the universal (spell the word if you like, as Gentile does, with a capital U), the infinite; in a developing sense of the whole, past, present and future. So soon as the writer introduces the name of God into the discourse the danger of misapprehension begins, especially in writing about education; for some readers may confuse what is here set down as a plea for upholding this or that institution of religious observance (p. 86). The principle at issue surely extends beyond the bounds of any formulated creed; it seeks to record, in the simplest language of common experience, that man as we know him (either in evolution from the most primitive types, or in development from infancy) is engaged on a quest to relate and harmonize himself not only with the current flow of the objects about him but with the last things, the universe of things. In the language of religion this is called the search for God.

Some such statement, expressed either in the scientific speech of the psychologist or in the theological language of the spiritual man, forms the keystone to all doctrines of progress, and therefore to the foundations of education.

A successful, healthy development of the self, an all-round development, incorporates every kind of good that a man may attain, in an increasing apprehension of relations which we call godlike or divine or infinite,

since other language fails us to portray the situation. If it is questioned whether children growing up to be men and women do make such progress we must rely upon our own interpretation of history, and of the behaviour of those among whom our lot is cast. Such interpretation should by no means be confined to the evidence offered in those varieties of religious experience which William James analysed. "God fulfils Himself in many ways."

This view of reality seems to put the individual in the centre of the picture, and to some extent quite justifiably, for you cannot constitute a programme of social or religious reform as a substitute for individual advancement; the single soul may find his life by losing it, or he may not. We may grant that an excessive cultivation, on the conscious plane, of solitary habits of meditation (as, e.g., in the cult of Buddhism), perverts the inner life to egoism and can be charged with producing error both in philosophy and religion, yet we cannot, if we fairly examine our inner behaviour, believe that any man is helping progress when he plunges neck and crop into the activities of organization in church or school, in social or political effort, without inner reflection. Let it be admitted that there remains an antinomy between individuality and sociality, which multiplication of words cannot reconcile, yet among our spiritual conceptions we should certainly include a sense of the infinite worth of mankind. Belief in the communion of saints is not limited to the Apostles' Creed. It inspires all that is worthy in patriotism, and yet "patriotism is not enough." What we should deprecate is any attempt to confine our aims for education, i.e. our spiritual apprehension, to one aspect of experience, to a view which, when pressed to an extreme, as it is in our day, threatens to destroy our sense of human worth, striving to accelerate the millennium through mass agencies.

This at least is clear : progress in society is only progress so far as actual individuals (pp. 22–24 above), one by one, are advanced ; whether our social effort be concerned with promoting decent houses for our neighbours, with teaching their children to read, or with helping them in the pursuit of the Universal. In every case, achievement can only be made for and with the single soul. Some teachers are speaking of individual teaching as if it were a discovery ; they would be nearer the truth in declaring that there is no other way of learning :—whatever activities, with numbers in a class-room, may be embraced under the word ' teaching.'

It appears, therefore, that there is only one aim in education : *the nurture of the human spirit* ; other aims, those, e.g., which claimed our notice in Chapter II and others which will need attention in a moment, are valid just so far as they can harmonize with each other and with the acknowledgment of the single purpose here set down. Expressed so simply, does it need so many words and hesitancies to expound it ? The hindrance is not so much in an intellectual acceptance of it, by way of theory, as in a lively apprehension of its consequences, for the stress and interest of the objective values, one and all, urging their claims upon attention, make it all too easy to expose the current of spiritual experience to the hazard of circumstance.

Reduced to such simple terms, this unified aim appears as just a redraft of what the wisest and greatest of men have said in countless forms of speech, ever since man ascended to some realization of himself. In matters of schooling those Great Educators to whom I have referred arrive at a like conclusion, although the channels of approach are diverse :—those, for example, who have influenced theory in our epoch : Arnold of Rugby and his contemporaries, Herbart, with his single aim

fronting many-sided interests, Froebel, who familiarized English teachers with the antithesis of inner and outer, speak with no uncertain voice. Even John Dewey, who exercises so remarkable an influence on American education and appears as an unsparing critic of loose thinking and cheap sentiment, is seen, with all his reserve, to be in the company of those who witness to the supremacy of the human spirit. "*. . . When a sense of the infinite reach of an act physically occurring in a small point of space, and occupying a petty instant of time, comes home to us, the meaning of a present act is seen to be vast, immeasurable, unthinkable. This ideal is not a goal to be attained. It is a significance to be felt, appreciated. . . . It is the office of art and religion to evoke such appreciations and intimations; to enhance and steady them until they are wrought into the texture of our lives.*"[1] The accent, the intellectual presentation, varies—must indeed vary, since apprehension is a matter of feeling as well as of thought, and the art of speech falters in its utterance.

Since these relations of inner and outer can only be brought to consciousness by efforts of thought, an important contribution has been offered in what is called the New Psychology—especially welcome to an epoch which is ready to yield to intelligence while reluctant to trust its intuitions, still less to bow to authority. The pathologists who investigate on the objective plane the behaviour of abnormal minds impress people whose ways of thought refuse to accept the findings of introspection; the phenomena were first observed in cases of mental disorder, but the interpretation applies equally to the behaviour of normal minds. I make no pretension to have mastered the full import of these researches, so as to discriminate closely between the conclusions of Freud, Jung and the late Dr. Rivers: it may well be that their

[1] Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct*, p. 263.

conclusions are only the prelude to a more ample view of the subject-object principle. And I am very sure that the layman, however ardent he may be in the search for truth, should abstain from probing into his own consciousness by the procedure of psycho-analysis, unless he and others wiser than himself are convinced that his behaviour needs to be examined in the dry light of science. For the average man it should be sufficient to acquaint himself with the description of complexes, repression and the like, just as he satisfies himself in other fields of research.

We conclude that both the wisdom of the ages and the researches of the psychologist confirm the common sense which we attain by introspection; what, then, are the obstacles to the application of this philosophy to the practice of education? Taking a wide view of modern history, it would appear that for many people the symbols and ideas of earlier epochs which nourished the inner life of earlier generations no longer satisfy; they cannot stand the criticism of advancing knowledge. Hence, by reaction, the world of objects suffices as the boundary of the orbit; men find scope for adventure in ideals of a lower order, in material progress from coal to electricity, in social and political reform from Bentham to the League of Nations; new symbols and systems are created in these regions which compensate for the loss of spiritual insight; the infinite and the universal drop into the unconscious, as matters beyond our ken. But this is surely a passing phase, even though a century or two be needed to redress the balance. Nor need we be anxious to hasten the advent of a better harmony between outer and inner, for the ideals and adventures of our modern world are not in vain. Material progress is a good thing; social and political reform are even more valuable, both to the race and to the individual who gives his mind to them; their final worth lies in the aid they afford to

the spiritual life, which, as we saw, cannot flourish in a vacuum.

Let us consider the situation as presented in the school. Whatever obstacles the bias of our epoch may offer to the translation of theory into practice, the individual, teacher or social worker, if his own apprehension is clear, will be making the translation all the while. He will be aware that the experiences to which he invites his pupils affect their inner consciousness at the same time that they develop intellectual and artistic powers. It is for him to see to it that the life of the spirit is not suppressed; to some extent his operations can decide what is kept on the threshold of consciousness and what descends into the limbo of the forgotten. But have we any such power? our schemes of school management and of curricula handle public matters on the objective plane; is it possible to bring these outer, external interests into touch with the inner self of our scholars, each one of whom is a personality? And, if we could, have we the right? Are we so confident either in our psychology or in our intuitive sympathies with the young as to warrant the intrusion? In our general practice we abstain; only on rare occasions, and by invitation, do we break in upon reserve. Even the clergy, in discharge of their office of spiritual guidance, hesitate before they step from their public rôle to the intimacy of an individual approach. The reader will now see why I confessed to reluctance in handling the topic of this chapter: any attempt to bring the outer world of speech and argument within the private circle of the self is a delicate task; an expositor needs to be careful indeed lest by multiplying words he thwarts the work of intuition. The inner life pursues its way in silence, even though the advertising agents at Wembley propose to boost religion with rounds of applause.

Perhaps the situation becomes clearer if we recognize

that it is not after all the teacher who by any conscious act at any given moment influences the scholar as a self, but the objects themselves, the knowledge, the art, the social situation. Let us try an illustration. Humanistic studies, literature and history, are objects of interest to all children and to many adults. As the average man or child pursues the story he gets from it a widening grasp of his fellow-men, of institutions and personalities; his knowledge grows and his taste becomes selective. So far as any conscious apprehension is concerned, he may rest there; no 'appeal,' as we say, is directed either by the text or by the teacher to the inner life. And yet, when the story is of such quality as to make such an appeal, we cannot doubt (if we are convinced of the reality of spiritual experience) that the relation *is* established, whether or no the subject be conscious of the process, whether, i.e., the deeper meaning of the story comes into the focus of attention. For this reason we pay attention to the quality of the story, the 'classic' element, as we say, in good literature and drama; those who teach and who organize curricula have it in their power to give or withhold nurture which is not only of objective value as art and history, but of supreme value as nurture for the soul. In the history of pedagogics the record by Herbart of the effect of the *Odyssey* on the mind and heart of his pupils is widely known; and it does not stand alone.[1] We recollect, however, that Herbart was the teacher, and that the little boys who read their Homer, with no consciousness of supreme values, were undoubtedly helped to gain the best out of the situation because their teacher's attitude, whatever words he might employ, was that of a man in touch with the infinite; the rest of us, scantily endowed with philosophic insight, are not excluded from the temple.

[1] Browning's poem called *Development* offers a genial comparison.

The same point of view can be sustained in dealing with pursuits such as arts, science, school games, which may seem on a superficial survey to have no relation to the inner self. If, for example, the search for truth be one expression of man's spiritual urge, it would seem that, both in the ordering of a science curriculum and in the method of handling it, young people can either be arrested in their search or be helped on their path of progress. The current speech of educational reformers in this field describes the process as the approach to intellectual freedom, or as 'the method of discovery,' and sometimes such principles become elevated to symbols, which play strange pranks in methodology.[1] But the perversion of wisdom should not lead us to scorn the wise. The plea for liberty, which, as we have seen, is stirring the waters on many seas, is a protest against the pressure of numbers in the class-room (the throng distracts attention and hinders self-realization); against the pressure of multiplied subjects (each of which in itself stands for some large principle of human need, but cannot get breathing-room to live and so reach the human spirit); against the pressure of vulgar ideals which invade the temple; "the world is too much with us."

Enlarging, then, our brief formula we repeat that the aim of schooling, in all its occasions and pursuits, is to help our pupils to see themselves and their neighbour in the light of the Universal. If it be replied that this is mere verbiage, a programme plainly impossible, fit only for philosophers or saints, the answer is implied in what has been set out. Aims are not achievements; even the finest examples of 'the good' life may not be accepted by a

[1] With no disrespect for the so-called Heuristic Method, which is sound enough in its basis but has been grotesquely caricatured by weak disciples (see Browne's essay in *Educational Methods and Management*, edited by Sir John Adams, 1924).

critic as models of perfection. The enigma confronting us in Chapter II as to the meaning of progress remains : we have no terms, other than the abstractions of a vocabulary of morals, in which to define perfection of character or beauty of holiness. Progress is not arrival, but an ever-expanding prospect, a prospect opening out, as the child grows from infancy to maturity, in busy exchange between the inner and the outer. Having secured this standpoint, we can now turn to the varied scene of objective values, and, by further definition, see how each in turn makes its contribution to development.

CHAPTER IV

CONSTITUENT VALUES

We need a classification here. We have to analyse the powers of man, to ask ourselves, in Professor Thomson's phrase, *What is man?*[1] apart from that unique fact about him which we have labelled the inner life or the human spirit.

(*a*) *The body-mind.*—The first feature in this description concerns his bodily structure: he is body-mind, or mind-body. There are many theories as to the relations between body, mind and spirit, theories on which we need not enlarge; for our purpose it is enough to note that education, as now conceived, takes physical welfare into account, and formerly neglected it. The child's body provides him with his first experience of a material world, of matter and movement. He presently discriminates other objects: the persons about him, clothes, the room, all the phenomena, so to speak, of space and time.

Now he does at least two things with this material world: first, he has to get sustenance from it, and here the psychologists explain his nature, parallel to that of other animals, as dominated by appetites and instincts. We may take these processes for granted, and get at the fact underlying them; the importance of just living and continuing to live as a body; the consciousness of livelihood as an object present to the imagination. It appears that the physical frame, with its organs, limbs, eyes, ears, has evolved largely in response to this need; we shall see below (p. 47) that the aims of physical

[1] See p. 21 above.

education should keep this racial purpose in mind. As the child develops he becomes aware that there are many ways of obtaining sustenance, and eventually he finds interest in a vocation. The great majority of mankind value their vocation (p. 89) as directly concerned with securing sustenance: food, clothing, shelter; a minority find other vocations, and a few seem, as we say, to have nothing to do. But with them also appetite and racial memory hold good; excess of idleness is as unhealthy as excess in toil.

The body, too, is concerned with survival; hence the importance attached to eugenics (p. 16 above), and to control of sex, both as appetite and as instinct. I cannot follow the conclusions of Freud, based on a singular interpretation of morbid patients, as answering to the facts of infancy in normal development; if only for this reason, that, while the cravings of hunger, thirst, physical movement are manifest and must be satisfied in infant life, sex presents a problem for the future—unless, indeed, attention is precociously called to secondary organs of sex by excessive fondling. Nurses and parents too often forget that the self as a whole is concerned in what affects any part of it. In some cases infantile sex desires are stimulated which heighten the task of self-control in later years, and these account for some at least of the instances cited by the Freudians to support the theory of infantile sexuality. The issue is confused by an extended use of the term 'sex' to include sentiments to which we commonly attach the word 'love,' but to discuss the controversies thus aroused would carry us beyond our province in this book, and in any event are not to be treated, by the utmost stretch of the imagination, as merely an affair of physical education. The outstanding fact about the body is that all the appetites, whether for sustenance or for the satisfactions

of sex, have to be *controlled*, and that the little folk are much at the mercy of their elders as to whether good or bad habits shall be formed. I need not dwell on the theme, for everyone knows how restraint in infancy simplifies enormously the tasks of moral life for the adult; the newborn babe at least leads the simple life. These are the first problems of physical education and in my judgment they surpass in importance all the measures taken in later years by teachers and schools to promote the child's physical well-being.

Whatever falls to be said on the place of physical education in schools will be found in Vol. II. Here we are only concerned with the foundation principle. The body, viewed apart, is not evil, but good; the appetites are there, given, as we say, some to be fulfilled here and now, all to be controlled and sublimated in the interests of the higher nature. The old heresy, in spite of St. Paul's dictum,[1] treated the child as having only one organ, the brain; the new heresy threatens the organism at the centre, for it exalts instincts and appetites as imperious powers which have us at their mercy.

(*b*) *Art.*—Thought requires us to separate the self from the body; we have spoken of the child as doing this or that *with* his body. In passing to another region of values this separation is still to the fore, but the organs are now concerned with other demands made by the self on the objective world. The body-mind displays tastes, likes and dislikes; impressions of colour, form, smell, touch, invade it. While these are essential to its sustenance as an animal, enabling it to distinguish what is useful from what is harmful, we cannot regard them merely as functions of livelihood. The infant ascends to a higher stage of self-realization by finding pleasure and pain in the movements of his organism as it

[1] "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost?"

responds to the movements of the outer world. The term 'art' seems adapted to indicate this realm of experience; sometimes, of course, a distinction is made between useful art and fine art, but these adjectives do not seem helpful to clearness of thought. It seems better to confine the word 'art' to those affinities between the self and the material world which we experience when problems of livelihood are not in the focus. This restriction of art to sensuous experience may not commend itself; poetic art, which Massingham defined as "the balancing of refined and harmonized values," [1] has a wider reach, and yet if we view language as a kind of music we may bring it within the circle. I would rather contemplate art as a form of experience that the self must cherish and seek to harmonize with the rest. If we like we may speak of the art of life or the art of thinking; but, if so, we are using one term to cover separate conceptions.

Art is, therefore, individual: if we could conceive of a single self growing up in the outer world apart either from racial history or from contact with his species, we should still postulate relations between bodily organs and stimuli outside the self which provide the basis for art. We commonly speak of feeling as the mental process by which art does its work—as distinguished from thinking. Since thinking and feeling stand in opposition language cannot get far in describing the province of art; when you record an experience in the phrase 'I feel' or 'I dislike' you are intellectualizing a mood which is lost as soon as it becomes an object of reflection. The artist lives in his own world, and if we who see or hear his work do not feel with him so be it; he has done his part when he has shown his taste by his works.

Yet art does not stand aloof from the rest of our

[1] *Letters to X*, p. 196.

experience: it provides both animals and men with signs, and we call language (using the terminology of the next paragraph) an institution. More than that, some of these signs become symbols, invested with permanent emotional attributes, embodying in one image the experience of an epoch.

(*c*) *The Institutions of Society: Morals.*—Among all the objects of the external world the most attractive to the infant, as to the man, are his own species, the *alter* which is the theme of sociology. Response to his kind is no doubt made on the levels of sustenance and art; but only a very primitive view of the attitude of child to parents would regard him as loving and honouring them because they feed him; these are subordinate to relations which we call moral or social. These two terms are not identical, but they cover very much the same ground: our behaviour is the result of human intercourse. A man has also moral relations with the animal world, and our sense of right and wrong in this sphere has developed in historic times; we know little of the mind of animals, still less of the structure of plants, although Bose's researches give a hint as to factors in their nervous organization which some day may establish for us a code of conduct extending even to the lowest form of organic life. But it seems evident that our conscience, in dealing with lower orders of creation, develops out of the feelings and the reflections engendered by human intercourse: if we can speak of loving our dog we do so because the sentiment of love has developed in social attachments within our own species.

This whole field of human relations is grouped by the sociologist in the term 'institutions.'[1] We need not enlarge on the aims of education in this sphere; the self becomes man, a moral man, a man of character, through these

[1] See above, p. 31.

relations; long before the child is ready to apply his intelligence to such abstractions, i.e. to form concepts of virtue and vice, his social intercourse has laid the foundation in habits, in the control of instinctive impulses, and in social sentiments. The ground-plan of compromise between the rival claims of institutions is already outlined when he goes to school and divides his affections between the elders of his family and his schoolfellows. We need not anticipate here what falls for consideration later: the grand institutions of religion and of civil government await him in the offing as he steers his course on the high seas. Just a word of caution on the current fashion to erect the State into an august symbol of worship, and speak of *citizenship* as the supreme or even the sole end of education. The word has a good sound, and provides a text for claptrap at prize-givings; sometimes the speaker uses it as equivalent to morality as a whole, sometimes he really does mean to exalt the State to the detriment of other institutions and inspire patriotic fervour. It will be seen that this book by no means encourages indifference to civic virtues,[1] but educators must not allow legislatures or officials to mark the limits of our faith and prescribe the code of duty.

It is scarcely necessary to add that moral values are pre-eminent, if we arrange a hierarchy of values from those concerned with sustenance onwards. "Conduct," said Matthew Arnold, "is three parts of life"; but mathematical comparison is misleading, for we are behaving at all times while we are conscious. Health and art, intelligence and feeling, are not parts of morality: they are aspects of a life, of a self which cannot be conceived apart from them; our imperfections and failures in conduct

[1] I may be allowed to refer to treatment of this theme in *History and its Place in Education*, pp. 34–7.

are more significant just because we are human, and our fellows, also human, afford us the chief avenue by which the spirit finds activity and nourishment.

It is useful, however, to distinguish within the sphere of morals between values of a lower and values of a higher order. Institutions of courtesy and good manners, of law and order, provide conventions which in normal situations demand our acceptance. 'Discipline' is a term which has many implications; it implies acquiring and following the prescriptions of the code. True, the self seeks for freedom — moral freedom no less than physical or aesthetic; but there is only one kind of freedom that is absolute and unconditioned, and it may be possessed by an Epictetus in chains. "Stone walls do not a prison make." Freedom of the spirit is the goal, the supreme reward of a life which lives among and enjoys the institutions of society. Occasions arise when a man must be "a law unto himself," but he must be sure of his ground, convinced that for him and in his case the conventions of his family, of the State, or of vocation are unrighteous. His moral education consists indeed in the development of a conscience, of standards of value, which enable him to say that for me—not for anyone else—this is right and that is wrong. To attribute, however, to a child such maturity of judgment and refinement of feeling is a gross error : no one can entertain it who looks back upon his own development and recalls his indebtedness to the discipline of society.

(*d*) *Intelligence.*—The contrast noted above between thinking and feeling reminds us that we must include the products of intelligence[1] among the forces which relate the outer world to the inner life. In the popular view thinking often stands as the first, if not the only, aim of

[1] See Report of Consultative Committee (Board of Education, 1924) on the Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity, App. IX.

education. English schools came into existence for the purpose of instruction; physical and social needs were satisfied through other channels, taken for granted as concerns of universal obligation for which no scholastic provision was needed. The theorists in due course took a further step: they divided the mind into separate compartments, or faculties, and bade the teacher use the acquisition of knowledge as an instrument for training these faculties: schemes for training the memory, cultivating the judgment, etc., were elaborated. Forty years ago such devices formed the stock-in-trade of many discourses on education; they gained a foothold both in the notes of lessons prepared by students in training colleges and in public opinion[1]: recipes are still advertised and purchased as infallible nostrums for training mental powers. It should be unnecessary in these days to fight over again the battle of formal training: the high percentage of chaff has been effectually winnowed from the modicum of grain; the experimental psychologists have confirmed again and again the *a priori* verdict that Herbart delivered many years before quantitative studies were devised.[2] They are now seeking on other lines of research to discover by Intelligence Tests (see p. 19) how far we can postulate a single distinctive quality or feature in mind to which we can affix the label Intelligence.

These researches have not only a negative effect as criticism of outworn beliefs: they help us to see where the office of Intelligence needs supplementing. The power

[1] Thus a writer to *The Times* (August 4, 1924) writes, apropos of Simplified Spelling: "We hear a great deal of the need for mental gymnastic in education. We make children acquire such 'useless' knowledge as the ability to write verses in a dead language with the avowed purpose of training their minds. May not our present system of spelling, cumbrous as it is, have a very real value as an educational exercise?"

[2] For the most recent pronouncement on this theme see Report of Consultative Committee, loc. cit.

we possess in the control of conscious thought is so magnificent that it may betray the educator into the abuse of power; the symbol of Truth—formulated knowledge set down in black and white—fills his soul, until he comes to believe that by knowledge alone men can solve the riddle of existence. Jung's warning is therefore timely:

"That intellectual apprehension of the psychic process must lead to paradox and relativity is simply unavoidable, for the reason that the intellect is only one among divers psychic functions which Nature[1] intends to serve man in the construction of his objective values. We should not pretend to understand the world solely by the intellect; we apprehend it just as much by feeling. Therefore, the judgment of the intellect is, at best, only half the truth, and must, if it be honest, also come to an understanding of its inadequacy." *Concluding passage in "Psychological Types."*

Pride of intellect, as fostered by an earlier generation, has led to a reaction among educational reformers: these tend to regard thinking as a subordinate function that can be laid aside when the subject desires 'not to think,' or when those who direct a pupil's attention bid him cease from reflection. But we can, and indeed must, exercise our intelligence, even when deliberate attention responds to impulses of emotion. We do not think, i.e. compare, define, arrange because we keep a special machine which can be set in motion or stopped at will: we *are* intelligent, more or less, and every item of contact with the outer world provides matter for thought. It is not so much that we inherit an instinct of curiosity which contends, successfully or not, with other instincts; instead of saying that we want

[1] Note the capital N.

to know, let us say that the accumulation of knowledge is as natural a function as breathing; the comparison is the more apt since we breathe out as well as breathe in; forgetting goes along with remembering. There are many ways of knowing; the brain is worthy of all honour, but muscles play their part; the whole body is alive with energy to 'know how' things are done, to acquire accomplishments. We distinguish knowledge from skill in our curricula, but the intelligence works its way into every nook and corner of our activities. Small wonder, then, that the control of knowledge has been stressed unduly in programmes of education, for here is something that can be got at; we can make people think, with Five Steps[1] or other intellectual machinery. For the products of thought, unlike those of art or of morals, are impersonal, objective in the extreme. We are only justified in the insertion of a personal experience, as the author of this book occasionally permits himself to do, on grounds of art: some readers feel that such disturbance to pure thinking is bad form. Pure intelligence fulfils its highest office in an impersonal search for Truth, the approach to the Universal.

This brief outline must suffice as a ground-plan for educational aims. Each of the divisions we have made is conceived by us apart and because each lodges a distinctive claim—mind versus body, institutions versus morals, thinking versus feeling:—conflicts are set up; each of them contends, shall we say, for mastery of the spirit. The fact of conflict is not in itself to be deplored; peace and tranquillity are noble ideals, but they are not to be won until man has overcome his 'last enemy.' We have a choice of terms that indicate an attitude less absolute than that of peace or rest, terms which suggest

[1] The reference here is to a plan for preparing school lessons which will be discussed in the last Section.

the holding of a balance, the arrangement of the competitors in order: thus the area of conflict is narrowed, and a limited peace is attained—no doubt with a prospect of further conflict. *Compromise*, *harmony*, *rhythm*, *balance*, *concord*, are such terms, and I select *harmony* as being the least liable to misinterpretation. Biologists would prefer us to regard 'adaptation' as covering the field; I cannot, however, regard Henley's "unconquerable soul" as satisfied by Herbert Spencer's "adjustment of organism to environment"!

Our final step in defining educational aims is, therefore, to find ways by which these varieties of experience can co-operate in the culture of the human spirit. The theatre of conflict and of approach to harmony is an organism which changes from infancy to maturity and old age. The teacher's province stays at maturity; up to that point he needs to trace the steps, the stages of that 'Growth of the Self' which Professor Nunn[1] sketches with animation in the fortunes of Jack. 'Harmonious development' was a favourite phrase in the older pedagogy, and has fallen out of fashion; I revive it because I think that the psychology of our time can put a fuller meaning into it; the harmony is no longer confined to a balance of mental powers, nor the development to a growth of faculties.

Consider it well: each tone of our scale in itself is nought;
It is everywhere in the world—loud, soft, and all is said:
Give it to me to use! I mix it with two in my thought,
And, there! Ye have heard and seen: consider and bow the head

. . . . .

Why rushed the discords in, but that harmony should be prized?

Robert Browning, *Abt Vogler*.

[1] Loc. cit. p. 22.

CHAPTER V

HARMONIOUS DEVELOPMENT

ADEQUATE data for genetic psychology, sometimes called child study, were not available for education until the physiologists made a start. Their researches establish definite points, such as the average date for cutting the first teeth, for the maximum weight of brain, for the onset of puberty in each sex; experimental psychologists follow suit, and indicate, with a confidence not so universally shared, the age of sixteen years as a limit to the growth of intelligence.[1] These milestones on the road of life cannot be ignored, whether we follow a dualistic hypothesis and regard body and mind as separate entities running a parallel course, or accept what I suppose is the monistic view offered in this book, assuming the self to be a unity, in which mind and body are manifestations or appearances of an inner life.

The anthropologists have contributed their quota to these theories of parallelism. The Herbartians of the Ziller-Rein School, with little warrant, I think, from their master, made a bold plunge with a Culture-epoch Theory based upon slender equipment in anthropological facts. Stanley Hall, with equal courage and better insight, has pictured the course of child development in stages which carry back to the most primitive types of humanity. Now, while these speculations should certainly be treated with caution, they by no means deserve the ridicule which some scientific men have poured upon them. For the concepts of racial memory, and of instincts of the body-mind

[1] See Report of Consultative Committee, loc. cit.

throwing back to the earliest epochs, are irrational unless we are ready to allow some correspondence between the individual life and the stages of racial evolution. All we can safely do with these investigations is to use them as supplementary evidence: the basis for any view of child development rests on observation and experiment with children of our own time; if the results of such investigation are found to present points of analogy with the findings of the anthropologist so much the better. Pictures and other forms of art afford a ready means of comparison. Take, for example, the collection made by Kerschensteiner[1] of children's drawings from five to fourteen years of age. When these are placed side by side with a series of representations in colour and clay made by primitive races the line of development in the child-mind is unquestionably seen to correspond with the products of imagination among savage peoples.

Among all conclusions taken over from natural history to education the most serviceable is perhaps the explanation offered by Agassiz of infancy as a time of dependence or helplessness, which 'extends' *pari passu* with the evolution of organs and their capacity in animals, and with the evolution of civilization in the human species. "The meaning of that period of helplessness, or infancy, as I see it, lies at the bottom of any scientific or philosophic understanding of the part played by education in human life."[2] From this point of view education is contemplated in time periods, during each of which latent powers, ready for exercise, emerge, while others are postponed. Butler points out that the most gifted specimens of humanity to-day are sometimes afforded an education extending over thirty years before they are expected to forage for themselves and render to society

[1] *Die Entwickelung der Zeichnerischen Begabung.* (Munich, 1906.)

[2] N. M. Butler, *The Meaning of Education.*

a return for what they have received. And this return, which has to be compassed within another thirty years before the fruits of endeavour are rewarded with a pension, will surpass in its quality what a lower type of capacity will produce from fifteen to seventy. This law supplies the justification for the extension of schooling, for the withdrawal of children and 'young persons' from the responsibilities of service, in the conviction that their expanding powers will be better adjusted to the opportunities of modern society. We shall see in a moment how Stanley Hall has sought on this principle to explain adolescence as a period of postponement.

The application of this doctrine encounters grave difficulties when we endeavour to control the occupations of children and young persons in our systems of schooling: if the child is sheltered unduly from the exercises of what is called practical life, habits of dependence may be formed which inhibit the youth and man from desire to balance the account between himself and society. The baffling feature in human nature, as compared with the animal world, lies in the variety of talent and capacity. Thus, while we are safe in pleading that postponement of economic responsibility is justified for all who display fine qualities in character and intelligence, we cannot be so certain about the average—that is, we cannot be certain as to the value of any given scheme of education, which society may here and now devise, as warranted to meet the needs of a multitude, wherein each individual differs so greatly from his fellows. Limits, it is true, are fixed to some extent by the stages of physical growth to which mental progress and the development of the inner life must correspond: thus the most gifted of children, a Mozart who produces fine music, a Jackie Coogan on the stage before six years of age, are still in the stage of childhood. However solicitous

parents and tutors may be to develop the genius of a gifted child, he must (along with the commonplace children about him) wait upon the physiological and mental changes of adolescence to appreciate the significance of art and of learning. The educator has to steer as best he can between precocity and retardation, the Scylla and Charybdis of school organization. There can be little doubt that in these days professional zeal tends to copy the devotion of anxious parents, looking for immediate results, putting old heads on young shoulders.

> Oh! if we draw a circle premature,
> Headless of far gain,
> Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
> Bad is our bargain!
>
> Robert Browning, *The Grammarian.*

It cannot, however, be denied that our wholesale schemes of school classes and standards involve grave risks in arrest of development. When the eight-year-old is offered infant toys and occupations, when the twelve-year-old, ready for thought in mathematics, has to be content with 'doing sums,' the teacher may doubt whether the scholastic machine which makes each pupil keep in step with his fellows is worth the pains we spend upon it. For the man who never 'grows up' either in intellectual or social insight, the man who leaves boyhood without the desire for self-development, is in no better state than the one who is forced to "put away childish things" before he has ceased to be a child.

One or other in these stages of development are often picked out as significant or important beyond the rest. How often are we reminded that if we can only lay a right foundation in infancy we may trust the child to build wisely from that foundation; others,[1] impressed by the

[1] e.g. Arnold of Rugby (p. 68 below).

storm and stress of adolescence, would seek to put the weight of endeavour into the period of secondary education; others again, conscious of the need for helping young men and women to see their way amid the political and social distractions of these times, regard Adult Education or University teaching as the important task. These partial enthusiasms find no support in laws of development. At each stage the individual can accept all the help that his capacity warrants; at each stage the pupil is a self-governing organism and will respond to his environment according to the measure of his capacity. No one portion of a man's life is more valuable or important than any other. We may discover, on looking back, that at some earlier stage failure or loss has been incurred; so be it, the past is past; the one important period of life for either pupil or teacher is the present moment.

Those who make these comparisons tend to ignore one of the essential facts about development. They regard these stages as a succession of compartments from each of which a new self emerges, independent of its earlier existence; the youth is bidden to put away childish things, to be a man; maturity is reproached when it displays the vestiges of youthful effervescence. To a degree, of course, this is sound psychology, but it is surely more in accordance with experience to recognize each stage as contributing its own quota to the making of the whole man; only complete in adult power if he has retained, in physical organs, in attitudes and mental powers the memory of that mode of life which possessed him in each of the earlier passages of life's journey. Space only affords opportunity for one illustration: we may take it from the reference we have made above to the distinction between the personality and the inner self. The mature adult character displays its virtue in relation to society, those many institutions, many individuals,

with each of whom a well-balanced character seeks harmony, displaying a distinctive 'face' in each situation, not by artifice but by sympathy. But whence does this power of varying the personality finds its source? how comes it that one man in his life can play many parts? Its origin is evidently to be traced to the play-time of life, to infancy:

> A wedding or a festival,
> A mourning or a funeral;
> And this hath now his heart,
> And unto this he frames his song.
> Then will he fit his tongue
> To dialogues of business, love or strife;
> But it will not be long
> Ere this be thrown aside,
> And with new joy and pride
> The little actor cons another part.

Yet this is only the beginning: the child still desires to play, although he has passed into a stage where the sensible is realized apart from the phantasies of infancy; youth and manhood though burdened with "the inevitable yoke," also make a play of life, and perform their parts with ease if infancy has pursued a genial course.[1]

Let us now glance at the sequence of stages, not attempting an adequate sketch in terms of psychology, but noting a few features that may help us in succeeding chapters.

It is seldom realized how very modern is the respect that educators pay to infancy. Wordsworth was anticipated by Traherne; Froebel and Montessori trace back through Pestalozzi to Locke in recognizing the need for basing intelligence on sense-perception. The pendulum has now swung across; we learnt in the nineteenth century that "happiness, our being's end

[1] I have developed this theme, as regards History, in *History and its Place in Education*, pp. 42–9; and in *The Children of England*, pp. 152–4 and 198.

and aim," could at least be applied to the care of our little ones. The infant's happiness is largely a matter of physical adjustment: diet, exercise and sleep are the things that matter, and they are so essential that the physician who controls the nursery and the nursery school is liable to overlook the subconscious effect of other environing influences. Happiness is a state of harmony at the moment; the baby is happy when his physical organs are working normally, with freedom for incessant activity in limbs and voice, eyes and ears, and with the atmosphere of love which is the foundation of social relations. Froebel's *Mutter-und Kose-Lieder* is a classic, for with all its faults it touches the heart; no 'Gifts,' Froebelian or Montessorian, can replace this primary condition of service rendered by mother or nursery-teacher in the spiritual guidance of infants. Psychology is helping us to some comprehension of the steps by which social sentiments are formed in the depths of the unconscious; the sketch of Jack, to which I have already referred, in Professor Nunn's volume [1] offers a lively example of the aid which genetic psychology can now render to parents and teachers, all the more valuable because in main outline the conclusions confirm the intuitions of wise and loving parents. We hesitate to follow the psychologists only in matters on which they themselves are not agreed. Jung tells us that the early history (of infantile sentiments) does much to determine whether the child will "become an 'extrovert,' finding his business in outward things, or an 'introvert,' concerned mainly with his own feelings and thoughts." [2] Jung

[1] See p. 56 above.

[2] Nunn, loc. cit., p. 145. Professor Nunn does not adopt this view, but I regard it as a typical case of the over-confidence with which the psychoanalyst claims authority to reveal processes in the unconscious mind.

credits this distinction to heredity, as a factor in the make-up of each one of us, while others would rely upon environment to effect marked change in the disposition.

As soon as the infant can talk and can walk a new era is opened, the sense of power is enormously extended; he becomes an explorer into every nook and alley of his world; the sights and sounds of nature, in city streets or country lanes, help to reshape him. It would be foolish to decry the plans for developing intellectual power now taken over in our infant schools from the systems of Froebel and Montessori: for the child is now ready to discriminate, with ever-increasing detail, between great and small, heavy and light. The error is to suppose that these experiments, encouraged on the floor of a school-room, can replace wider contact with a less organized but more varied and natural world.

At the close of infancy there ensues a period which we used to call years of 'transition'; the psychologist stresses their value as a time for 'consolidation.'[1] Both at this time (say, between six and eight years of age) and at the later period of transition (twelve to fourteen) health tends to be disturbed and therewith the behaviour often gives anxiety to parents and teachers. The transition is the halting-place between two modes of existence: the childhood into which the infant emerges is a life in which the self stands apart, conscious of the *ego* and the *alter*. Stanley Hall's description still stands[2]:

"The years from about eight to twelve constitute a unique period of human life. The acute stage of teething is passing, the brain has acquired nearly its adult size and weight, health is almost at its best, activity is greater

[1] Nunn, loc. cit., p. 147.

[2] The first paragraph in Stanley Hall's *Youth*. He worked out the theme more fully in *Adolescence* and in earlier writings.

and more varied than it ever was before or ever will be again, and there is peculiar endurance, vitality, and resistance to fatigue. The child develops a life of its own outside the home circle, and its natural interests are never so independent of adult influence. Perception is very acute, and there is great immunity to exposure, danger, accident, as well as to temptation. Reason, true morality, religion, sympathy, love, and æsthetic enjoyment are but very slightly developed."

He then proceeds to speculate on the recapitulation theory to which I have referred above.

Youngsters during this period often display an assurance and confidence in contrast to the vagaries of the years that follow : hence it is sometimes called The Period of Stability. We must not, however, take stability to mean pause or standing still; far from it. The child applies a new principle to the conduct of life; if he is felt to be selfish, over against other selves, his attitude is due to the need for finding harmony between himself and the positive realities of his world. We saw (pp. 47–49) that these phenomena approach him from two directions : livelihood on the one hand, art on the other. The other two types of value which contribute to his development (p. 50–55) serve as means to these practical ends; he is a pragmatist, and the pragmatist philosophy has met the situation.[1] The institutions of society, more especially the school, are

[1] It is significant, to my mind, that the country in which pragmatism is most at home has interpreted childhood in those years of stability and worked out a pedagogy which conforms to the type. Students of philosophy in Europe who are familiar with William James and John Dewey as leaders in philosophic thought are often unaware of the profound influence that they have exerted on the practice of American schools: James, *Talks to Teachers*; and Dewey, *The School and the Child*, *School and Society*, and *Educational Essays*.

used by the child to bring these basic interests into relation with the self, and they render this aid, in general terms, by assisting his intelligence.

The reader may well demur to this description as far-fetched, because in ordinary children we do not witness efforts towards the arts as enjoyed by adults, nor in modern civilization do we expect the child to work for his livelihood. And yet racial heritage and the constitution of organs and limbs between them are the basis for the self on the platform so far attained; the urge to live as a physical being, the urge to use, and to enjoy the use of, his concrete world seem to be the starting-point for all the child's activities. Only, of course, the starting-point; for the mind is now awake and we call the child a practical person because he applies his intelligence in the ascending effort to make of himself a new creature. Two illustrations, in advance of what will be set out in the second volume, must suffice at this point. As regards art, it is now recognized that childhood is the time when music, vocal and instrumental, eurhythmics and poetry are found congenial. These are pursued both as outlets for emotion and as whetstones for thought. The dry bones of grammar are rightly discarded, for they are unpractical; but children are ready enough to appreciate the rhythms of poetry and to discriminate forms of speech, as Mr. Caldwell Cook has shown in his work and play with the youngsters of the Perse Grammar School.[1] And during the last fifty years, since John Hullah and Curwen first made singing an intellectual exercise for the young, we have been aware that the voice and the ear are waiting, from the age of six onwards, for submission to intellectual discipline: and now Dalcroze has completed the

[1] *The Play Way in Education*; and the Perse Play Books. Mr. Lambourn (*Rudiments of Criticism*) was an earlier pioneer at Oxford in the same field.

harmony by teaching the child to organize the rhythms of trunk and limbs.[1]

As regards livelihood we have come to see that the handicrafts and domestic work take high rank among the pursuits of young children, not solely or chiefly as preparatory to the employments of adult life but at the moment giving scope for interests which the child feels to be vital. Through such occupation he gets at science, gets at mathematics, gets at history and geography, for these 'subjects,' as we call them, are, in him as in the race, the outcome of thought applied to the reality in which he exists.

Thus childhood completes its tasks: the little man who has never lost, one hopes, the spirit of play that followed him from infancy, finds new fields for life's adventure. About the age of twelve or thirteen comes a second period of transition or consolidation; our organizers fix on this time as appropriate for change from the primary or preparatory school to the secondary school (p. 135), and rightly so, for a new life seeks a new habitat. Whether the higher standards of a primary school or the lower form of a secondary school take charge of these later years of childhood, this period cannot be regarded as a completion of education, and the legislature has at last taken notice of the ensuing stage by comprising the earlier years of adolescence in the clauses of the Act of 1918 dealing with *young persons*. The more familiar term, 'youth,' will serve our purpose better to indicate the years from fourteen to eighteen; 'lads and lasses' are the best terms to use, but we are not likely to revert to the homely language of our forefathers. I need not delay to sketch the psychology of this stage: it has received the solicitous regard

[1] *Rhythm, Music and Education*, 1922. Comp. p. 258 below.

of students ever since Arnold of Rugby[1] described it, with unnecessary vehemence, as "the dangerous period" through which the lad must be "hastened." There is no need for haste; the youth himself is all too willing, when once he finds his foothold in the new country, to forge ahead. Stanley Hall is surely nearer to the truth (whatever be the worth of his analogy with racial evolution) when he speaks of "postponement." For the youth has now his life's quest in full view; no longer is he satisfied with the moving spectacle; he sets out to learn the nature of man and to place himself in relation to the Universal. As we associate with young persons, in the family the workshop or the school, we find them to be companionable, for although we know much more than they and often in pessimistic mood exclaim, "If youth but knew!" we err if we interpret their lack of conscious purposes as evidence of weakness. They accept our discipline among the other conventions by which they and we adapt ourselves to the social milieu, and they need it, for they are passing through a stage between the stability of childhood and the freedom of the adult; but their strength lies in the development of self-regarding (not necessarily selfish) sentiments which keep inviolate the sanctuary of the human spirit. Their strength, over against our weakness, lies in their hold upon the future; try as we may to shape them to the settled pattern of our time they will, each for himself, break the mould and shape the clay anew. It is well, therefore, that our modern systems of education accept the demand for varied types of curricula and of schools: science for one, humanities for another, the craft shop for a third, the fine arts for a fourth; freedom is the watchword,[2]

[1] Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, chap. iii.

[2] Only in contrast to the discipline congenial to the earlier stages. For it must still be a limited freedom (see p. 44 above).

for it can now be applied to the selection of pursuits as well as to the manner in which these are followed.

Whatever pursuits are either chosen or prescribed for him, the adolescent uses them, unconsciously perhaps, as aids to explain himself to himself. If this statement appears vague to my readers I can only ask them to recall what memories they have of their own life at this stage and to supplement the memories by experience gained in intercourse with youth—intercourse, that is, on those occasions when, formal instruction being in the background, the adolescent, in the frankness of exchange, affords a glimpse of his hopes and fears. My interpretation can only be my own ; as I see our young people, gay with the exuberance of new powers, eager to test new values in experience, I regard them as facing the great institutions of mankind, of sex, of property and of religion, devouring all that comes to them from teachers and books, from science and art, to help them to a realization of the self. In each of these fields they shape and reshape their ideals ; sometimes with rapid alternations of 'storm and stress,' but often in the even flow of a current whose surface is unruffled, whatever under-currents may be suspected in the unconscious. I am convinced that most of the prominent writers and teachers who have described adolescence have been biased ; they are themselves exceptional natures, sometimes, like Thomas Arnold, precociously developed ; they strike a note of alarm which it is well to hear, since we need to be alive to peril, but, as I have said above, I hold that all periods of life are equally important and equally exposed to peril. Adolescence is but the first stage in a new orientation towards existence : 'storm and stress,' retreat and advance, may be witnessed at every halting-place on life's road. An educational ideal which is fraught with anxiety and strain is not appropriate to the slow-maturing

processes of evolution; we should welcome the realism of Bernard Shaw, who warns us that "ethical strain is just as bad for us as physical strain . . . although it may be of use in emergencies." What distinguishes our age from all previous epochs as regards adolescence is the rapid pace at which young persons garner the fruits of learning, if they are so disposed.

The later years of adolescence may once more be regarded as a period of consolidation, till finally the young person, now become student or worker (though students, sometimes, work!), attains to twenty-one, an age at which the State once more marks the beginning of a new period by admitting the young man to the franchise.

Looking back over the successive stages of the long road from infancy to adulthood, making a reckoning of what is gained—or lost—we are impressed above all by an immense variety of differences. We divide them into types: the dominant sex, if it may still be so labelled, contrasted with women; the wealthy and semi-wealthy using their resources to provide a sheltered upbringing for their children, over against working classes, and in each of these we witness profound differences in taste and capacity; we sort them out as clever and stupid,[1] coarse or refined; the psychologist would separate them into extroverts and introverts, subdividing these again as exhibiting bias towards intuition, or feeling or intellection, and again he distinguishes them on lines of inherited temperament. With every advance in psychology a new standpoint is offered, and the organizer, seeking to make use of the science in planning his schemes of education, is apt to be bewildered. No wonder that the latest exponents of reform (p. 22) give a prominent place to individuality, and insist that all our attempts to

[1] On Intelligence Tests see pp. 53 and 215.

describe and classify types must yield to the necessity for letting each human being work out his own salvation. But we plan for millions and legislate for types; we plant the child amid the crowd of a school; hence it becomes our concern, before following up the development of children under the charge of teachers in the Practice of Education, to review the principles on which a community organizes education for the many as well as for the individual.

SECTION II

THE ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER VI

THE INSTITUTIONS[1] THAT FOSTER EDUCATION

FURNISHED with some philosophy of aims and ideals the student of education proceeds to investigate the organization[1] through which these aims are to be achieved. He observes the school as an association,[1] assembled day by day in one spot, with teachers, one or more, responsible for the concourse of scholars who 'attend' for a few years and then give place to their successors. Who provide the meeting-place? Who appoint the teachers? Who regulate the attendance of the scholars, imposing conditions as to age and attainments? Who has authority to determine the specific aims of each school, defining its relations and functions with regard to all other schools? These are problems certainly of professional interest, affecting intimately the fortunes of the teaching profession, but they are public concerns also. The teacher, in his own sphere, planning a Time-table, helping children to learn lessons, claims his independence and shuts out the public; behind him, however, stands the adult community who place their children in his hands (pp. 5 and 254).

Now since all institutions have their roots in the past and are never the outcome of pure speculation (if indeed speculation can ever be 'pure'), the history of education is a necessary foundation for principles of organization. The beginner finds interest in the story of great educators and pioneers; presently the history of schools and colleges claims his attention; finally, Professor Adams

[1] For the technical sense in which these terms are employed see p. 31.

helps him to get behind the minds of the conventional historians and sketches *The Evolution of Educational Theory* (1912). Or the student looks abroad, for the example of our neighbours must be reckoned among the forces that promote reform: thus The New Learning came more or less from Italy by way of the Rhine; the English Continuation School is partly the result of experiment in Munich and other cities of Central Europe[1]; so a branch of study called *Comparative Education*[2] takes shape. English folk have never been over-eager to copy the devices of their neighbours, yet no one will deny that these inquiries into foreign systems of education have had great influence both consciously and at the back of men's minds. In Britain this impulse may be dated from 1851 (the year of the first International Exhibition); with the Bryce Commission of 1895 it became fully recognized as an indispensable aid to education. We shall be content in the following sketch to garner the fruits of these prolonged inquiries, keeping our attention on the immediate task, viz. the exposition of principles on which men are acting in our own day and our own country. At the same time, since our English system has largely taken shape since 1902, references to recent history will be frequent, and these chapters may be viewed as a sketch of development since that date.

The theory of organization springs from activities of 'groups' in the community that specially represent this or that institution. In one sense it may be said that all the institutions of mankind stake a claim on education, since all alike look to the future and therefore desire to influence the young; but some have a better title than others, and I select eight whose

[1] M. E. Sadler, *The Continuation School* (Manchester University Press, 1907).

[2] Peter Sandiford and others (under this title, 1918).

claims can scarcely be challenged. These I arrange in order as follows: *Family* and *Class* give prominence to individualism in education; *Religion* and *Vocation* provide respectively for the spiritual and the secular needs of man. The institutions of *Culture* take two forms: Art and Learning in general, in contrast to the expert knowledge represented in the vocation of *Teaching*. Finally, the institutions of the *State*, both *national* and *local*, have come to full recognition in our own epoch. This order is not adopted as an order of importance, but for convenience of arrangement. In this chapter I shall seek to define their province; thereafter we can trace the sequel in the forms of organization which are devised to adjust their claims.

It may be questioned whether these eight institutions include all that should be admitted to a voice in organization; I trust that after they have been reviewed one by one, the list will be recognized as complete. Some, e.g., may hold that a specific rôle should be assigned to the institution of property, but it is really subsumed under the rubric Vocation (compare p. 227). The economic needs of schooling need consideration, and are surveyed in Chapter IX, but they play a part subservient to the ideals of all institutions which inspire the aims of education.

Family.—No one who reflects upon the life of children will dispute that the influence of parents and of others in the circle of a family is paramount in guiding the disposition of the young, certainly of infants, and very often up to maturity. It is quite true that in modern times, and more especially in the environment of crowded cities, this influence is checked by vivid contacts both in the school and on the streets; true also that families, in all ranks of society, differ immensely in the strength of domestic ties. None the less, the obvious conditions of

helplessness and intimacy during the first year of a child's existence establish sympathies and controls which under normal circumstances hold sway, quite apart from those traditions and conventions which reinforce the bond.

Intimacy and sympathy :—these two terms express concisely the basis on which the family makes good its claim. Because of these ties the family group is affected vitally by the fortunes of its younger members : if they do well then the stability and happiness of the rest are vastly promoted ; if they fall by the way the rest of the family are deeply concerned to find a remedy. It is in vain for critics, whether philosophers or writers of problem fiction, to deny the pronouncement ; the facts of life, biological and spiritual alike, are against them : biological, because man, although something more than an animal, still shares with beasts and birds the instincts which lead every species to foster its young; spiritual, because with every access of range and insight man ascends to regions where loneliness and solitude are hard to endure, unless he shares the new illumination with those who have passed with him through lower levels of experience.

I am not forgetting that there is something to be said on the other side : the younger generation—even before Bernard Shaw—had a quarrel to pick with father and mother ; what the latest advocates of emancipation have done is to bring more to consciousness a lack of harmony that had always existed within the family and to display the energy of other institutions. Culture (especially the drama), incitements to amusement, ambitions in one's vocation, the spread of political ideas—all these offer avenues of escape from the home and make it inevitable that parents should accept, should indeed go out to meet, this new attitude in their young people. Readjustment, however, is not destruction : bachelors and spinsters,

who have outgrown or escaped from one home and have not found another, may be excellent critics of family institutions, but are scarcely likely to undermine the conservative impulses which have so far sustained the human race. If, and when, the daring prophecy of a biochemist[1] is fulfilled and human life from its start is put in the care of skilful surgeons under the ægis of the State, then no doubt the family as we know it will disappear; but that time is not yet, and I only refer to such weird speculations to remind myself and my readers that the most cherished institutions of mankind must not be content to rely solely on traditional sentiments.

The practical result of these movements away from the family is to justify resort to a boarding-school (pp. 140 and 241) for families where temperament or circumstances render it difficult for the child to combine home influence with education in a day-school; in former times the roving impulses of young men were encouraged by wise parents, and the emancipation of women implies a similar recognition for young women: most educators, e.g., approve of sending students to college or university at a distance, cutting them loose from the nest; the argument is weaker at earlier stages of development, but is strong enough to explain the popularity of boarding-schools in certain classes of society. Such schools, whether for wealthy or indigent classes, certainly tend to 'institutionalize' their inmates—that is, they cultivate sentiments of attachment to other institutions, to religion, to class, to public life in general, in contrast to the narrower circle of the family.

The family is thus seen to be an expression and outgrowth of individuality; whatever a man may demand for himself, the ego, he asks also for those who 'belong'

[1] (J. S.) Haldane, in *Dædalus; or, Science and the Future*, 1924.

to him, his partners, his successors. If we choose to mark the distinctions of sex we may say that the demand is more intense among women who are mothers, for they suffer more and risk more on behalf of the young. It is from men that other institutions, during historic epochs, have mainly been derived and by men that they have been mainly controlled. And yet it would be unjust to stress this distinction of sex, since in civilized epochs the principle of monogamy has been exalted by both sexes, and the foundation of harmonious family life rests upon this principle, i.e. upon equality of sacrifice and service for the maintenance of the common stock. This maintenance is, of course, seen superficially in providing one's children with what we call the necessities of life, food, clothing, housing, with something put by for the future, in providing even an excess of these, so that the youngsters may step forward and ascend the social ladder: but it is also seen in deeper currents of anxiety, in desires, not always expressed or even consciously felt by the elders, that the young folk should *be* of the best rather than have of the best; that they should grow in grace and wisdom, and thus be 'a credit to the family,' exhibiting behaviour that will be approved by the best people. All such strivings, we say, can be set down as an expression of individualism as opposed to collectivism: in the history of schools during the nineteenth century, when the collectivist energy of the State was aroused to remedy the neglect of other groups, one can see how the opponents of State control always turned to 'the parent' for support. They deplored the decay of parental responsibility when it was proposed to introduce medical inspection; they founded Parents' Leagues[1] when the State threatened, rightly or wrongly, to interfere with religious instruction. Quite recently they relied on parental

[1] P. 239.

jealousies to hinder the success of a scheme of continued education in London.

This last instance suggests a misgiving which is shared by many devoted friends of education. They tell us that there are two types of parent; they admit that many are actually self-sacrificing, but they point to the notorious case of 'half-timers' in Lancashire and Yorkshire as an example of individualism pushed to its logical extreme; here the grown-up folk appeared to care little for children, and willingly deprived them of schooling in order that the family as a whole might secure a higher weekly wage. It was only in 1923 that this unhappy survival of old-time customs was finally brought to an end; if the law is enforced no child in Great Britain can now be withdrawn from school until he passes his fourteenth birthday. Now, while one shares in the general gratification that this long-drawn-out controversy between factory and school has at last ended in an adequate recognition of the rights of childhood, one ought not to allow this and other evidences of parental individualism to warp one's judgment. It must be borne in mind that the whole movement in this country for compulsory schooling is only two generations old. The grandparents of these factory children were brought up in a society which viewed the labour of children in a different light: they believed that work, constant work, was part of the necessary discipline of childhood, and in so believing had memories not only of their own severe upbringing, but the tradition of ages, reaching back to the time when the settlement of races in agriculture and domestic industry gave a chance for advancement to humble folk at the price of unremitting toil for the whole household.[1] Hence, while greed for children's earnings has always played its

[1] I may venture to refer to my own book, *The Children of England*, for the elaboration of this theme.

part in the resistance of peasants and of operatives to the extension of schooling, it is wrong to attribute the whole of their resistance to such a motive. Rather we should say that the primary source is to be traced to a tradition, a social consciousness, of which the family and the group of families in any neighbourhood are the inheritors.

For such a family, living in its narrow circle of hamlet or city street, normally tends to maintain its stock by the conservation of old customs. Adults, if they will, may adopt new-fangled ways and heretical opinions, but for children the path of safety is the old path. This theme has been so often trodden both in biography[1] and in romantic literature as to need no extension here. Thus it comes about that tendencies which at one moment display the family as the mainstay of individualism, asserting the right of man and woman, when parents, to do as they will with their own, appear presently as the allies of stability and conservatism, determined to protect the young from a too sudden introduction to the novelties of a world in which parents would fain protect their children from ill-balanced and radical change.

Class.—The illustrations here adduced have been taken from the humbler classes, for whose welfare the State has been increasingly solicitous during the last hundred years. We might equally well have chosen our examples from families of fortune. The most honourable motive that any man can advance for making money is that his children will reap the benefit; he may well be mistaken in his logic, but the motive itself can scarcely be questioned. And the wealthy family uses this money to control the children's education according to the ideals and traditions that the parents hold as to what is right and proper. This feature of educational history should not be ignored, for it presents in the most favourable light

[1] Edmund Gosse's *Father and Son* is a modern example.

the claims of the family to a voice in education; wherever family means have made it possible to assert the claim, it has always been made and always admitted. Now, as in earlier days, public provision is made for schooling in public organization; but such provision is rarely enforced upon the children of those who can provide education from their own resources. Some of the Western States of America appear to be emulating the example of ancient Sparta, desiring to compel all classes to place their children under State discipline.

It is not the purpose of these chapters to discuss the relations of wealth and poverty; men have differed, and will continue to differ, as to the virtues of the poor and the benefits accruing to 'private' wealth. Our only concern here is to note that three types of schooling (Chapter VII) have emerged from the use of wealth by parents: the private tutor, the private school,[1] and what we know in Great Britain as the Endowed and Proprietary Schools. The first is the clearest example, since the parent in this case does not send his child to school, but he creates a 'home' school for his child; he is the sole organizer of the education, exempt from the interference of any other institution.[2] A glance at other countries shows us that such individualism is sometimes regarded as excessive; in Germany, for example, a child cannot be exempted from attendance at a 'recognized' school unless the State is satisfied with the tutor's competence for his office, yet even with this *caveat* the authority of the family is patent. We are not at this point concerned to discuss the demerits or otherwise of private tuition (p. 113), it

[1] 'Private' in the British rather than in the American terminology. In the United States all schools are called 'private' if they are not maintained by public authority.

[2] But compare p. 114 below

plays a great part still in certain branches of art, such as music and dancing, as well as among exalted classes of nobility. In private and in endowed schools the dominance of parents is not so absolute, and yet, since the continuance of these schools depends upon adequate patronage, they are always conducted so as to meet with the approval of the class of families which resort to them.

Parental influence, in fact, spreads into a larger sphere which is commonly viewed as *class* education. We have noticed how the family in all ranks seeks to identify its members with friends and neighbours of the same social standing; style in manners in language and in taste is communicated to the young by putting them together at school. But this motive is no longer obtruded; a few obscure schools still put out prospectuses admitting only 'the sons of gentlemen,' but these are survivals of an epoch when class distinctions rested on law as well as on custom, when each man accepted his station, keeping apart both from those above and from those beneath him in the social order. Since the epoch of the French Revolution democratic ideas have relegated these usages to a more limited sphere; those who found schools at the present day open them to pupils of any class who are able to profit by the course of education. It is indeed an offence to popular sentiment when proposals are made that countenance the separation of one child from another on the ground of social upbringing; and I may perhaps be criticized for introducing so thorny a problem into a survey of education.

But we are only concerned to get at the facts, and the fact remains that, in the most democratic of societies, in New Zealand for example, or in the Middle and West of America, every family which is jealous for its integrity desires for its children a social environment at school

corresponding to the domestic influences of the home; and families which cannot secure such an environment in the common school seek other means to achieve their end, if they possess the needful wealth. The terms 'class' and 'class distinction' are offensive, but the underlying idea persists, and extends far beyond the provision made for schooling. My American friends, for example, object to our European exclusiveness on the railway, separating a First Class from a Third Class; such labels, they say, would not be tolerated in a democratic country: but they admit that this distinction between the New World and the Old is only an affair of labels, for when an American wishes to escape from the crowd he buys a seat in the Pullman. In every large city we may observe separation by class silently operating in the schools of congested areas as well as in the graded avenues of the suburbs.

There is only one justification, from the public point of view, for the endeavour to recognize social distinctions in the sphere of education:—the desire to spread among all children those advantages which have hitherto been enjoyed only by a few. The school should not be a leveller, reducing every child and every home to the standard of the lowest; on the contrary, whatever distinctive virtue can be found in any social milieu should be studied, reshaped, and then appropriated so as to add variety and richness to the whole field of education. Only in this way can the past be utilized to help the present. Many examples could be quoted to show how the community has benefited by transfer from the few to the many. In England an illustration is to hand in methods for fostering corporate life, first cultivated in the exclusive atmosphere of 'Public' boarding-schools but now adapted to the very different circumstances of municipal schools, both primary and secondary.

I have considered the institutions of Family and Class together since, in contrast to the institutions of religion and of democracy, they appear as separatist or individualistic.[1] Christianity goes out into "all the world"; the State comprehends all the children of a nation; in the family every child is a precious exception. The conflict between individualism and collectivism is unceasing, and it will be our task in a later chapter to note how compromise is being sought in the organization of education: meanwhile there is little dispute that class can no longer be recognized in education law, however much it plays a part behind the scenes. With Family the case is different; in Chapter VII we shall see how compulsion interferes with parental rights, and in Chapter XII we shall note the relation of parents and authorities in the school to which parents and guardians entrust their children.

Religion.—The institutions of religion also advance their claims on principles grounded in human nature, although the method of approach is different. One person may abstain from religious observance, and deny the reality of spiritual experience, as another person abstains from domesticity; he may even resent the intrusion of religious institutions into public life as an offence; but, once more, let us observe the facts. The individuals who hold such views are exceptional, although they may be persons of singular probity and worth; they will not deny that the phenomena discussed in Chapter III are witnessed in the great mass of mankind, whatever strictures they apply to the convictions professed, which they contemn as relics of superstition.

Such being the case, we cannot wonder that the institutions of education have sought a close alliance with those

[1] In *An Introduction to Sociology* I have treated Class and other institutions more fully than is possible here.

of religion; indeed, it was only in modern times, i.e. since the Protestant Reformation, that a severance began to be made between the two; and it was only in the last century that a theory of compromise was adopted in England and Wales culminating in the Acts of 1902–3, by which an approach to harmony was achieved between secular powers and spiritual powers in the control of school children. The conflicts which this compromise allayed were inevitable; not, however, because the disputants differed as to the importance of religion; they differed as to the varieties of expression by which this importance should be manifested. They quarrelled, in fact, because they esteemed religious influence so highly; each party sought to enforce its own views both as to the nature of this influence and the method by which it should operate. We have hitherto spoken of religion as if all adherents in the community were of one mind: if that had been the case, if the union or reunion of religious bodies had been achieved, no difficulty would have been encountered in organization. Here, as in the case of Class, the organizer is faced with lack of *homogeneity*. In all parts of the world where a community accepts a single form of religious observance the 'separate' school[1] is not needed, for the problem of religious instruction gives no concern; it is because men differ, because their differences cut so deep a furrow in the inner life, because a man's relations to God are felt to be of supreme importance both for himself and for his offspring—such reasons underlie the tragic conflicts which have been witnessed both in our own and in foreign countries. During the last twenty years the virulence of these disputes has abated, and it is possible for a student to reflect upon the principles at issue in a judicial frame of

[1] This term is used on the continent of Europe as equivalent to what we now call 'non-provided.'

mind. At the same time he will not make the mistake of assuming that the smooth waters on which we now sail will never be agitated, or that the problem may be ignored because a compromise has been reached which serves for the time being. Let us note the principles which are at stake and see how far this compromise contains elements of permanence.

The cardinal principle which has issued from the dreary controversies of the nineteenth century is based on the doctrine of *toleration*, a negative doctrine (thou shalt not persecute), which has played so conspicuous a part in our national history from the sixteenth century onwards, alike in religion and in politics. The man who tolerates is not indifferent as to the essential quality of his creed; on the contrary, he looks to it as an anchor which should hold together the whole society. He believes that his faith will finally conquer; but he is content to forego the exercise of power. He refuses to enforce his opinions on those who differ from him, and therefore allows freedom and equality both in opinions and practice, although such opinions and practice may be alien to the deepest impulses of his nature.

This doctrine took its own trend when applied to the school. Men of conservative disposition were loth to allow toleration in a community of children, for they were impressed by the need for retaining the young in obedience to settled ordinances; it is only the mature minds, they said, that can be broad-minded. They realized that if once the school became public (i.e. secular in its attitude towards religion) the child's affections might be alienated subconsciously, but quite definitely, from the family altar; and, with every advance in the efficiency of the State system, the peril of defection would be increased.

Those, on the other hand, among whom toleration had become itself an article of faith looked to the school to

foster in youthful minds a new spirit—a spirit of *comprehension.* Children, they said, are not ripe for understanding the deep mysteries which divide grown men; let them at least be united in common worship of the Father of all mankind, united in a society where the antagonisms of creed, of politics and of class are postponed, until men and women, grown to years of discretion, can reconcile adherence to a distinctive group with an attitude of comprehension and good-will. Students of the nineteenth-century history can see how these currents of opinion, which no logic can reconcile, fought for mastery both in political parties and in individuals like W. E. Gladstone, whose story both as a churchman and a statesman is typical of his epoch. As a result, three forms of compromise emerged: we shall better appreciate their value after we have noted the functions allotted to the State, the 'secular arm,' which has stood as rival both to the Church and the Family in making claims upon the life of childhood.

Vocation.—A man's occupation, the calling by which he seeks his livelihood (p. 47) has always made a claim upon the institutions of education: the movements for technical instruction which gathered strength during the last half-century can be paralleled by similar endeavours at earlier epochs—in the Middle Ages, for example, when apprenticeship was more important to the majority of city boys than the grammar-school education. It is not surprising, therefore, that recent efforts to extend the influence of the State in our epoch, in opposition to ecclesiastical control, have been powerfully aided by those who stress the importance of livelihood, now seen to be dependent upon the secular studies of men of science. For, since the era of the Industrial Revolution, the functions of government have been viewed more and more as concerned with trade and industry. The political

theory which derives from Jeremy Bentham sought to enable men to find their happiness in the freedom of their vocation, emancipated from all interference, whether in religion or in trade; but when it was realized that the State, through education, could promote, as well as hamper, the enterprises of trader and manufacturer, it was easy to discard the individualism of the '30s and appeal to Government to give technology an important standing in the educational system. Using the terms 'technology' and 'vocation' in a broad sense, so as to include professions as well as trades and humbler employments, we have to admit the ever-increasing prestige of places of education which pursue aims specifically vocational.

In former epochs the family accepted the chief responsibility for vocation; the girl learned domestic crafts in the home (as she still does for the most part, unless she is excluded from the kitchen) while the boy either followed his father's trade or was apprenticed to a neighbour. Even to-day the craftsmen keep close to this age-long tradition, especially the small farmers, who tread the old paths, growing stock and their crops as a family concern. Apprenticeship has had a chequered history.[1] Up to the seventeenth century it supplied the chief means of education, in the best sense of the word, to a large proportion of English youth; for the master accepted a double obligation: he contracted both to instruct his pupil in the mysteries of the craft and to train him in right behaviour. The Industrial Revolution, expanding the power of the machine in contrast to the handiwork of tool and bench, hastened the decay of a system which had already been undermined, in England at least, by the dominance of commerce; in Napoleon's phrase England had become "a nation of shopkeepers" before she extended her world empire by means of factory

[1] *The Children of England*, loc. cit., pp. 98 100.

products. The nation has not yet come to realize the loss which our epoch has sustained by the disappearance of that old-time control[1] which industry exercised over the adolescent. When legislators first saw that some modern substitute must be found for mediæval apprenticeship they thought almost wholly of technical *instruction*, of 'subjects,' so-called, which would help lads to a reasonable grasp of the processes of industry. They ignored the deeper currents of adolescent life which demand the inspiration of human interests, turning a technical pursuit into a vocation, that is, a calling which provides both discipline and vision to the youth who finds life opening out before him.

In vocations which we call professional rather than industrial such needs have been met more easily, for the secondary schools, based on the grammar and endowed schools of an earlier age, were re-shaped so as to give the future solicitor, doctor or merchant some discipline and culture before embarking on his career. The professions, in fact, were able to look after themselves, and advanced their prestige and their corporate position right through the nineteenth century: rivalries in method have emerged, e.g., between the Medical and Law Schools and professional articles based on traditional modes of acquiring skill; but these rivalries have only stimulated the energy with which professional men have entrenched their position. The influence of vocation on education is indeed most clearly witnessed in the powers entrusted by the State to medical and legal corporations; they settle the qualifications in respect of liberal education which the neophyte must display before admission to vocational study, and thus exercise powerful control over the secondary school curriculum; and they determine absolutely the course of study when these entrance

[1] Compare p. 68 on Adolescence.

requirements have been satisfied. Both law and public opinion agree in enabling the Councils of these professions to exclude from practice all unauthorized persons; thereby not only giving to their clients a guarantee of qualified service, but securing themselves against the mischiefs of unrestricted competition. Other professions, more recently and less thoroughly regulated, look with envy upon the status of those ancient corporations; they may become incorporated or even secure royal charters; in some instances, as in the callings of architect and surveyor, exclusive privileges have been granted; but the public look with a jealous eye upon further extensions of corporate privilege.

Meanwhile, in all branches of trade and manufacture, the influence of Trades Unions, Chambers of Commerce and the like advances, although it may still be said that the promotion of vocational education is not so much affected by the direct interference of such bodies, taking formal responsibility for the fortunes of schools and colleges, as by the force of public opinion, acting through the organs of government and leading these to spend money and care on this branch of educational enterprise. In other words, vocation as an institution is also effective where the direct control of vocational associations is not admitted.

Culture.—Some little care is here needed in separating the spheres of various institutions. Technical science is commonly encouraged as an aid to Vocation, to the resources, i.e., by which men gain their livelihood and expand their wealth; but in itself it belongs to the realm of culture, to the institutions of art and learning. We must not permit the manufacturer or merchant to assume control of learned corporations on the mere ground that he helps us to bread and butter; learning stands on its own feet, and is sufficient unto itself. There is a specific branch of learning and of art pursued by

teachers, for the purposes of that profession. Teaching is also an institution, a human function and purpose: it has its own demands to make in the organization of education; these demands should be kept apart from the claims of scholarship, art, science, when pursued on their own account.

The man or woman of culture, while ready to take a hand in teaching, at times indeed most eager to help the young to follow in his steps, looks at the world of education with different eyes. He is, *par excellence*, the specialist; his calling takes him away from organization; he does one thing, and does it well. But since this single aim of his tends to be thwarted if the public treat it with neglect, he too finds it necessary, in spite of his antipathy, to pay some attention to public affairs; he has to take his part in associations, with their presidents, their secretaries, their committees, to give corporate expression to the unique function which he and his kind discharge in the body politic. The man of letters, the painter, the biologist, the economist, expect to be consulted about school affairs; the subjects they profess are sometimes regarded as important items in a curriculum, but their standing in these concerns rests on a wider basis, on the assumption that culture, the hall-mark of the educated man, gives them an insight and power beyond that of the average citizen absorbed in industrial or professional life. I regard this assumption as valid, but then I belong, willy-nilly, to the *intelligentsia;* 'the man in the street' fights shy of culture, and when he is somewhat of a humorist often holds us up to ridicule both with pen and pencil. But the claim persists, and on second thoughts our man in the street accepts the position. For he too accepts culture as one of the constituent values of life (p. 52). His own tastes may not extend beyond the penny newspaper and a game of

billiards, but he is seldom churlish enough to try to limit his fellows within these bounds. More often than not he admits his deficiencies, blaming the schools for having neglected his capacities in childhood; certainly in a country like ours, with a long tradition of regard for eminence in literature and art, men who are willing to offer their contribution to public affairs are seldom given the cold shoulder, unless they offer their services in a contemptuous and intolerant spirit.

It is not so easy to make an inclusive list of groups which can be said to represent culture. The Universities are commonly accepted as filling the bill: they are definitely organized under Royal Charter; they have a prestige which has been greatly enhanced during the last fifty years or so, and they have actually been entrusted with considerable authority in matters of education (p. 245). In legislation the representatives of Universities find a place in the House of Commons; this representation is, however, a small affair in comparison with the rôle assigned to Universities in the oversight of secondary and technical education. Now and again a distinguished poet like Tennyson or a great man of science like Kelvin has been invited to make his contribution in the House of Lords, but these should be classed with honorary titles rather than as the recognition of a claim to authority by artists or men of science.

We may perhaps be liable to confusion if we assign to the Universities the duty of representing culture. For they have to discharge a double function: they are repositaries of learning, but they are also 'schools,' exhibiting the most advanced type among all corporations which take charge of youth. From this second point of view they take a conspicuous place in the teaching profession; their representatives, for example, constitute one-fourth of the membership of the Teachers' Registra-

tion Council. It might, therefore, be held that the claims of culture are amply satisfied by identifying the University as an academy for culture with the same corporation when viewed as a school.

And yet this solution, although one that has been accepted as convenient and easy to manage, does not cover the whole ground. Culture is by no means confined to Universities and Colleges : most branches of art find scanty recognition in them, partly because scholastic traditions are alien to the temperament of the artist ; and even in the pursuit of knowledge one can scarcely regard the Royal Society or the British Academy as associations which can be left out of account. These two bodies occur to one at random ; every reader can mention others, both in London and the provinces, which stand for the same ideal at a lower range. Here, as in the case of all institutions, we sharply distinguish the organized influence of corporations from the vague and yet effective influence of public opinion.

Teaching.—We assign a separate place to teaching since the end in view is more specific ; it is an offshoot from the institutions of culture and of education. The terms ' teacher ' and ' teaching ' now mark off a vocation, professing distinctive skill and experience, which in our modern jargon we label ' expert.' The recognition of the expert as such, the *connoisseur*, is a modern notion as applied to education, although it has long been admitted in the institutions of religion and in vocations other than teaching. The peculiarity of the teacher's position, which justifies us in giving a separate place to Teaching as an institution, is that he must not only know his job, as a vocation, but must be somewhat of an artist or scholar, a man of culture. He plays a double rôle : to the young he stands as a representative of taste and learning, not exclusively but as one of the channels through which

culture reaches them; among his fellows he represents a vocation, an expert calling. As we shall see in Chapter VIII, the institution of teaching is represented by many who do not identify themselves with the profession, for, like all great institutions, it springs from a universal impulse—the impulse, that is, to communicate, to share knowledge with our neighbours. When this impulse is organized in a body of persons who make a vocation out of it we see an institution emerging with a narrower and more precise range than can be assigned to Culture as we have defined it. Teaching corporations justify their existence in the public eye when their members take pains to *be* what the terms 'vocation' and 'profession' imply (p. 157).

I have dwelt on this aspect of teaching as an organized calling because of its bearing on the themes we shall consider in the final chapter. The argument falls into line with one of the most-debated doctrines in modern political theory—doctrines which are not wholly modern, for the historians and lawyers trace them back at least to the Middle Ages and the Holy Roman Empire. The expert, whether a workman who holds by guild socialism, or a physician protected by the Medical Council, claims for his corporation a distinctive position within the body politic as a juristic personality.[1] In spite of the distrust which the advancement of these claims by teachers may encounter, they are certain to be pushed further, for the movement falls into line with a powerful tendency of our times; it will not be repressed by prejudice, or by the premature zeal of some teaching corporations to force the pace; it must seek to be harmonized with the last of the institutions in

[1] For an admirable summary see Ernest Barker, *Political Thought from Herbert Spencer to To-day*, pp. 175 to 183. He gives also the necessary references to Maitland, Figgis, Sidney Webb, etc.

our list, viz. the State, which is often regarded as the enemy of all the rest.

The State (*Nation and Locality*).—Political institutions are of two types[1]: national and local. Before distinguishing the two, let us observe the foundation on which the intervention of the State in education is justified. The question may be deemed superfluous at the present day, especially since the Act of 1918 has asserted the right of the State to supervise, or at least to investigate, all forms of organized education. And yet the claim is in one sense very modern (Chapter IX): so far as financial aid is concerned, it was less than a hundred years ago that the central Government began to give money from taxes for this purpose; and only since 1870 have local authorities been empowered to seek aid from the rates. But in another and much more vital sense the claim of the State has always been in evidence. We may go back at least to the time of King Alfred and witness the zeal with which some of the rulers of our country fostered schools. For this claim does not rest upon the Budget or upon the City Treasurer, although the philosophy of our grandfathers held that "he who pays the piper calls the tune"; it abides in the nature of things; in the desire of a community to use the organs of government in aid of all great affairs which are of universal interest and involve concerted action. This is not the place to expound a theory of politics or to review the doctrines of political philosophy which, from Plato and Aristotle onwards, have sought to reconcile the one and the many. At bottom there is no reluctance to accept the general thesis, "man is a political animal"; and when he ceases to care for his πόλις he is less than

[1] A third, already come to life in the activities of the League of Nations, might be included, but we must be content with a short notice of this institution in the last chapter.

a man. Where men differ is in reconciling the rights and duties of ourselves when organized as citizens with our rights and duties as partners in other institutions, and our right also as individuals (Chapter IV), who have something which we call our self to dispose of when all our social duties are discharged. Here, again, it is beyond our ambit to discourse on the relation between self and neighbour. He who warned us that a man must lose his life in order to save it gave a foundation for the duties of a citizen which the philosophers can scarcely better. What distinguishes the State from all other institutions that control education is its comprehensiveness of range; it has its say in every problem of education, since each separate problem affects the whole, and it makes its claim on every school, on every child and student, since each and all are members of the body politic.

Now the very magnitude of this claim gives the ground on which its rivals and opponents find occasion for resistance thereto; if it were pushed to the extreme of logic, as has seemed likely at times in crude collectivist theory, it would reduce public welfare to the mechanism of a factory, engineered by that bureaucracy which is the object of such frequent scorn. When parents, churchmen, traders, teachers protest at large against state interference they are making a particular protest against a general doctrine; the special interference which they resent may or may not be a proper intrusion of the public will into procedure which had better be left alone. But when their resistance takes shape as a theory of general opposition to the rights of the commonwealth, on behalf of individualism or of *laissez-faire* all round, then they are beating against a stone wall. What such persons have to do (if I may repeat) is to find some compromise between their own activities and those of the State, which will allow the

programme of education to advance without denying either the prerogative of the State or the capacity of other corporations which also function for the common good. Evidently, therefore, the first rubric by which one limits the exercise of these overriding powers is—*abstinence*. Wherever the Government finds a piece of education well done it should leave well alone. For example, the general law requires that children should attend school; there are, however, the rights of the family, and the law permits a child to be educated in its home if the magistrate to whom appeal is made is satisfied that the home (here regarded as a place of education) provides what is requisite.

This rule of abstinence is hard for our administrators to accept: some local authorities show jealousy of private or endowed schools which are not under their management; if their theory of politics were more generous they would rejoice to find so many efforts made to multiply the resources of education; they would join hands with them and commend their efforts to public notice. No doubt some of the "Independent" (p. 177) schools are more or less inefficient, although in some cases they foster virtues which State schools fail to exhibit. But, unless their deficiencies are so grave as to cause obvious injury to the young, by what right do officers of State, relying on the public purse, depreciate them or hinder their welfare? They represent the wishes of *some* families as regards their children; or they represent the efforts of *some* groups, religious or vocational, or of traditional tastes, to foster specific virtues and specific talents. It may well be that, along with excellent features, abuses may be witnessed which detract in the eyes of many citizens from their merits: sectarian animosities, class animosities tend to be inculcated, insensibly perhaps, but none the less quite effectively. Such results are deplorable; and progressive citizens

become restless when they find the wealth of individuals expended in raising up a generation of children who may perpetuate the errors of our fathers. But what is the alternative? Are we justified in calling in the State to prevent our neighbours from holding foolish opinions about education and establishing schools in which their opinions are upheld? Or are we so certain of the efficiency of state organization that we are ready to use its resources to stamp out the varied efforts of other corporations? I at least (if I may intrude my own opinion) would entrust the State more readily with the provision of our food than allow its officers to act as the *sole* fount of education and ignore the claims of other institutions. I would carry this doctrine of abstinence further than seems warranted by the opinion of our time. For the necessities of the case have thrown upon Government the duty of actually establishing schools as government property and of conducting many kinds of association, from Royal Colleges to the primary and secondary schools provided by Local Education Authorities, meeting the needs of an immense population. To cavil at these great efforts is folly; those who write, as is still sometimes done, of 'the failure' of public education ought to know better. To speak of a rule of abstinence while millions of children are hungering for intellectual food is nonsense, or worse; the job has had to be done, and done quickly, with the best administrative machinery that can be devised. The mistake is to assume that schemes of education in which the State, as local or central government, is *corporation sole*, represent the best theory of political action in education for all time. The whole structure, powerful as we find it to-day and wonderfully effective in many respects, is but of yesterday when viewed as an experiment in politics. Its mission has been to establish firmly in all ranks of society a

belief in the *necessity* of education both as a minimum for every child and young person, and in ample supply at all stages of development for all who care to profit thereby.[1] As this article of political faith extends statesmen and officers of State will be more ready to yield to a public opinion which also cherishes the other institutions which we have reviewed.

The rule of abstinence is negative: it just admonishes the State to hold its hand when other groups can adequately discharge *any* of the functions which a complete organization prescribes. If they cannot, either from their own weakness or because the opinion of the day refuses to accept their aid, then the State, central or local, must not abstain but must see that the task is done, even though by enlarging its own sphere it leaves a mistaken impression of the ideal relations which Government should establish between itself and its citizens. Are there not, however, some functions which the State and the State alone can fulfil? We answer this question by reverting to the feature that distinguishes the State from the institutions previously examined. To it alone falls the task of comprehensively reviewing the entire field, of investigating the needs of all citizens, of superintending the operations of education and thereupon of enacting such laws as shall secure that the work is done, either by its own fiat, or, preferably, through the agency of some other corporation.

Now these duties are onerous and involve the exercise of large prerogatives. They give a supremacy to the decisions of Government over and above all other groups, even when the doctrine of abstinence is admitted to the full. The State claims to stand both as an 'authority,' ready to make provision of education, sponsor for all the children of the nation, and as an arbiter, judging and

[1] See Preamble to Education Act, 1918.

deciding between the rival claims of other associations. From this supremacy there is no escape; men must at some point submit to universal rule since they must live in community. When passive or active 'resisters' reject the commands of officers of State their resistance may be well grounded; other groups whose functions we have discussed will not relinquish their ideals, and at long last they will assert their freedom, sometimes at the cost of life. But their conflict with the State does not issue in a rejection of State prerogative; rather it gives them, sooner or later, the freedom which they seek *within* the body politic, sanctioned by the State itself.

No other solution is possible, for the alternative is anarchy, which is not a system of government, but a description of men's behaviour when they will not obey and cannot rule. We can readily see how at the present epoch, when the State has been compelled to assume such immense powers in education, men have become afraid of Government, jealous of the power of state officers, acutely sensitive to the evils that may ensue when so large a province in moral and spiritual development is relegated to the control of a bureaucracy. These fears are not confined to the institutions of education; the entire field of operations included in social welfare is viewed with a like anxiety; we alternatively appeal to the State for help and fend it off. The right mode of composing this conflict is to examine the issues which it raises in detail, separating point by point the various tasks which fall to be discharged by this or that authority in our day and our country; after such a review we should be better able to lay down principles which may harmonize the relations of all the institutions which are admitted within the circle of authority in education.

Locality.—I have used the term State to include the institutions and the associations both of central and of

local government, and have based the claims of both institutions on the common ground of citizenship. Yet the two spheres should be discriminated, for they continue to present difficulties both to the Legislature and the Executive; more particularly since the Act of 1918 antagonism has been displayed both in the Press and in the Council-chamber.[1] In the period when public education first came under State supervision the history and theory of locality was little understood; all branches of social welfare suffered under a like disability, through a failure to recognize the principles of behaviour on which local authority rests.

"Side by side with our expansion in nationality and Empire the domestic neighbourhood-life of the common people has survived, from the days when every district, as well as every county, was a law unto itself. We know, too, that this same Anglo-Saxon bias towards local independence, in sharp contrast to continental custom, has been carried by our people, first to America and then to our own Colonies and Dominions. It is not, therefore, overstepping the mark to say that a Part III Authority[2] (in a country town or as a collection of villages) is a self-perpetuating government, living a corporate life, which will claim to be kept alive, however much it may need to be reformed. And because it does possess this quality the trend of legislation, when one surveys the long story of the past, has been, and will be, to use the people of the area, in every possible instance, for the common good.[3] Adopting the technical language of the sociologist, the people of such an area are a 'community' sharing a real life which to them is as interesting as is the larger community of nation or of Empire. It is beyond our

[1] A lively contest took place in 1917 before the Bill became law, and has been renewed since 1921 (see p. 185 below).

[2] As defined in the Act of 1902.

[3] A recent example is the transfer (1924) of Juvenile Employment from the Ministry of Labour to the L.E.A.

purpose to consider why the Anglo-Saxon race, as distinguished, say, from the peoples of Germany or France, has displayed this local habit so markedly; the historians tell us that it had a good deal to do with the early establishment of political liberty in England.

A critic might accept all that has been so far advanced and yet might question whether a difficult task like education should be managed locally. Every function in modern government, he would urge, must be assigned, according to its nature, to an area most appropriate for its efficient discharge. We propose to educate the children of the nation; before we entrust the children of Billington—our good old Saxon settlement—to the people of Billington, you must convince us that they are competent for this particular task. But, on the contrary, it is for a wider authority to make out *its* case! Billington has to surrender its autonomy as regards tramways and post office, because, in these instances, rural management manifestly spells failure. But the local community abides as the natural source and authority for local affairs; its title is still supreme; it yields its claim only when its disability can be proved.

How, then, does the case stand with regard to the children and the schools of Billington. These children certainly are the children of the nation, but it is an arrogant usurpation of central power when it thrusts the nation to the forefront and claims the children as the property of the nation rather than as the peculiar treasure and delight of the good folk of Billington. For the children are, more than aught else, a local possession: here is their school; they go to and fro all the time; their whole environment is in neighbourhood-life. Of course there is another side to the picture; the nation cannot be shut out, and its claims must also be asserted on the children's behalf; but any scheme of education which is based on things as they are rather than on theories of organization must begin at the foundation; and must get out of Billington, for the good of its children, all that can be got. When this basis is laid then larger

areas can be called in, to supplement but not to supersede the efforts of local community.

This plea is strengthened when we note how our conceptions of schooling have broadened since the days when compulsory schooling was first introduced. It was regarded in those days as a somewhat mechanical affair, imparting skill in the three R's, or as communicating knowledge such as any teacher who possessed the knowledge could impart. We now see that the school itself is a community, that teachers and parents are people with affections and common human qualities; that the stir of local interest, however restricted, plays continually both upon teacher and taught. Inspectors, codes, by-laws have their uses—are, indeed, indispensable; but the character of the children, their intellectual and emotional life, finds nourishment to a large extent from the immediate environment. The force of this argument reaches still further when we note the trend of educational reform. Our schools now attend to children's health and food, to their games, their employment in industry; a teacher is as much social worker as pedagogue. All these matters are local matters; they are canvassed on the streets; they touch the neighbourhood in its domestic life. The good people of Billington are harassed by the new demands and resent the interference of the State with their children; but in the long run they will be found as much devoted to the children of Billington as any member of Parliament can be.

These are the solid grounds of social psychology—that is, of common sense—which lead the common people throughout the Anglo-Saxon world to demand a share in the management of the common school. The smallest neighbourhood-area handles the primary periods of school life; a larger area, but still local, is needed to embrace the field of secondary or trade education, while for certain purposes of still wider range combinations of local areas are now proved to be necessary. The Bill[1] meets this need by entitling the Board to establish pro-

[1] 1917, resulting in the Act of 1918.

vincial associations; in other words, the Board will carve up England into a series of provinces whose geography is based, not upon the general sense of community displayed by the inhabitants, but upon the specific educational problems in which the Board is interested. We shall have, in fact, a sort of Home Rule in English provinces, but with a sphere limited to education, and defined by boundaries which may or may not coincide with local affiliations. Here, again, the Government is beginning at the wrong end; provinces must develop by the co-operation of counties; it is the county which has the first right to determine its own destiny and make its own alliances. Government can only step in to compose differences and in the last resort to compel co-operation in cases where one area is profiting at the expense of another. But it is not the function of any specific Government Department either to abolish a small authority or to create a new area by its own fiat."[1]

This view of the status of local institutions does not pass unchallenged; the popularity of non-local schools is cited as evidence against it. An epoch when railways, the daily press, telegraphy and wireless bring the entire nation within call is not going to be governed from the parish pump; if we except the farmer and peasant class in the country and the shopkeeper and clerical classes in the city, families are migratory to an extent that was impossible in earlier epochs (even shop managers are on the move with the extension of multiple shops). It is therefore maintained that local sentiment is now on the decline, and the apathy evinced in many local elections is cited as evidence. And yet if this were really so how

[1] From an article by the present writer in *The Times Educational Supplement*, Nov. 15, 1917. In *An Introduction to Sociology*, chapters vi and vii, the problem is viewed apart from education and the references there given to Gomme, Dicey, Redlich, Hirst, and Graham Wallas show the foundations in general political theory.

can we account for the steady advance in the prestige and range of local authority since the middle fifties? At the present moment, for example, the distrust of proportional representation is largely derived from a fear that national party caucuses would, under such a scheme, sever the M.P. from the institutions of locality.

To my mind the most valid criticism of local authority comes from the size of many local units, either in area or in population.

"To the average citizen in the West Riding there is not much difference between the type of government that issues orders from Wakefield and that which speaks from Whitehall; both are pretty remote and impersonal. Historically the one is the development of the other, depending on the extension of means of communication and other arts of civilization; but in relation to the private citizen they are of the same order. The unwieldy West Riding finds the need of districts or other sub-local areas, with sub-offices and sub-committees, until the principle of neighbourhood again finds scope."[1]

But since these units are really founded on local, i.e. county or city, sentiment, sprung from racial memory,[2] they hold pride of place; their size enhances their power when dealing with the national competitor. Sometimes they tend to display the vices of power, imitating on a small scale the habits of the Central Authority, which also tends to impose excessive uniformity and discourage the activities of voluntary groups.[3]

[1] *Introduction to Sociology*, loc. cit., pp. 143–4.

[2] A remarkable feature of this inheritance, brought out by Bryce in *The American Commonwealth*, is the transfer of these sentiments throughout the Anglo-Saxon races. Redlich and Hirst contrast our people with those of the Continent in this respect.

[3] The term 'voluntary' should not be confined to religious foundations, but to all groups that derive their power from other than political institutions. "No longer do we write *The Man* versus *The State*; we write, *The Group* versus *The State*" (Barker, loc. cit., p. 181).

The contentions between nation and locality are not composed by exalting either at the cost of the other; the L.E.A. and the Central Government can claim an equal status both in history and in public opinion; they are equally under the control of the supreme Legislature, the King in Parliament, and, like all other corporations, must obey the law as interpreted by judges.

Having defined the nature of the institutions which foster education and seen how their influence is exerted both through opinion and through groups who claim authority in educational affairs, we are in a position to review the tasks which are undertaken by one authority or another.

The first problem of the organizer, contemplating the educational needs of any community, is to *define the types* of school which the situation demands. This definition involves a decision as to the age and attainments of the scholars who are to attend; of the order of social life and experience which they shall enjoy, of the pursuits (technically called 'curriculum') which they shall follow, and of the time which they spend in these pursuits. These points may be set down in black and white as descriptive of a school before it actually comes into being, and they are so determined by Acts of Parliament, codes, by-laws, before a school or a system of schools can be set on foot. The determination of such points has often led to painful controversy, as in the issue raised by the Cockerton Judgment (1901), for in this, as in other situations, the definition of one type of school involves its relation to other types. These topics engage our attention in the next chapter.

Since one or more teachers are required for any school some separate notice is required for problems relating to the teacher's office: the organization of the teaching body is, therefore, surveyed in Chapter VIII.

While the school is intrinsically an association of persons, it needs a habitation; land and buildings are needed, funds for maintenance must be forthcoming. Having found out what we want to do (not before !) we must look around to secure the material means (Chapter IX). Thereupon, other questions arise; the school is now in being; those who have sanctioned and established it will superintend its progress in the various directions treated in Chapter X. Finally, there is a duty in which all the institutions take a hand, whether it be informally or by the organized search for truth and expression of opinion. For education is a movement, the expression of social forces, dynamic rather than static; I therefore put Advisory and Reporting Functions into a separate chapter. Chapter XIII brings the conclusions of previous chapters to a focus, reviewing the constitution and duties of education authorities. Thus we answer the question (p. 71) raised at the close of Section I.

The New State, by M. P. Follett (Introduction by Lord Haldane), published by Longmans, Green & Co., is well worth consulting on the problem of this chapter. It is written by an American, with special reference to the conditions of American culture, but the exposition takes full account of European research in sociology and political science. (See also her later book, *Creative Experience*.)

CHAPTER VII

SCHOOLS CLASSIFIED IN TYPES

Our definition of school indicates two ranks, teachers and taught. There may be one scholar or many, one teacher or many, in the association; but one of each there must be. Every school also has an owner; it belongs to some one, an individual or a corporation. Its property has commercial value, but beyond its visible property there is its good name. This, in the case of private or proprietary schools, is called its good-will, and can be disposed of. The owner of a school may conceivably have no school property, beyond books and apparatus; some schools are conducted in furnished dwellings. The hedge schoolmaster in Ireland had not even that much. The ownership derives from relationships sanctioned by custom and law between the owner and the parents (for pupils under age) and scholars. On this basis we can make a first classification.

The Home School.—The simplest and earliest form is conducted under the family roof. The parent is the owner, the responsible officer, and the teacher is either one of the family or a tutor introduced from outside. The home is of course the centre of all kinds of educational influence, religious, vocational, cultural; it only becomes a school where such influences are deliberately planned—not of necessity with an elaborate time-table so far as the teacher is concerned, but certainly with steady adherence to time and place on the pupil's part.

We must not be too hasty in dismissing such plans as out-of-date; when families came to live together in

villages and towns the advantages of co-operation were realized, and the school proper came into being, with a teacher set apart for the task, for all children who enjoyed what we call 'liberal' education. The only type of schooling which still held by the homestead was in apprenticeship for some boys and domestic training for all girls; the wisest of mothers still accept this responsibility for their daughters. There are still families which prefer to keep their children at home for liberal education; sometimes their reasons are to be commended, sometimes not. Such parents are at times visited by an attendance officer and summoned before a police court if the officer thinks they are abusing their freedom. The magistrate has then to decide whether the children are really being educated, i.e. whether the alleged school actually is a school. He judges as best he can by 'results': if there is evidence that the children are making progress in the three R's the summons is dismissed. In Germany it would not be incumbent on him to undertake the duties of an examiner, for the children would be compelled to enter a public school unless their teacher, parent or tutor, were already registered as competent to act.

While vigilance by the State is certainly necessary to ferret out cases where parents neglect their duty, it is not to be assumed that the home school is always to be discountenanced. When parents hold definite views as to the upbringing of the young and are prepared to sacrifice some of their leisure to achieve their ideals, the results are often most happy: the account of Alastair Geddes,[1] one of the heroes whom the Great War claimed as a victim, shows how finely a home can teach its children; but the teachers here were Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Geddes. The results are not always so happy, as the biographies of

[1] *A Citizen Soldier* (a Memoir of Alastair Geddes); by Victor Branford, (Headley Bros.).

some great Englishmen bear witness. Quite a different situation is presented in areas where population is scanty, in the 'back-blocks' of Australia, for example; in Great Britain we live closer together, and the L.E.A. can usually find ways of bringing children to school. I am not sure whether we should not do well to study the methods adopted, e.g. in New Zealand, where circulating libraries and resident tutors help the parent to discharge the teacher's office. City people should not assume that all the advantages are on the side of urban education; there is ample testimony to the worth of family schooling in all cases where the parents appreciate culture. I by no means underrate the value of the social experience gained at school, especially for children whose home life is isolated; and yet the country-bred child may have to pay too high a price for learning if his schooling cuts him off from sympathy with his home environment.

Where the parents do not teach, but employ tutors or governesses, we have a Home School in the usual sense of the term. These arrangements are expensive if they are to be efficient, for the tutor should exhibit tastes and culture at least on a par with the family which he enters; but, setting aside the economic question, we recognize what a large part this form of schooling has played at all periods of civilization. Not a few distinguished men have accepted with pleasure the post of tutor in families where their scholarship and outlook were appreciated; and our knowledge of educational principles is vastly indebted to them—Ascham, Locke and Herbart are familiar instances. The advantage, both to the pupil and to the theory of education, comes from the individual relationship; the tutor, thinker and pedagogue both, sees his philosophy working out day by day in what is for him a laboratory of method. In

England the late Miss Charlotte Mason organized this field of education with extraordinary success, founding an important society of parents,[1] publishing books on method for the guidance of tutors, and conducting a training college to equip them for their service.

Private Tuition and Correspondence.—The office of the family tutor is to be distinguished from that of a specialist teacher, who is not attached to a family or concerned with the upbringing of children as a whole ; he is accomplished or learned in one or more branches of study, and offers to teach these to all and sundry who come to him for the purpose ; or he may go to them, being called a ' visiting ' teacher. It will be more convenient to consider the status of specialists in Chapter VIII ; all we need note here is that the continuous procedure of such a teacher, receiving pupils year in year out, falls logically within our definition of a school (compare Part-time Education below). Sometimes a staff of tutors is brought together and the work then assumes the character of a private school. The examinations ' coach ' will flourish so long as our distinctive system of examinations is maintained (pp. 212–221).

Many organizers, accustomed to think only of publicly managed schools, are inclined to overlook these short-lived enterprises ; and may think that we are wasting time even to glance at them. Anyone, however, who watches closely what is going on, and notes the extent to which families and tutors concern themselves with the instruction of children apart from public provision, will be convinced that they deserve some notice.

The Private School.—I have noted that the private school of the last hundred years is largely due to class institutions. This was not always the case, for the Dissenting Academies of the seventeenth century were private

[1] Parents' National Educational Union.

because the State at that time sought to suppress Nonconformist places of education.[1] And to-day not a few private schools are conducted by pioneers who cannot find freedom for their educational conscience within a more public system; as in the parallel case of family tuition their service will be indispensable to the progress of educational theory, even though the control of the State become much more liberal than is possible under present conditions. I am referring to foreign countries and to the Dominions quite as much as to England; every advance in the complexity of culture, of class, of vocation, of religion impels teachers with initiative to come into direct contact with parents without the intervention of the State; the fact that the enterprise assumes the possession of private wealth by the parent, and therefore shuts out the poorer classes from sharing directly in the benefits, should not lead those who work in the public system to despise the private school. The teachers in such schools are naturally disposed to resent the competition of the public system; but this prejudice is just as unwarrantable. Their merit lies in their capacity to do what the State, at present, cannot do; the public, sooner or later, will appropriate the fruits of their ideas, and to this they can raise no objection so long as the competition is conducted fairly. In other words, the State should first of all use its power, now made concrete in the Act of 1918, to inspect and report on all such work, and should thereupon acknowledge and encourage all that it finds to be sound and commendable, acting on the principle of abstinence (p. 99). When the L.E.A.s carry out such investigation they will no doubt discover abuses, as H.M. Inspectors did when they reported on the dames' schools of the '60s

[1] Adamson's *Short History of Education*, chapter xi, and Irene Parker, *Dissenting Academies*.

and '70s. To-day there are many commercial academies which, to adopt the idiom of trade, cater for a popular market and sell a pretty poor article; the best of these need not fear official oversight, and would indeed benefit, for the chaff would be separated from the wheat.

The owners of any type of private school can no longer rely on a public opinion to support them solely on a political or economic theory of individual rights (where competition suddenly introduced in the neighbourhood obviously threatens the livelihood of a good teacher, justice demands that the case should be considered; but I must not trespass into details). Opinion has radically changed within living memory as regards this aspect of education. Adam Smith based his views on the organization of education on the relation between economic motive and the efficiency of the teacher: the only motives he recognized stirring the teacher to exertion were emulation and competition. "Those parts of education for the teaching of which there are no public institutions, are generally the best taught."[1]

The Proprietary School.—It is a short step from private to proprietary ownership, although the position of the principal is very different, for in a private school he is both Governing Body and Head Teacher (p. 232). The Limited Company school represented a passing stage in the evolution of higher education in the last century, and was rendered possible by an extension of the joint stock principle to corporations whose nominal purpose was to earn a dividend while their actual design was educational. Many excellent schools and colleges, especially in the sphere of women's education,[2] and of boarding-schools

[1] *Wealth of Nations*, Book V, Part III, Art. II.

[2] E.g. the Girls' Public Day Schools, and, for boys, Clifton College and other corporations which rank among the "Public Schools."

established under religious auspices, owed their foundation to this device, and a few still survive. The majority of them, however, have been reshaped into 'Trusts,' which make no return to their promoters by way of dividend; and the motives which have led to the change are well worth investigation, although we can only briefly notice them here.

Money put into a school is seldom a good investment—good, that is to say, from the standpoint of investment. The attempt to compromise the balance-sheet between the pecuniary claims of a shareholder and his philanthropic desire to support the spiritual ends of education always create difficulty. For the original shareholders are commonly inspired by lofty motives, but when the scrip passes into other hands the new holders may find no other than a commercial interest in the relation, and may exercise an embarrassing control. It being in the nature of education to expand in complexity and range beyond the resources of fees and income, a point is presently reached where the competition of rival places of learning, sustained by resources other than those of joint stock, will threaten the stability of the balance-sheet. This point was reached early in this century, when the State placed the public purse at the disposal of hundreds of endowed institutions which were under no obligation to produce a dividend. During a brief period a share in grants (p. 198) was made available for the directors of proprietary schools and colleges, but the position proved too anomalous and before long these institutions had to choose whether they would continue to be independent, relying solely upon the chances of competition, or would abandon the joint stock principle. The great majority have accepted the latter alternative, the shareholders either surrendering their holdings or receiving an equivalent in debentures; and we may take it for granted that

this special type of school, arising out of the distinctive economics and philanthropy of the nineteenth century, will not reappear.

Endowed and Trust Schools.—The proprietary school has in fact reverted to the simpler form of control which had prevailed in all types of education before either the stockholder or the State had come upon the scene: a control created by a deed of gift, a trust, or a charter, and exercised by owners whose rights are based on some such document. Methods of selecting their property, their responsibilities, their liabilities to parents, to teachers, to other corporations, varied infinitely; but there always existed some document or series of documents, accepted by the law-courts, which governed their procedure.

Alike in the ancient universities and the public schools, the local grammar-schools, and in the parochial schools and schools of industry scattered throughout the villages, the same basis of organization—or lack of organization—was seen: a property, in buildings, land, income from rents, dedicated by written word to an educational purpose, and a body of men, chiefly residing near at hand, to be responsible for the scheme as set down.

Obviously there was no system here; nor did our forefathers think of education in terms of system. Every locality took its chance. 'If Providence has planted a good school close at hand, all the better for our boys; if not, then we must look further afield.' A zealous parson, allotted to a neighbourhood where learning was neglected, would stir up the godly to good works. Pious benefactors, one or more, would sometimes arise, as at Rugby, whence Lawrence Sheriff had flitted to London and prospered; thus a substantial endowment would be provided, to the immense advantage of future generations.

Such "freedom, variety and elasticity"[1] sufficed for old England; it was only when population began to increase—after 1750—along with an increasing sense of duty towards the young—after, say, 1800—that the public mind became seriously concerned. The first step was to ascertain the facts; a series of Commissions were set to this task, and were at work in one part of the field or another until the Bryce Commission, 1894–5. Elementary education was first reviewed, since it had become painfully clear that the great bulk of English children, huddled together in the new factory towns of the north as well as in the congested portions of London and other large cities, were destitute of the means of culture. The reformer in these days, presented with such findings, would turn to the State and would advocate the extension of local or national schools maintained by rates and taxes. But our forefathers of a hundred years ago were far more conservative, i.e. were sincerely attached to the principle underlying the endowed school, based on local affection and local initiative (p. 102). No doubt also they may be charged with unwillingness to foot the bill, and were all too ready to yield to reactionaries who discouraged every endeavour to raise the standard of life among the poor. Hence a compromise was effected and hundreds of schools came into existence which need to be distinguished with a new nomenclature.

'*Society*' *Schools.*—This compromise took shape in the organization of great Societies, the National Society (Established Church) and the British School Society

[1] A sonorous phrase used by the great Master of Trinity, Dr. Butler, to describe the virtues of higher education in opposition to the demand of examination syndicates for progress, efficiency and uniformity.

(Nonconformist) being the most successful.[1] These associations, which still play a part in national endeavour, undertook to arouse and sustain public interest in the needs of education all over the country, and therewith to find material resources for its extension. The single parish, or township, could no longer face the situation; so it was invaded by the agents of a national corporation, which divided the responsibility for management and control with the good folk of the locality. The Societies did far more than this: they sought out young people fit to serve as teachers and gave them training; they gathered statistics, investigated dark places and revived in the public mind a sense of the value of schooling which had been lacking since mediæval times. And, more important still, they were entrusted with public money—acting, that is, as the agents of the State in the first tentative endeavours of national government to discharge its obligations.

Endowed Primary Schools. — It was chiefly in the sphere of primary education that these modes of national effort came to the aid of the locality; and it is in this region that controversy between the institutions of religion and of politics became embittered. We noticed (p. 89) that three modes of solution are to be found. Firstly, the separate school, or, as it is now called in Great Britain, the Non-Provided school. The school property in this case is held by a non-State corporation which decides the form of religious instruction and observance. It may or may not receive grants-in-aid from the State (p. 195 below), but, however substantial this help may be, it does not bargain away the principle of spiritual freedom. Secondly, the public school, formerly called the Board School, but now Council (or Provided)

[1] I need not refer to previous efforts in the eighteenth century, such as the S.P.C.K. (Adamson, loc. cit., pp. 197, 198).

School, since the property belongs to a Borough or County Council. Here the form of religious instruction, and therewith of religious influence, is determined partly by order of the law, following the Cowper-Temple compromise of 1870, partly by the will of the local authority. Under the principle of comprehension a common basis for the Christian religion is sought in Bible teaching, with undenominational prayers and hymns[1]; under the principle of toleration parents to whom this type of religious influence is obnoxious are entitled to withdraw their children from it.

The history of English Elementary Education since 1870 shows that this plan meets with general approval, so long as the non-provided school is maintained alongside of it. In some quarters, however, these measures have not met the case and a plan of comprehension is substituted or added. For the Cowper-Temple scheme is Erastian; it makes the State, willy-nilly, a teacher of religion; it 'establishes' certain forms of religious observance; in the days when conflict on these matters was so bitter this feature of the situation aroused violent feeling, both among Nonconformists and Churchmen. Where the objection to State religion prevails the public school is made secular, but a place and time for religious instruction and observance are afforded within the school building, to be conducted by the teachers or ministers of various religions, each after its own pattern, the children being separated only for these occasions. Classes for religious instruction are then held in various class-rooms at the same time, while the unity of the school is preserved for 'secular' education imparted by the school staff engaged by the state authority. It is

[1] Sometimes a course of moral instruction is added, and this is encouraged in Board of Education regulations; but it is no substitute for the offices of religion.

not astonishing that the teaching profession stoutly opposes the intrusion of outside agencies, and the assumption thereby implied that the teacher is solely concerned with so-called secular responsibilities. For this reason I am convinced that this third mode of adjustment, technically called 'the right of entry,' will never be widely adopted; where a community is determined to keep the public school system under its own control, and is jealous of ecclesiastical interference, as in France and America, it refuses admission to the clergy for any purpose and leaves the Family and the Church to guide the young in matters of religion, either on Sunday or on the weekday outside of school hours. Exclusion, however, does not constitute a compromise, in the eyes of those who are anxious to give effective weight to religious observance among the young.

"I would urge that, in place of 'right of entry,' the parent should seek right of *substitution*. The proper *venue* for denominational teaching is not the public school, with the Protestant teaching one group in Room X and the Roman Catholic another group in Room Y; the church building is the fit place of assembly (on week-day or on Sunday) for teaching the distinctive doctrines which the Church holds dear. And the clergyman himself is the fittest teacher, not the public school teacher who in these unhappy controversies finds his allegiance divided between Church and State. It would surely not be difficult for the law to recognize 'attendance' once or more during the school week in church buildings. Already school children are sent to swimming-baths and to playing-fields under public auspices; it would be almost as easy to organize a plan for 'attendance' at the ministrations of the clergy or their delegates when parents made a request to that effect. And I, for one, should not hesitate to vote public money to facilitate such arrangements, so long as they were conducted with efficiency;

such influences are at least as much a part of education as instruction in swimming or cookery." [1]

Compromise on some such lines is not needed in populated districts where the parent can choose between a provided and a non-provided school, but in single-school areas the conflicting claims of Church and State will scarcely be composed except on some such lines. The conferences recently held between religious bodies show that an earnest desire is felt to attain harmony without plunging the school once more into the contentions of party politics.

Endowed Secondary Schools.—The needs of higher education, although investigated by two Commissions, were not so acutely felt by the people at large, although a number of important schools for boys, which we have since learned to classify as 'secondary,' were set on foot; some of these were associated with the Established Church and others with Roman Catholic or Nonconformist bodies.

The girls had greater need of succour, for the grammar-schools and the public schools with old endowments were almost entirely preserved for boys; hence the success of the Girls' Public Day-school Company (p. 115), which adopted the device of shareholding and planted dozens of schools throughout the country.

The important feature of all these efforts (private, proprietary, endowed, society) is that they relied upon the principle of *voluntary* effort, at once national and local, as opposed to the absolutism of civic or national control.[2] We have little conception to-day of the vehemence with which our fathers, in many political camps, adhered to this principle. Reluctantly they agreed, in 1833, to take the first step in national control by accepting a modest

[1] *The School*, loc. cit., pp. 111–13.

[2] Compare Graham Wallas, *The Great Society*, loc. cit., pp. 337, 338.

grant of £20,000, administered under a Committee of the Privy Council, little foreseeing that before the century was closed the State would have laid a mighty hand on English schools and colleges, dispensing many millions in their support and sending government agents into every nook and cranny of education.

State Schools and Colleges (National).—We have noted (pp. 100) the need for adjustment between the functions of the State and of other corporations in the provision of places of education. It is already pretty well agreed that, as regards actual ownership, the national government should reduce its commitments to the minimum, except to meet the needs of its own 'servants,' civil or military. It is only recently, however, that this principle has come to be generally accepted. Thus, it has been more than once proposed that the Government should establish a great national college for the training of teachers; but the resistance offered to this proposal showed that the collectivist[1] doctrines of the nineteenth century were already yielding their ground; the only remnant of this idea is in the lecture courses and Summer Schools provided by the Board of Education; these come under the head of Part-time Education (p. 145 below) and are presumably instituted because the central authority cannot at present find other authorities competent to do the work to its satisfaction. At the period when Germany and France served as a pattern for Europe in matters educational the Royal Colleges of Art and Science, with a corps of instructors on the civil list, were instituted; but they remain as survivals rather than as patterns to be repeated.

But the exception reserved in the last paragraph points to an important principle. In every department of State

[1] Collectivist in the sense of Dicey, *Law and Public Opinion in England*, chapter vii. (Compare p. 22 above.)

there are groups of employees who need the resources of education, and the State should be a model employer. In some instances, e.g. in the continued education of messenger-boys and girls under eighteen, the need can best be met by utilizing the machinery established by local authorities; the Board of Education does not conduct its own classes for the young persons whom it employs in Whitehall, but hands them over to the London C.C. Education Committee. But when the education demanded is more specific the departments of State, like other employers, desire to keep the management in their own hands. This applies with especial force to military affairs, for the Army, Navy and Air Force are cut off in social life and outlook from the civilian population. This severance is certainly to be deplored from the standpoint of social progress, but it is inevitable so long as the nations of the world continue to maintain the institutions of war. Up to ten years ago the main provision thought necessary for the soldier was vocational, and the chief form of general education organized by the War Office was the provision of Army Schoolmasters for the children of soldiers in non-commissioned ranks. But before the Great War was concluded it was realized that soldiers needed 'liberal education.' as adults, quite apart from technological equipment. At first the War Departments, both in allied and in enemy countries, encouraged civilian and voluntary agencies (among which the Y.M.C.A. played a conspicuous part) to supply the deficiency; but it was seen by 1919 that education, in the large sense of the word, would henceforth become a permanent feature of army life. And, since the corporate life of a regiment, of a battle-ship, of an Air-station are unique, especially in the absolutism of their modes of government, these schemes of education, as soon as matters began to return to a peace footing, were conducted solely

by military agency. It was natural that many soldiers of the 'old school' would have scant sympathy with such schemes when adopted as permanent plans for a regular army or navy in peace time; but they have realized that education takes a higher place in the public mind than in earlier days, and that an opportunity at least must be offered to every man if only on the ground that he will some day return to civil life. The Army Education Corps has thus become a permanent foundation,[1] with similar schemes under the Admiralty and the Air Force, separate both in aim and in administration from the multiplied schools and colleges, military and naval, for technological training and for the preparation of officers.

There is another side to the interest and responsibility of the State in matters of learning which is sometimes confused with the provision of education in the proper sense of the word. Every department of Government is concerned with research, or ought to be. The problems that it handles are on the move; Ministers, like the heads of any great business, require the help of those who give their mind to statistics and returns, to libraries and laboratories. Hence the foundation of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, the Imperial College of Science and Technology, the Libraries of the Foreign Office, of the Board of Education (p. 222 below) and of other Departments of State. Some may hold that, since research is now recognized as one of the tasks assigned to universities, it would be well for Governments to hand over their responsibilities, as is actually done in many of the American States; but in this instance the State University is, to all intents and purposes, a department of civil government. In Great Britain, at any rate, this application of collectivist theory is not in favour; on

[1] Lord Gorell's *Education and the Army* gives the early history of this movement; later developments are reported to Parliament.

the other hand, one expects every important Department of State, alive to the benefits accruing from science and learning, to ensure that its needs are satisfied; so far as it can secure the aid of universities by collaboration well and good, but the responsibility rests with the Department. It is still a moot point how far the results of state investigation should be put at the disposal of the public (p. 223 below). Until 1914 few British politicians realized how necessary such collaboration is in the concerns both of war and peace; and one may hope that both parties will develop such relations, since the universities, in many branches of research, must look to the State to suggest problems as well as proffer aid towards their solution.

State Schools and Colleges (*Local*). — Now, while the national government, in theory at least, will only conduct and own such schools as are required for the specific needs of its Departments, the position is exactly the opposite with the State acting as local government. Here the collectivist, or, as some would call it, the socialist, principle (p. 22 above) was firmly established by the School Board Act of 1870, in respect of primary education, and it has been applied most effectively and with an increasing range to the present day: municipal and county schools of all types flourish side by side with independent and voluntary corporations. There is no need to classify the types, for every form of school considered in the following paragraphs can now be included within the ownership of a local authority. It is only in the highest types of education that a limit is usually placed on the range of municipal or county ownership; the universities and many other corporations for the pursuit of art, science and professional studies are commonly conducted as chartered bodies under the oversight of the Privy Council (p. 249). This restriction

from the purview of the L.E.A. does not presume any disability or lack of resources in the local area ; it is simply due to the non-local character of the functions that these corporations discharge. In Chapter XII we shall see that most of them are themselves to be regarded not only as teaching corporations but as exercising authority within the national system. Yet some of them, e.g. the 'modern' universities, while independent of direct local control in respect of ownership, look to their 'province'[1] for local aid and also for assistance in control ; one here and there is actually the property of a great city corporation : e.g. the University College in Nottingham, the Colleges of Technology in Manchester and Bristol, and a few colleges in London, where the L.C.C. Education Committee controls the education of a population equal to that of many small nations.

The above paragraphs have classified schools on the basis of ownership : we now add a series of distinctions which are concerned with diversities of aim and function. The following seem to include the points necessary to an adequate description of any given school ; each arises from some feature in the circumstances or disposition of scholars which have come to our notice in previous chapters.

A. Normal scholars, distinguished from the abnormal or defective.

B. Classification in terms of age and attainments.

C. Distinctions made in terms of curricula.

D. A variety of types due to the extent of responsibility for the scholar's education.

i. Boarding *v.* Day-schools, including children bereft of home.

ii. Partial responsibility undertaken by non-professional associations : e.g. Sunday-schools, Boy Scouts.

[1] See p. 106 for the use of this term in recent years.

iii. Part-time education in separate subjects of study.

iv. Part-time education and industry.

E. Differences bases on social upbringing.

F. Differentiation by sex.

(A) Schools for Defectives (Physical, Mental, Moral)

At the outset we included the care of defectives within the province of education, and in Chapter II noted the reliance which Galton and other biologists place upon eugenics to remedy the mischiefs. I need not catalogue the many types of school which look after these unfortunates; it is important, however, to distinguish the principles on which men act in caring for them. These appear to spring from three motives. The sentiment of pity has gained immensely in strength. If anyone doubts whether the Europe of to-day has progressed (p. 36) within the last two hundred years I would point to our humanitarian impulses in this region of social endeavour; men and women devote themselves to the derelicts without any great hope that the subjects of their pity will make a return, in the same spirit that animated Franciscan and other Orders of both sexes in earlier epochs. Those, however, who distrust such sentiments, and try to regard them as concessions to weak and womanly emotions, support these schools as prophylactics against the extension of social maladies: Preventive Education supplements Preventive Medicine. Allied to this second motive is the intellectual interest (p. 53) of the student, medical man or teacher, who has found a rich mine of investigation in the striking variations of capacity which come before him: in every field of human activity the extreme instances provide the best laboratory material.

For this reason the medical profession has taken the lead in all this region of educational effort; its members are

trained to observe defects in normal patients, whereas the teacher, during his time of training, spends very little time on observation of individual children, and, unless his mind is bent that way, does not form the necessary habits when he takes up practice. The physician has, however, suffered from the bias of his training. He has diagnosed too much from data supplied by physiology, and ignored psychology; but this neglect is in a fair way to being remedied. Thus, in the treatment of the deaf, it is a fairly easy matter to diagnose the physical causes of deafness, and, if money is available, to educate deaf children in their own schools; but little progress was made in helping them to re-enter the world until lip-reading was adopted, and even now many physicians and teachers of the deaf are unacquainted with the psychology of language which justifies the adoption of this method and enables the teacher to employ it with success. It is indeed obvious that no 'case' is purely mental, or purely physical, or purely moral. This was well seen in the first efforts to segregate normal from abnormal children in the primary schools. Classes or schools for defectives were set up in London and other large cities, and the teachers were instructed to recommend for admittance such pupils as were manifestly unfit to profit by the ordinary teaching in Board Schools. They were unable to make a satisfactory diagnosis and at one point it looked as if the Special Schools would be crowded with children who were not making good at school, but were hindered by causes quite other than those assigned. In fact the first benefit conferred by these efforts was to establish methods of examination by which the intelligent, the stupid, and the actually defective could be identified (p. 216 below).

While opinion is now agreed that physical and mental defectives should be cared for with good-will and with

scientific oversight, there is no such agreement as regards adults or young folk who commit offences against the community, displaying grave defects in moral behaviour. Opinion is now gathering weight that misbehaviour should be classified with other types of defect and that the offender should be placed in the charge of a physician and a teacher rather than left solely to the discipline of warders and police. This great reform, which a few distinguished medical officers like Dr. Hamblin Smith of Birmingham are now pressing upon public attention, will carry us far. For there is no age-limit to crime. The criminal, thus regarded, is a child, a naughty and wicked child, but yet a child, needing restraint since his disposition is perverse, needing re-education before he can be safely 'let out.' First of all, he needs scientific diagnosis by a skilled physician, who understands something of the dark workings of the mind as well as of bodily and congenital defects, who withal maintains a touch of sympathy, which is so immensely hard to keep alive within prison walls. The goal of penal reform is to convert prisons into schools and colleges, and as a matter of fact the first steps in this revolution have already begun. However eccentric these opinions may appear to some readers, I look forward with confidence to the time when all this realm of public discipline will be administered by the Board of Education,[1] handled as a province of social salvage, with the dark and cruel doctrines of penalty and repression thrust for ever from the scene. Such a consummation depends on advancement in the three professions, law, medicine and teaching: as these become more enlightened and more conscious of their power, they will be sustained by a loftier sense of good-will in the community, and

[1] This Board already undertakes the administration of instruction in prisons; lectures and concerts are provided through voluntary agencies.

prison warders will be enrolled in the teaching profession, as the staffs of reformatory and industrial schools already are.

Two further points need to be kept in mind which apply to all types of defective: first, no age limit can be assigned when the process of schooling or of re-education can be regarded as complete. In many instances care and oversight are needed throughout life; the police, in the public interest, keep records of the habitual criminal, but a more kindly sentiment would lead society to keep in touch with everyone who has come under the public care, even when he is discharged at some period of life as cured. Resources do not at present reach so far, either in personnel or in money, yet the principle is admitted in After-care organizations of various types, both for normal and for abnormal cases; these are specially valuable in helping to find employment.

The search for a vocation is the second point of public interest on behalf of defectives. Some cases are incurable, and need permanent support as patients all their lives. But many can do something towards economic independence; some can be trained to be entirely self-supporting; if so, it is essential that they should be vocationally educated. This is not because their earnings are of great monetary value, but because their inner integrity is maimed if they come to regard themselves as dependent on public or private charity; self-respect is itself a means of restoration. The educator, whether teacher or physician, misses the main point if the constituent values discussed in Chapter V are disregarded in the life of those whose outlook on life is blurred and distorted; let them find that they can be of some use, even though they remain economically dependent on their fellows.

(B) Gradation by Age and Attainments

The normal child is not perfect; he is below par on some side of him or other. What marks him off most clearly from the abnormal is that he advances at a steady rate in body and mind through successive stages (Chapter V); he may for a time be ill, or appear to be backward, or get into trouble, but he recovers and goes on, while the abnormal is marked for life, or at least for many years, with his pronounced defect. This factor settles the type of education given to the abnormal; whereas with the normal part of the population the governing factor should be sought in development through successive periods, in each of which the scholar displays specific qualities and demands a distinctive treatment. Three chief *grades*, Primary, Secondary, and College or University, correspond to three well-marked changes in the developing body-mind (Chapter V above). These three divisions, covering twenty years of life when reckoned from the extremes, three plus to twenty-three plus, can be subdivided as our knowledge of immature human nature increases, and our discovery of means for assisting development; the nursery, or nursery school, for example, comes into the educational system as a prelude to the regular scheme of primary education. These subdivisions, however, should not be too minute, for even though the psychologist could sketch with precision the changes that mark the child's development year by year and the teacher could thereupon prescribe an advancing course of instruction, more harm than good would be effected, if these alterations involved frequent breaks in the *social* life of the educand. To the child his school appears as a society of friends, to whom he becomes attached; if some of his fellows are by no means friendly, all the same, his contact with them needs time for the adjustments which

experience alone can make between the self and the *alter*. Hence the organizer, in all countries where a system is planned out, assigns to each type of school a period of years, never less than two and seldom more than six; the shorter period is sanctioned in places where vocational education is stressed, such as Training Colleges and Technical Schools; but the rule should be to allot at least three years as the minimum period for association between a scholar and his schoolmates. We can thus divide up the twenty possible years between 3 and 22 into four periods:

Nursery or infant grades . .	3–8
*	*
Primary grades	9–13
*	*
Secondary grades . . .	14–18
*	*
College	19–22

At the margin between the periods I put an asterisk to note what some psychologists call a time of *transition* (p. 64 above) the scholar at 8 is sometimes already a steady child, but sometimes still displays the wayward fancies of the infant; some boys at 17 are already ripe for college, or for the responsibilities of an adult career; others are as unripe as an average lad of 14; human beings vary, both in congenital capacity and in rate of development, more than any other species, either of plant or animal; you get at one extreme a baby of four like John Stuart Mill learning Latin and Greek (not, one thinks, for his own benefit) and at another the slow-witted yokel who can scarcely penetrate the mystery of signing his name. The data drawn from physiology and psychology supply the teacher with a rough-and-ready guide to average capacity which will be found among the school

population in each of the periods Infant, Primary and the rest (compare Chap. V). Armed with such a sketch, he can outline a course of progress for the normal scholar, proceeding through the system from start to finish, spending four, five or six years in a succession of schools, entering each at the lowest class and passing out at the top class to the next above. In newly settled countries, e.g. the middle and western States of America, plans of this kind can be worked out with reasonable satisfaction; but in Europe many variations due to social heredity are required (p. 150 below).

I have provisionally attached the labels Primary and Secondary to the periods from 9 to 13* and 14 to 18* respectively, but this nomenclature is not taken from our education laws. The term Primary has never been sanctioned, although its correlative Secondary was adopted by the Act of 1902; we speak instead of the Public Elementary School, since its purpose was originally limited to what were called the Elements of Instruction, the three R's. But the range of the P.E.S. has for a long time passed beyond this definition; downwards it reaches to the age of 3, where the ordinary school subjects have no place, and here the terms Nursery and Infant School have been adopted; upwards it extends to the Central School, which launches out freely into curricula identical with the modern studies of secondary schools. The Central School has had a chequered history; under various names, Higher Grade, Higher Elementary, Trade or Science School, it has survived as a 'top' to the primary schools, and seems likely to hold its own in spite of the objections raised to its tenure both from primary and from secondary school teachers.[1] The term Secondary

[1] It seems evident that history is repeating itself. In the '90s the Higher Grade Schools (in their upper classes) held the position which is now taken by many Central Schools: then, as now, a cheaper form of further

is equally elastic ; at the lower end it may reach down to children under 10 years of age ; at the upper end it may

education was offered to pupils who for various reasons were not mentioned in a secondary or technical school. Just as, after 1902, many of the higher grade schools were converted into recognized Secondary Schools so the present-day Central Schools, carrying on their pupils to 16 + and preparing them for matriculation, will claim to be called Secondary, since they are doing secondary work (of course under grave disadvantages). Conditions no doubt vary from town to town ; in one large city, at any rate, a number of Central Schools have been opened without any disguise to provide an education which is *almost* identical in curriculum with that of its secondary schools. The reasons assigned are, frankly, to avoid the heavy expense of procuring land, buildings, and staff needed to satisfy the Secondary School Regulations of the Board of Education. A few elementary school buildings are set apart for this purpose, the teachers are paid pretty much on the elementary scale, and a form of instruction is offered up to 16 + which is presumed to be as worth while as that afforded in the neighbouring municipal secondary schools. One can only hope that the rivalry between Central and Municipal Secondary will not approach the vehemence of the competition witnessed up tc 1903 between higher grade and endowed grammar-schools.

One permanent result appears likely to issue from this movement: the scope of the ordinary Elementary (or Primary) School will be universally recognized as ending, for the average child, at 11 + with the consequent reorganization of the entire school population beyond that range under a different plan of education. In large towns the primary school buildings will contain no pupils beyond that age (except a few who are backward in attainments); in areas of scantier population the older scholars will not be taken off to another school building (except the few who go to secondary schools) but they will be educated apart from the standards, in a distinct department, with opportunity for individual instruction far beyond what is now possible, and with encouragement to remain until fifteen or sixteen. This change, which has been so much canvassed of late years, meets, however, with one great hindrance : the non-provided school, which already stands to lose by the withdrawal of its brightest scholars to secondary and central schools, will be still further restricted. A new form of compromise between the institutions of religion and of those of the State must be worked out. Recent discussions by religious bodies, especially within the Established Church, show that a basis for such readjustments is being prepared.

stop at 16 or extend to 19. One can only employ Elementary, Secondary, University, Industrial, etc., as respectively denoting such types of education as are assigned to these titles by statutes and official regulations. In other words the statutory definitions serve the practical purpose of distinguishing types of education under the various criteria which form the theme of this chapter; as decisions relating to the criteria change so must the range of the titles change. This may seem to be an odd way of defining one's terms; a critic may exclaim, "We don't know where we are!" But why should he know, unless he keeps up with the times? Every branch of human activity, every science, has to expand or contract the scope of its terms with the passage of time; all he can ask is that changes are not made too rapidly, and that when made their purport should be free from misconstruction. Sometimes the old terms will not fit the new circumstances; our English law is famous for inventing ugly badges; ex-pupil teacher, 'uncertificated teacher,' 'non-provided school' are cacophonous, but the epithets serve the purpose of their inventors, viz. to indicate exclusion from a privileged class; for in public affairs labels are the symbols of conflict, the banners under which combatants align their forces. "Give a dog a bad name—and hang him!" Thus I would like to see the term 'secondary' attached to every type of schooling, whether part-time or complete, which is afforded to 'young persons' (p. 67), in all social classes, and I would extend it downwards to include what is now the Senior Stage[1] in Public Elementary Schools. But this desire springs from views relating to psychology and politics, and is not acceptable to persons holding different opinions; anyway, such an enlargement of definition would make havoc of the machinery under which Government con-

[1] *Suggestions for Teachers*, pp. 16–20 (Board of Education, 1923).

ducts its affairs; it would at once upset the regulations of the three Branches of the Board of Education which are concerned with Central, Secondary and Continuation Schools.

Among such opinions one of the chief points of controversy is the superior limit of age for compulsory attendance. If you hold with the full design of the Act of 1918 and believe that youth (see Chapter V) needs some control by the State up to eighteen years of age, you have then to determine whether the compulsion shall extend to all the working hours of the day, thus depriving the parent and the employer of the fruits of their labour, or shall take them in charge for a limited time (320 hours per year is the modest demand in the Act). And this involves an opinion as to the value of schools conducted in factories and shops, and as to the duty of providing full education to lads and lasses when out of work (p. 260).

Compulsion offers one of the thorniest problems in the whole range of educational policy. In a school where attendance is voluntary, the managers admonish the scholar that he must attend punctually and make due progress or he will be excluded. Under compulsion the position is reversed; if the scholar evades one school he is sought out and placed in another; his attendance is enforced, even if he "fails to profit thereby." This fundamental difference is popularly regarded as a line of demarcation between elementary and secondary education, but it no longer serves that purpose, although the sense of privilege attaching to secondary schools springs largely from the altered attitude (p. 148 below) between teacher and scholar when compulsion to attend is replaced by compulsion to improve; the popular distinction between 'higher' education and 'lower' derives mainly from this source, although it is often confused with subordinate problems relating to curricula. The

reader will see that I have here touched upon topics where the institutions of culture conflict with those of vocation; as they seem to provide material for party politics, I do not pursue them further.

A passing reference must suffice to note provision for adults who have long passed the highest possible age for compulsion, although in attainments they may or may not equal the youngsters. We saw (p. 4) that the organization of such provision has of late been treated as an outpost of university influence, operating through Extra-mural Departments. So long as the demand takes the form of lectures and single classes this arrangement satisfies; but the present trend goes further, and looks to the organization of continuous corporate life among adult students. The Settlement, the Guild House,[1] the Village Institute may be contrasted with proletarian efforts to develop Labour Colleges on class-conscious lines. All these forms of association are chiefly concerned with 'part-time' education, but not entirely; a few working men and women find it possible to risk loss of employment for the sake of a year or more at a college or settlement.

(C) Differentiation in Terms of Curricula

While a sequence of schools based on stages of development affords the clearest principle for differentiation, complications interfere with the simplicity of the plan when weight is attached to this or that branch of study. A Grammar-school usually gives special attention to Latin; a Commercial School, for scholars of the same age, offers book-keeping and shorthand. Opposed to these demands for specialism stands the advocate of 'liberal' education, who holds that the best foundation for the narrow requirements of a vocation is a common and general

[1] See publications of the British Institute of Adult Education.

syllabus which thinks more of the man and the citizen than of the future wage-earner or employer. Nor are these distinctions confined to the arguments of vocational versus liberal training; there is even more jealousy between rival schools of pedagogics as regards the elements to be included in a 'sound liberal education.' We need not here dwell upon these thread-bare controversies; they led in Germany to the institution of rival types of school, *Real-schule*, *Gymnasium* and *Real-gymnasium*; but in Great Britain we have usually avoided separation into distinct types, finding it more effective to separate scholars as they advance to the higher classes of a school into separate 'sides,' each of which specializes in its own subject. The university seeks the same unity amid diversity at a higher stage still, often at the sacrifice of corporate sentiments.

The principle involved is evident: the younger the scholar the more general and universal should be the course of study offered to him; as he approaches the time for leaving school he can fairly demand that his curriculum should be planned with some regard for his future. And, as a rider to this proposition, the longer he remains at school or college the more extensive will be the period allotted to general liberal studies; a boy who is destined to finish his school and college life at 22 should not be troubled with specialisms at 16, or even 18; but if he is to start 'work' at 15, he is not fairly treated if the curriculum of his school from 13 to 15 entirely ignores the type of employment on which he will enter. On the other hand, who is going to forecast the future vocation of a youth of 15? Even the most searching of Intelligence Tests should not be accepted as condemning any young person to a career of unskilled labour. Hence the importance attached to what the law calls Further or Continued Education offered, or enforced

(p. 148), after the period of full-time school is over; if you can rely in the primary grades on a sequel in 'Part-time' Education, you need not frame the curriculum up to 14 with any regard to subsequent vocation. Further discussion on choice of studies falls to the next volume.

(D) Range of Responsibility for the Scholar's Education

Under this head we consider variations in the extent to which a given school undertakes entire or part-time charge of its pupils: the variations are very wide, but the distinction can be readily followed.

i. *Boarding, or Residential Schools.*—The most comprehensive type of education is witnessed when the scholar resides on the school premises except during holidays. If he has no home, or if his home is not within reach, he may remain under scholastic control all the year round for many years; on the other hand, he sometimes resides on school premises for five days, only getting home for week ends.

There are two types sharply divided by class distinctions, both of which exert the same kind of influence on their pupils: they 'institutionalize' them—that is to say, they replace, partly or wholly, the influence of family institutions by the specific social effect of grouping a number of contemporaries (usually of the same sex) in an intense and segregated life. This social milieu is itself to be described as an institution, for customs and usages proper to the period of life of the pupils are established, and influence permanently the disposition of the members of the association, both teachers and taught.[1] I have not included it among the

[1] The school novel, from *Tom Brown's Schooldays* to the notorious *Loom of Youth*, by Alec Waugh, has made this field of education familiar to all who read books.

eight institutions for fear of confusion in thought, since this is the one institution which is created by the school itself, and only comes into being when the Practice of Education is started; it, therefore, stands over as a topic for consideration in Vol. II. Obviously this institutional or corporate aspect of school life is not confined to boarding-schools; as a phenomenon it is to be reckoned with in every concourse of scholars, for it arises simply from face-to-face intercourse. The only difference between the boarding and other types of school is in the stronger influence resulting from the uninterrupted intercourse of the members for long periods of time. I have no need to enlarge on the general sociological principle here illustrated. In many spheres of social activity men get together for short periods; by shutting out alien interests and coming face to face with their friends they accelerate the pace of their endeavours: the Retreats in religion, the Summer Schools, are familiar illustrations. The boarding-school is merely one example, on a formidable scale, of the application of this sociology. And the process is not merely negative, shutting out family and locality from the scene; it enables the authorities who control this corporate life to introduce other institutions to which they attach importance. Thus the French *Lycée* bears the hall-mark of military discipline; most English boarding-schools cherish a special form of religious observance; schools of the lower type usually stress the importance of manual labour.

The history of boarding-school education for the upper classes has yet to be written. I have my own theory as to the popularity of the custom in England,[1] as contrasted with Germany or Scotland; the success of the *Lycée* in France is attributed to quite distinct features of national

[1] Cf. *The Children of England*, loc. cit., pp. 180–1.

habit and consciousness. One aspect was common to all of them until yesterday: they cut the boy loose from the other sex, mother, sisters and girl friends, in the belief that separation of the sexes is wholesome from twelve years of age; when girls began to frequent boarding-schools the same principle was followed. Quite recently, however, the advocates of co-education have carried the contrary conviction over from day-schools to boarding-schools: Bedales,[1] St. George's, Harpenden, are examples of successful pioneer work.[2]

I cannot myself hold that the boarding-school should be regarded as the normal form of education up to eighteen years of age, for reasons given above; on the other hand, it performs a valuable function, and should be fully recognized as a necessary feature in the public system of education. Since it takes such extensive responsibility for the life of its scholars, the selection of fit persons to serve as teachers is even more important than in the day-school. Parents who heedlessly send their children to a school which has secured a reputation, without being personally satisfied that its influences are wholesome, take a grave risk.

After eighteen years of age the problem wears a different aspect: young men and young women are ready to cut loose from home and from the home town. The lack of corporate sentiments in modern colleges and universities which I noted above is partly due to this stay-at-home habit: especially when the student has to travel some distance day by day to get to his work. Under such conditions he has little time for comradeship; however highly one may rate the intellectual benefits derived from work in lecture-rooms and laboratories, the contrasted

[1] J. H. Badley, *Bedales: A Pioneer School* (1923).

[2] The Society of Friends has for many years received both boys and girls at Ackworth, Sidcot, Penketh, and elsewhere.

benefits *at this period of life* accruing from unsupervised intercourse should be equally prized. It is a different question as to how students should live in the university town: every country has evolved its own traditions, and for women at any rate the hostel is everywhere in favour. The one important point is negative:—removal from home, if the best results of college education are to be secured. Unless a student, by eighteen years of age, is sufficiently stabilized in character to be emancipated, he ought not to be sent to college at all.

In the second type of boarding-school, where the parents do not come into the account, the selection of teachers is equally important; the best results are found when teachers enter on the life as a mission, to be fulfilled in a spirit of love for forlorn children to whom they must supply the place of home. They are of many types; those for foundlings and orphans gathered into Barnardo, Stephenson and other schools have a history of their own reaching back, in principle, to the early days of Christianity. The so-called Children of the State,[1] under the charge of Poor Law Guardians (p. 251), afforded Dickens a theme for tragedy, and the public conscience has slowly been aroused. Many of these children are now well educated either in large boarding-schools or in Cottage Homes, where some approximation to family life is possible. The Reformatory and Industrial Schools referred to above are almost always residential, although some cities have conducted Day Industrial Schools. An interesting experiment has been conducted in recent years by an association called The Caldecott Community, which has taken a few dozen children from working-class homes and educated them amid charming surroundings in the country. The domestic circle from

[1] The State Children's Aid Association has done capital work on their behalf.

which they are removed is by no means vicious; on the contrary, the parents are keenly alive to their children's welfare. But the founders despair of raising children well in the surroundings of mean streets, and they have certainly proved that the boarding-school is a means of rescue even for children under twelve; but it is obvious that resort to such a remedy is too revolutionary to be regarded as a solution for the social situation in congested areas. The chief value of the work, to my mind, is as a contribution to the principles on which all residential schools should be conducted. Still more recently, as a sequel to the advance of the Labour Party to office, another proposal has been mooted, to reconcile the *bourgeois* with the *proletariat*. The exclusiveness of the Public Schools, it is alleged, can be broken down if working-class boys are sent to them at the public cost; already a few such boys are associated with wealthier comrades in holiday camps under royal patronage, and there is no doubt that all concerned benefit by the intercourse. No such expedients, however, are worth serious consideration as remedies for the troubles of our time; but they illustrate the regard which is paid to the boarding-school, and the hopes that are entertained for social progress through the agency of education.

ii. *Part-time Education by Non-professional Teachers.*— From the boarding-school, which takes complete responsibility in contrast to the day-school, we pass to the other extreme, where the pupil is offered some assistance in his development supplementary to the resources of the day-school. It is enough to mention some of them. The Sunday-school is pre-eminent, and its history recalls the epoch when these associations provided the only means of culture for adults as well as children in many parts of Great Britain. The Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., Boy Scouts,

Girl Guides, take a similar position from the standpoint of the organizer, although the last two often come into close relations with the internal life of a school. They all have this feature in common: while many of the instructors are actually professional teachers, they discharge their duties in these associations as laymen (p. 164), and claim, therefore, the maximum of freedom. These efforts are not on this account to be dismissed as trivial, or to be left out of reckoning by public authorities: far from it, for these represent in educational practice the same principle which political theory advances in the sphere of educational control, the principle of volunteer service. Whatever jealousies may be felt from either side, the public welcome every worthy endeavour on behalf of children, even though the results, expressed in terms of attainments, may be meagre. For the gain which accrues to pupils from these associations springs from personal relations with the scout-master and the Sunday-school leader, from spiritual influences which cannot be assessed in 'returns.' Where the day-school can give of its best to its scholars in these high concerns, well and good; in such cases it may be best for the young folk to be entirely absorbed in the single community of the day-school, instead of having their interests dissipated by competing claims on their regard.

iii. *Part-time Education in Separate Subjects of Study.*—The Sunday-school, in spite of its name, is by no means restricted to one day of the week, for in practice it forms a continuous bond with the home and the church. There are, however, many important types of school that occupy only a few hours of their scholars' time per week, and cover only one or two subjects of study, on the assumption that the rest of the students' time is filled with industrial or other employment. The variety is great: Evening Continuation Schools, Extension

Courses, and the whole field of Adult Education are comprised under this head. When the demand on a student's time is very slight it seems absurd to attach the label 'school' to the casual association of persons, once a week perhaps, for a 'course' of six weeks. But the history of all such enterprises shows that if they succeed they develop a recognizable corporate life, since it is in the nature of things that persons who share common interests shall extend their intercourse.

The attention now paid by public authorities to these forms of partial education may lead one to overlook the far more extensive activity of private enterprise which I have already noticed from the point of view of ownership. Every conceivable subject can be studied in classes organized by tutors, as the advertising columns of the press bear witness; and their success may be advanced in support of Adam Smith's doctrine of competition (p. 115). The postal service cheap printing and advertising have created a very special form of such instruction called Correspondence Teaching. The relation here established can scarcely be included among schools, although the promoters often use the terms 'school' and 'college' in their prospectuses. As an aid to individual study they render a real service, although, no doubt, they lend themselves to abuse when students are crammed for examinations by their means. But our censure should be transferred to the authorities who allow credit to be attached to qualifications which can be secured by such devices; e.g. a university degree or diploma won by correspondence or other coaching may afford good evidence of industry and docility of mind, but it stands on a different footing from one gained after a course of education at a place of learning; the public should not be misled by the identity of titles conferred on those who have undergone such different types of education.

Correspondence teaching stands in low esteem just because it can be so skilfully misused as a substitute for personal intercourse; in its right place it should be recognized, i.e. in circumstances where a student can only be reached *through* the post. Thus during the recent war many soldiers availed themselves of private correspondence teaching, for the post never failed to ultimately reach the soldiers; and the British Salonika Force established a useful Correspondence Bureau in Constantinople, 1919. I understand that the Air Force has a similar scheme in operation, and it is a matter of common sense to offer facilities in books and tuition through the post to units when cut off from other resources of culture. At least one State University in America, that of Wisconsin, serving a widely scattered rural population, has conducted a similar agency for many years. The State, which enables mail-order business to flourish by carrying parcels, ought to be equally solicitous to help agriculture by offering correspondence instruction to the farmers and peasants.

Most of these forms of Part-time Education tend to favour curricula concerned with technical and professional studies rather than with general education, since the student has come to feel the need of help in his occupation. But there are many exceptions; liberal education maintains its hold in the W.E.A. and the Labour Colleges as much as in the field of secondary education.

iv. *Part-time Education and Industry.*—The competing claims of liberal and special curricula are seen at work also when we look at Part-time Education from the standpoint of industries. We have already seen how the Act of 1918 sought to take 320 hours per year as compulsory time for education within the hours of wage-earning employment. Many reformers are apprehensive of this form of compulsory part-time education and fear that it

will be used as a plea for retaining a low compulsory age of leaving the full-time day-school. But the principle is sound, whatever be the limits of age in question; it establishes the right of the juvenile worker to education (even if he himself does not welcome it), as well as his duty to industry and his reward in wage. The educational organizer is naturally inclined to favour schemes which put students under his sole charge for the entire week or year, making a clean cut between the school or college and the world outside; but surely this is a profound mistake. Whatever complexities are involved in establishing relations between the institutions of education and those of industry a time comes to every scholar when he ought to be at work, and our modern substitutes for apprenticeship have to be founded on principles of which the Act of 1918 is an example. They should not regard these forms of part-time education as an intrusion of industry on the province of education, but as just the opposite, viz. the invasion of educational ideals into a sphere of life which threatens to swallow up a man's whole energy in earning a wage or accumulating wealth.

On this ground it is of capital importance first to claim for education the whole time of young wage-earners who are out of employment, instead of eight hours per week; public opinion would, I am convinced, gladly see them taken in hand for twenty hours, instead of being left to idle away their days. There is universal testimony to the moral harm which has accumulated during recent years when so many juveniles have been left without occupation. This is the right end at which to begin to apply compulsory education after leaving the day-school; if our legislators had foreseen what has now happened they would have found it easy to make a start in the brief period of industrial prosperity which ended so disastrously in 1920. To

begin now (1925) would involve great expenditure, but the need is pressing. I know that a few local authorities offer day continuation classes to such of the unemployed under eighteen as choose to attend them; but these pupils should be allowed no more choice in the matter than is given to those whose parents send them to secondary schools. Every 'young person' should either be at work or at school, and the law should ensure that this principle is carried out. The Continuation School, combining part-time education with part-time work (when the latter can be obtained), should become a universal feature of the national system, as highly esteemed as the secondary schools have become since 1902. I am well aware that employers of labour are alarmed at any proposals which tend to turn the minds of the young away from absorption in industry; but they are also realizing the new attitude which the industrial classes are adopting towards education. In Lancashire, e.g., at the present moment (1925) trade is slack and unemployment among youths is rife, and yet the mills are suffering from a shortage of juvenile labour; if they ran full-time the difficulty would be very grave, for already boys and girls are being imported from Salford to near-by cotton towns to make up the deficiency. It is vain to say that boys and girls are idle and will not work as their fathers and mothers did; human nature has not changed so suddenly. The fact seems to be that schooling and other social influences are leading the toiling masses to desire something more than wages and the mill-round of mechanical industry; education of every type—technical, liberal, non-professional—is making an appeal which was scarcely heard before 1914 and the industrial world has to accommodate its own ideals to a new public opinion. We must regard part-time education, in its varied forms, as perhaps the most important field of social endeavour in our epoch (see Note I, p. 260).

(E) Differences based on Social Upbringing

I have dwelt on this feature of education in the previous chapter (pp. 82–6). Class distinctions no longer enter avowedly into the arrangements of public education; but the varieties of wealth and culture displayed in all countries with a long history inevitably play their part in differentiating one school from another.

(F) Differentiation by Sex

Four types may be distinguished: (i) schools receiving only boys; (ii) schools receiving only girls; (iii) dual schools where boys and girls are received on the same premises under the control of one principal but separated both for instruction and for social life. A variation of this plan is the department system found in large primary school buildings: infants of both sexes on the ground-floor, girls on the first floor, under a head mistress, boys on the second floor under a head master; these are entirely separate schools put together in a building for economy of space, and united solely by drawing their scholars from the same neighbourhood. (iv) Mixed, or co-educational schools. When the control is in the hands of state authorities or of religious bodies[1] girls and boys are seldom taught together if the attendance is sufficient to admit of more than one school to meet local requirements. County Secondary Schools are often opened as co-educational, but when increased attendance justifies the establishment of a second school the sexes are divided —not always with the approval of parents or staff who have recognized the benefits of co-education. It is evident, however, that the balance of public opinion is

[1] The chief exception is in the boarding-schools conducted by the Society of Friends (p. 142). The influence of the Roman Catholic Church on the other side should be recognized.

in favour of segregation both in primary and secondary schools. As regards universities and places of adult education opinion has swung in the opposite direction. In the mixed school there may be minor variations in the extent to which the two sexes associate either in the class-room or in social life ; but the principle is to associate the sexes wherever possible and only separate for definite reasons, whereas in the dual school the opposite rule prevails.

I am convinced that separation of the sexes is adopted, even when parents would sanction it, because women have found it needful to favour separation as part of the general movement for what is called emancipation. Although the co-educational school ultimately tends to sex equality, the direction is usually (though not always) in a man's hands and the predominance of men in public affairs outside the school walls is reflected within, not always by design but by social habit. Hence educated women find in separate girls' schools a sphere for the exercise of unquestioned authority, and the sense of independence both among pupils and staff is fostered.[1] I shall venture my own opinion on these matters in the next volume, to which the topic falls more appropriately since the principles at issue affect the quality of corporate life within the school.

So far as curricula are concerned and comparisons of sex attainment in studies, the Report (1923) of the Consultative Committee, *Differentiation of Curricula between the Sexes in Secondary Schools*, has cleared the air. But that committee dealt with only one aspect of the

[1] In Wales, at one time, there was much friction in mixed schools conducted under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act; and the problem has recently led to more friendly discussion between the Head Masters and Head Mistresses Association in England. The cleavage among primary teachers is still more pronounced.

problem ; the sexes are separated for traditional reasons, grounded on social heredity ; change, so far as desirable, must wait upon a reshaping of opinion in manners and morals, with which other institutions are more directly concerned than those of teachers and schools.

Some readers may be wearied with this long enumeration of points in which one school may differ from another, and yet we cannot avoid the analysis, since the complexity is due to the varied ideals and distinctions within a nation which has a long past behind it, and rests its hopes for the future on the equipment of the rising generation. When the principles on which this arrangement of types is based are once grasped an observer can examine the documents relating to any given school and describe it under the headings first of ownership and then of the items mentioned from A to F. He thus gains an exact view of any place where schooling is carried on as a part of the entire national system. Thus some sort of order evolves from what at first appears chaotic and left to hazard. We now turn to principles on which the teaching body has been brought into existence to supply the needs of these multifarious associations of scholars ; since the schools display such diversified types, we may expect to find an equal variety among those who conduct them.

CHAPTER VIII

TEACHERS, PROFESSIONAL AND LAY

WHEN I wrote on The Teacher fifteen years ago[1] I was impressed by the low estimate in which the profession was held, both by the general public and by men of distinction in literature and politics. One might still dwell on that aspect of education, but the public mind is rapidly changing and begins to make a juster estimate of education values. It seems clear that there has been a quiet but steady appreciation of education for twenty years past, starting, I think, with the Act of 1902, which opened up secondary schools to families of small means and brought local authorities into immediate touch with the whole range of education. The Great War accelerated the movement, for it brought millions of Englishmen into contact with foreigners, and made us realize, both in friendship and in enmity, the loss we had sustained by our indifference to the resources of culture. Hence, when the Government of 1920-21, panic-stricken at the colossal scale of national debt and public expenditure, sought to save a few millions by retrenching on education and applied the notorious Geddes Axe, its effort proved to have little warrant among thoughtful people in any rank of society; it may be said with confidence that this time of trial has only served to establish public confidence in the offices of education and a greater willingness to make sacrifices on its behalf.

This reflection bears closely on the topic before us, for there is no calling which depends so greatly on the public

[1] *The School*, chapter viii.

good-will. Other professions and trades can pursue their business with little regard for the community, but the teacher, although not a *civil* servant, has to regard his work in these democratic days as eminently a public service, and a professional service, distinguished from unskilled labour, which relies solely on experience to prove its worth.

The transition from that status was slow; the earliest Training Colleges, or Normal Schools, were valuable in their day, but the teachers whom they equipped showed the docility of pupil-teachers and were not expected to assume the powers of a corporate body. It was only in the '40s, after the central authority had begun to shape a policy for primary education, that the change came.[1] The organization of teachers into associations, e.g. the N.U.T. and the College of Preceptors, soon followed, and before long Edward Thring brought the Public Schools into line by initiating the Head Masters' Conference and helped the Head Mistresses in Girls' High Schools to found a much more active association. In the '80s the list of associations grew apace, the Head Masters of Secondary Schools (I.A.H.M.) were brought together by R. P. Scott, while the Assistants united in the I.A.A.M. and I.A.M.A.[2] for

[1] Frank Smith's *Life of Kay-Shuttleworth* (1923) shows how this devoted teacher and administrator raised the standard.

[2] Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters; Incorporated Assistant Mistresses Association. The term Assistant, replacing the older terms usher and governess, seems firmly established in secondary school usage. It derives from the legal position of the staff in endowed secondary schools, where the head master appoints teachers to 'assist' him. Times have changed since the Bryce Commission of thirty years ago inquired into secondary education; and the tendency now is to regard principal and staff as colleagues (a *Lehrercoll·gium*). But the needs of an adolescent society may perhaps justify the survival of autocratic management in secondary education, although democratic

secondary schools; similar societies for primary and technical teachers have flourished, although in their case the need for separate organization was not so great, since the N.U.T. was founded on a comprehensive basis which made no distinction between principal and staff.

Quite apart from these strictly professional groups there have sprung up a multitude of societies in which the professional and administrative aspects of education play only a subordinate part. The earliest of these, the Education Society of the '70s, and its successor the Teachers' Guild, took a wide range and discussed the theory and practice of education on every side; associations more recently established limit their scope to some branch of teaching, e.g. Handicraft, Modern Languages. In fact, every 'subject' is now represented by one or more specialist groups. A directory of educational associations now includes several hundred titles, and testifies to the extraordinary vigour with which the teaching body has striven, during the last half-century, to give expression to corporate sentiments.

The drawback to this bewildering variety of 'organs' was patent to everyone: there appeared to be, not one profession, but twenty! Hence a very important step was achieved when, after many disappointing efforts, a Teachers' Council, authorized by the Education Act of 1899, was at last brought into being (1912) on a wide basis which gives a footing to every type of person who desires to call himself a teacher by profession. The roll of names admitted to the register of this Council has reached

sentiment no longer accepts it as necessary either in primary or in college education. But one should not be too positive: the trend towards self-government (so-called) in secondary schools is as yet highly experimental: if it succeeds it will carry with it a readjustment in the relations between principal and staff.

a total of 80,000, and although this is only a small proportion of the total who are estimated as making a livelihood by following their craft, these numbers are sufficient to justify the faith of those who set the Council on its feet. The present generation, accustomed to the title of 'teacher,' as including us all from Vice-Chancellors to nursery school directors, have no memory of the time when it was practically confined to the primary schools, when the terms 'secondary,' and 'technical' were unknown, when the grammar-schools were ceasing to be served by 'ushers' and replaced those humble assistants by 'schoolmasters,' while women enjoyed various titles, 'female-teacher,' 'governess,' 'schoolmistress.'

The survival of the traditional title 'schoolmaster' derived from the Middle Ages, when *magister* indicated the mastery of learning rather than the mastery of boys in school, reveals the central difficulty which besets everyone in putting a precise meaning upon the term 'teacher.' We saw in Chapter VI that the claim of Teaching as an institution is the claim of the expert. What, then, are the qualifications which decide whether a person can arrogate to himself this position of privilege? In short, what is a teacher? Obviously he must be more or less a man of learning; at least he must know a little more than his pupils. When his status as a man of learning is improved by experience in imparting knowledge and in school keeping, he presents himself with some assurance as an expert, just as craftsmen and merchants do. And yet the teachers themselves have felt, to an increasing degree, that neither attainments in culture nor extensive experience makes a sufficient basis for a calling which stands for more than a trade. A profession, as distinguished from bread-and-butter callings, demands a more intellectual grasp of principles on which the calling is

based. Very slowly teachers have come to see that their claims to respect as a profession, as a group entitled to a voice in organization, will be challenged so long as they present them merely as cultured persons who have 'kept school.' The new point of view has been reluctantly accepted, for most young men and women choose teaching in preference to other callings from love of learning or art, rather than from love of children. Hence professional studies have been at a discount, except for those branches (Infant Schools, Kindergarten, etc.), wherein women more than men are interested. Looking back over forty years spent in schools and colleges, I can see considerable change in the professional attitude to pedagogics (see p. 265), but the advance is not so great as some enthusiasts suppose. For the assumption still holds that the study of Education stands in opposition to 'attainments,' i.e. to scholarship and culture, and that the one can only be pursued at the cost of the other. I shall not pause to refute this error, for it has been exposed a hundred times: any system of training which does not lead the student to a finer appreciation of culture is self-condemned. The greater attention now paid to public education is due partly to the growing sense among teachers of their professional status, but quite as much to that general advance among the public of interest in the schools to which I have repeatedly referred. Nowadays teachers are wanted not only to keep school, but to inspect, to direct, to advise in all directions; the standard of children's attainments is canvassed; results are expected in return for the increase in public expenditure. If a teacher stands aside and relies solely on experience to justify his claim to a hearing he finds that his opinion is disregarded. The issue of this volume shows which way the wind is blowing; I should not have devoted so many pages to principles of organization unless

the evidence were to hand that teachers and others are thinking on the same lines.

We should not limit our view of the teacher's equipment to the beginning period when he goes to college for 'attainments' and 'training.' There is no profession in which more energy is now expended in self-development after the qualifications are secured. Here the change has been very pronounced ; year by year Summer Schools, both for scholarship and for pedagogics, are multiplied ; " no end to learning " is now the motto. Vacations are not wholly spent in recovery from the strain of an exhausting term, for thousands of teachers find both recreation and opportunity for self-development at all periods of the year when they are released from school attendance.

Answering, then, our question, What is a teacher ? we can now reply in the legal terms specified by the Teachers' Registration Council : he is a person who shows Attainments, a modicum of culture and learning ; who has pursued a satisfactory course of Training, and has thereafter obtained Experience during a specified number of years and produces evidence of teaching capacity. Evidence of training is not demanded from teachers engaged in universities and other corporations of university rank, for they are called upon to advance the bounds of knowledge, as well as to communicate their ideas in the lecture-room. Subject to these conditions, which have been worked out in detail by the 'recognition' of all reputable examination tests, any persons who have reached the age of twenty-five may be enrolled, and those of younger age who have not gained the requisite experience may be temporarily enrolled by the Council as Associate Teachers.

It is important to bear in mind that the principle

of organization is federal; the forty-four members of Council are not chosen by the body of registered teachers, but by various associations such as those I have mentioned above. These are in all cases either chartered corporations or incorporated bodies which can speak with authority for a considerable number of teachers; the complexity of the organization, the overlapping and rivalry of competing interests, still present many problems that time alone can solve. Meanwhile, there is sufficient evidence that the foundations of a united profession have been well and truly laid. Scepticism still prevails in some quarters as to whether the immense labour involved in constructing this organ of opinion has been worth while, for the Council has so far not been much in evidence as an authoritative exponent of professional opinions. This is, however, scarcely to be wondered at, or even to be regretted, since some of the groups included in the federation are highly esteemed and quite capable of declaring their own mind without reference to the Council. The university, for example, and the National Union of Teachers enjoy a prestige and exercise an influence over certain sections of the public which make it superfluous for them to defer to any other corporation. The source of power, in this as in all societies, must wait upon time and opportunity; the growth of social sentiments cannot be hastened. The one point of vantage from which this Council will in due course find leverage is in the determination of standards of recognition, and, as a consequence, the supervision, and at least the partial control, of all measures adopted to prepare persons for undertaking the teacher's office. Such authority is claimed by every trade and profession so soon as it becomes clearly distinguished in the public mind as a distinctive calling which is entitled to self-government; and the conflict between the selfish

interest of an exclusive corporation and the interest of community has to be ultimately reconciled in each instance by the authority of Parliament. As regards the teacher, the power of *effective* registration has so far been lodged with the State, acting chiefly through the Board of Education, but also through local authorities. For these bodies, by regulating the terms on which teachers are to be employed and, in the case of the Board of Education, by conducting its own examinations for certificates, decide for the majority of schools who shall or shall not enjoy the privileges attaching to the calling of a teacher. Some day, one may confidently prophesy, it will be recognized that the public interest is better served by delegating a large share in these duties to the professional body, although it is unlikely that the State will ever let go its control to the extent that has become customary in other professions.[1] For these departments of State, whether local or central, are subject, like all associations, to the infirmities of human nature (p. 98); they enjoy the exercise of power, and are unwilling to believe that some of their duties can best be discharged by others. They are slow to realize that absolutism in control leads to depression and indifference in those who are submitted to it; that results in affairs of intellect and spirit depend more upon the inner mind of men than upon compliance with codes and regulations. The philosophy of this situation is in fact part and parcel of the general trend of our times; the collectivist doctrines to which we have referred (p. 22), under which the organization of education took its rise, are slowly yield-

[1] It is often alleged that this claim of the State is based on the dependence of the teacher's emolument on rates and taxes rather than on fees. But this argument is derived from that collectivist theory to which I have repeatedly referred in this volume; more recent social philosophy gives no support to it.

ing in trade and industry[1] as well as in the concern of culture, to 'guild' doctrines which aim, when wisely expounded, to reconcile the freedom of the worker's spirit with loyal service to the community. It will, however, tax all the wit and all the good-will of public men to apply these doctrines to the work of the teacher and of his Council. It is easy to lay down the general principle that the teaching profession should have most to say as regards training and entrance to the profession. But when we examine the three conditions mentioned above we realize that the effective treatment of attainments and experience involves relationships with educational supervision as a whole. For a student-teacher cannot be trained solely in a college or a university department dedicated to that purpose: he must be welcomed in the schools and be guided in his first endeavours by older teachers engaged on the daily task. And the third condition implies that the Teachers' Council, as the registering authority, must be satisfied that the schools where experience is gained are places of repute, "accepted for this purpose by the Council." It is obvious that an authority competent to arrange for practical training and for the recognition of schools would stand on a very different footing from that so far accorded to any organs of the teaching profession. At the present moment all such problems receive small attention, for other measures of educational reform, arising out of the crises of recent years, take the lead; but they will come again to the front in due course; the solution will be found by giving a much larger place than hitherto to the voice of teachers in consultation and advice (Chap. XI), although the State will continue to retain the final voice in executive control. The

[1] Henry Clay, *Economics for the General Reader*, can be usefully consulted on this theory (pp. 436–40); see also references on p. 96.

Teachers' Council should at least be acknowledged as a statutory *advisory* body, to be consulted by the organs of government in all proposals that affect the welfare of the teaching profession ; and will thus come within the circle of national agencies for education. The idea of organized advice by teachers is already embodied in legislation, for the Act of 1899 which laid the basis for a Teachers' Council also instituted a Consultative Committee as part of the equipment of the newly established Board of Education. This Committee, however, is nominated by the President of the Board, and only gives advice on such matters as the President chooses to refer to it. Even under such conditions much useful work has been done,[1] but no one (least of all the teachers who are invited to serve on that Committee) presumes to regard their reports as expressing the collective opinion of the profession.

Let it not be assumed that a statutory right to give advice publicly and openly (p. 223) is a small matter. Not only is it in itself of value as an evidence of regard and esteem (a point to which I have already adverted) ; it is a positive mode of exercising power, and has always been recognized as such in the British Constitution. Its importance is the greater in our epoch since the communication of ideas is so rapid and universal.

Many people fail to see the need for imposing an obligation to receive advice, since it seems obvious that so long as individuals and societies are at liberty to speak their mind the advice is certain to be given and may be published ; the State authority, moreover, if it is discreet, takes care to sound the opinion of persons or of associations with whom it may have to reckon. The informal exchange of views which officials of the Board of Education conduct with the more powerful

[1] See Index for reference to the last two Reports.

teachers' societies has certainly smoothed the path of administration during the last twenty years, and no act of law can serve as a substitute for informal intercourse. But the difference in status, from the side of the teacher as well as in the creation of public opinion, is wide; the teaching body would find itself openly identified with the administration of education, a partner as well as a servant; and the administrator, inspector or secretary, would experience a reciprocal enlargement of good-will, enjoying the sense of partnership with colleagues rather than the exclusive privilege of a commander. Much of this spirit of give and take already informs the conduct of educational officials employed by Whitehall; and the time should not, therefore, be long before this relationship takes formal shape. The same argument applies with equal force to the State or to a local authority; and plans have already been adopted by some counties and county boroughs to introduce the new relationship. In Kent, for example, the Education Committee has established an Advisory Committee of Teachers composed solely of teachers of various grades[1] and submits proposals for change to its consideration.

In Manchester two Committees are established, one in which the Education Committee and teacher representatives sit together, another called a Consultative Committee, from which the Education Committee stands

[1] The Director of Education, however, is *ex-officio* Chairman. Travelling and subsistence allowances are paid to the teachers in respect of their attendance. Mr. Salter Davies writes, "The Advisory Committee has undoubtedly proved a useful institution. Not only has its advice, particularly on matters affecting the curriculum and organization of the schools, been most valuable, but it has also provided a means whereby discussion of the Committee's aims in certain directions has secured sympathetic co-operation on the part of the teachers." Other counties and boroughs have no doubt put similar plans into operation. Middlesex, e.g., has four consultative committees composed mainly of teachers.

aloof while seats are found for spokesmen of all 'employees' of the L.E.A., including caretakers, nurses and administrative staff. This scheme has many points of correspondence with the workers' committees established by progressive employers in industry. It can meet as a whole or in sections, and is convened by the Director from time to time. Much is gained when consultation is organized in any form; what begins in experiment will in time be accepted as custom and finally crystallized in by-laws. In some respects relations between the teacher and his local authority are more important than those between the central authority and a national council of teachers, for they come home more intimately to the daily life of the school. Putting the principle in the broadest terms, one would urge that the advisory relations between the central authority and the representatives of teachers, public and private, in the nation as a whole, should be duplicated in every locality, thus giving recognition and status to every reputable school that serves the children of citizens within the area.

While we may anticipate that movements for advancing the status and solidarity of the teaching body will continue, we may hope that accession to power and the use of freedom will react favourably on the inner life of school; such results do not always follow, for those who acquire freedom have sometimes refused to share the privilege with their subordinates. Happily there are abundant signs that the same spirit of harmony is being accepted within the school walls, in the varied plans for self-government, so called, for individual teaching and the like, which we shall consider in the second volume.

The Non-professional Teacher, or Amateur.—We see then that the teaching profession cannot hope (nor in my opinion should it desire) to attain so exclusive a status as

that conceded to many other callings. Our results cannot be really estimated, for everyone acknowledges that examination failures and successes give a one-sided and meagre account of the real effects of school life on the scholar's disposition and powers. This lack of definiteness runs of necessity through the whole business of education, and only the clergy can compare with the teachers in depending upon the public for confidence, without producing evidence of achievement in the most serious branch of their duty (Chapters II and III). Furthermore, the professional teacher, however highly trained he may be, however highly his Council may seek to define his province, cannot be exempt from the competition of the amateur, if we like to put the case in terms of rivalry. Here the clergyman, the journalist, the actor, the professional politician—all, in fact, who combine the pursuit of a livelihood with the utterance of a message—are in the same box as the teacher (compare Chap. II). The layman not only can but does teach.[1] There is no subject in the curriculum which is not expounded by 'specialists,' i.e. men whose main interest lies in the study itself, taking little thought about communicating it to others. The greater part of technological instruction is given by craftsmen, industrialists, men of commerce, who seldom care to be identified with the teaching profession; all the fine arts, with their studios, the professional 'schools' of medicine[2] and law are the concern of specialists. Occasionally such teachers are overjoyed to impart their craft to beginners, and display a skill and sympathy which many professionals never attain; they do not injure their own quality in

[1] Bernard Shaw is manifestly a great teacher of the amateur type, but he is foolish enough to declare, "He who can does, he who can't teaches!"

[2] The physician teaches in medical schools, and as S.M.O. may instruct the schoolmaster (pp. 175 and 191 below).

their own profession by this success, for the very effort to share ideas and practice with others is a spur and challenge to one's mind. Sometimes it is true that a great artist or surgeon is reticent, and can do little to impart his secret; but commonly he displays sufficient power of speech to help his fellows to interpret his work. And so far he is a teacher, even if he speaks without the title of professor or lecturer.

Then, again, there are the many thousands of Sunday-school teachers (p. 144) whose affiliations belong more to religious than to academic institutions. Yet since many of them in recent years have given attention to psychology and teaching methods they are justified in retaining the title of 'teacher.' Historically also they can make a good defence, for in England at least the Sunday-school and the Adult School, taught by laymen, led the way to secular education for the ignorant masses.

When to these we add the equally numerous groups who look after Lads' and Girls' Clubs, Boy Scouts and Boys' Brigades, Girl Guides, and Welfare Centres we begin to see that almost everyone who takes an interest in social or intellectual progress has a finger in our pie and can, if he likes, call himself a teacher. This freedom is sometimes found in religious corporations, such as the Society of Friends, where everyone may open his mouth if the Spirit move him. The educational system tends rather to follow the precedent of an 'establishment,' and hedge round the exercise of office with the mysteries of a cult, and yet even the Established Church finds a place for lay 'readers'; and we may hope that the most highly organized scheme of education will never attempt to create a 'closed' profession, thrusting the amateur entirely outside the class-room. Human nature, sympathetic and varied, demands this inclusion; education is a wide and universal institution, and schooling is only

one form in which its activity is manifested; the schools should welcome all kinds of partnership, so long as jealousies and rivalries can be adjusted.

Friction cannot always be avoided but one common-sense rule serves to distinguish the amateur from the professional, based on the employment of time. Wherever anyone spends the principal part of his time in teaching, then he should regard himself as a professional teacher and submit to all the obligations implied by the office. It is quite possible for a man to qualify for two professions, and he may render useful service in both so long as he makes himself competent in each of them. There are, for example, still many clergymen who accept appointments in schools, or who teach religion in parochial schools. Their position has often been resented, and with some justice, for it carries with it the assumption that the 'secular' teacher cannot be trusted in the sphere of religious influence. The proper *venue* (p. 121) for the religious minister is the sanctuary or the Sunday-school, where the influence of time and place in ritual and symbol can play their full part[1]; teachers should make it easy for their scholars to attend on such ministrations at appropriate seasons while maintaining their own rights within the school walls. But if a schoolmaster, in addition to securing full qualifications as a teacher, also 'takes orders' as a clergyman, we have no ground for critizing this extension of range, any more than we criticize the ambitions of a teacher who reads for the bar. The same argument applies to the many 'lay' teachers employed in evening classes (p. 145). If their principal employment is teaching then the profession is justified in demanding that they secure proper qualifications;

[1] This applies only to public schools where the religious difficulty is met on the principle of comprehension (p. 89). Where the school is on an ecclesiastical foundation the teacher is on a different footing.

if they are casuals, giving an odd hour or more per week, we welcome the special help that such amateurs can give.

Variations in Teachers' Attainments.—In seeking unity among teachers a great difficulty is presented in the wide discrepancies between the attainments of different classes of teachers. Thus on the same register there are persons who have been relieved from economic pressure up to twenty-three years of age or more to secure higher education, and persons who leave school at fourteen to become apprenticed in one of the woodwork trades, which they forsake after they come of age in order to serve an education authority as a teacher of manual training. It may well be that an individual in this latter class is an excellent teacher, better than the graduate man or woman who has passed ten years more in tutelage. We may even hold that the struggle for existence, the effort to secure culture, to pass examinations in the scanty leisure afforded after the day's labour in the shop is finished, affords a better discipline for a man than the more enjoyable experience of college life. But public opinion does not compare the two on these terms; the man who has had 'advantages' in childhood and youth is reckoned to be more serviceable, he receives higher pay, works under pleasanter conditions, and should, if advanced culture be of worth, render better service than the man who has had to snatch what he can of higher education where he can. Similar situations can of course be quoted from other professions: there is a considerable gap, for example, between a consulting physician in Harley Street and the panel doctor of a mining village, and yet the gap is nothing like so wide as in the ranks of teachers. The plain fact is that the divisions between types of school due to what we have called (p. 82) social heredity, or class, carry far more weight in matters of

education than in any other profession. This is inevitable, for it is precisely these matters of class, manners, breeding,[1] social contacts of all kinds to which parents both of high and low estate attach value. The differences so created are by no means affected solely by wealth, but the public see in the control of wealth the easiest means of commanding educational advantages; hence the problem becomes bound up with political conflicts, which books on public education seek to avoid. What is obvious is that the extension of democracy tends to the more equal sharing throughout the community of the favours now conferred, largely by accidents of fortune, upon a few. The method, however, by which this distribution is to be promoted in education, so as really to attain the end proposed, would be hard to set down in black and white.

The precedent set by other professions does, however, show the direction which reform will take:—the width of the gap will be lessened. The union of all teachers in one Council is already acting as a lever to bring diversities of grade into communion; and this is the first stage in the process of levelling up. The time will come—and it may not be far distant—when the village schoolmistress will show academic attainments on a par with those of the village doctor and the village parson. The President of the Board of Education in 1924 prophesied that this advance will be achieved within ten years, *if* he and his political party were empowered to go forward at their own pace. But the condition which Mr. Trevelyan attached to his promise demon-

[1] This will not be misunderstood. I am not attributing lack of manners either to my friends in the academy or my friends in the workshop; I am noting and interpreting the play of opinion. It would be easy to drop reference to such points (see p. 84) in this book, but one must not omit facts because they are awkward to handle.

strates the truth of what has been urged above, viz. that every system of education affects social and political relations. There is some danger lest teachers and schools should be divided into two camps, the one identified with democratic sympathies, the other with the so-called leisured class, resting on traditional culture and the power of wealth. A united teaching profession, standing on the sure ground of educational principles, should do much to secure English education from the worst effects of such a conflict. Teachers will more and more refuse to stand aloof from each other on the basis of class distinctions or of the varieties of ownership (p. 110) which distinguish school from school.

This is not to say that there is to be no diversity in the qualifications and services of teachers: each of the types of school classified in Chapter VII needs to be staffed by men and women possessing an appropriate experience and training. The unity based on a common standard both of general culture and professional skill is to be sought by a variety of routes; those, for example, who devote their lives to the care of defectives or to the needs of young children secure a training distinct from those who specialize in a single province of art or learning. But the task of making provision so as to secure for all types of teacher a fairly uniform minimum standard is extraordinarily difficult. The hindrances arise partly from finance; the great bulk of teachers are now educated and trained at the public charge, and I greatly question whether the public will be prepared, within the ten years anticipated by Mr. Trevelyan, to pay as much for the equipment of an infant school teacher as for the Sixth Form teacher of a secondary school. The ground for discrimination is usually sought in the fact that honours graduates are as a rule persons of higher capacity than those who teach the little ones; but this is an argument in a circle, for why

should persons of higher capacity be regarded as unfit to teach infants? If once the public came to realize that the care of little children or of 'slum' children is as important to the nation as the instruction of riper youth, there would be no difficulty in inducing persons of talent to devote their lives to that employment; some women of high attainments do so already, but they are pioneers; opinion has to be greatly changed before the nation is willing to spend millions of public money in educating and training every teacher to the level of attainment required, say, of a solicitor or a clergyman.

Another difficulty arises from the force of tradition in the academies where the teachers receive this 'education' and training. The demand for equality in attainments is commonly expressed by saying that all teachers should be enabled to secure a university degree; and yet it is obvious that universities, as now conducted, are only designed to equip a special type of teacher, those, viz., who seek attainments in branches of literature and science.

I rule out of consideration here the practical objections arising from the limited number of the existing universities and from their scanty resources, for if the nation really desires to see the universities strengthened and their number increased, it will find ways and means.

The university degree has gained an immense vogue in the public mind; not only teachers, but men and women in most professions desire to secure this evidence of attainment, and in the teaching profession there is a tendency to pay and promote graduates on terms which distinguish them sharply from those who have not secured this qualification. The titles Bachelor, Master, have not only this substantial and official market value, but stand high in public esteem. Now, if all teachers, as well as the specialists in science and literature, are to receive this hall-mark, how are the universities, old

and new, to accommodate themselves to the demand? Is the future teacher of music or of handicrafts to be encouraged to follow his bent during his years of higher education, say from sixteen to twenty-two, and be awarded the coveted title on the ground of attainments therein, or must he relinquish his tastes and his specific preparation for a career during these formative years, to engage in studies which lie outside his interests? The way out of this impasse would require the universities to adopt a new policy, so as to include within the term 'learning' all branches of human activity which are the subjects of study. An alternative policy would be to give a university constitution to corporations which are, in the current phrase, "of university rank,"[1] i.e. which give training to well-educated young people of, say, eighteen to twenty-two years of age. This proposal would tend to elevate the entire teaching profession into a 'graduate' body, but would encounter a further criticism. For it is pointed out that there is no profession in which there is a larger wastage of personnel than in teaching:—especially among women, many of whom forsake the schools after a short period of service in order to marry. Is it worth while for the community to spend its resources in equipping them for a calling to which they render so brief a return in service? The stricture is applied also to other callings, but it is felt more as regards teachers because there are more of them and because the cost becomes more and more a public charge. The sound reply is to insist that all young men and women of the right disposition and gifts are doing the best both for themselves and the community by spending their time up to twenty-two years of age in equipping themselves for teaching or for some other useful career, *regardless of what may happen to them afterwards.* No type of

[1] E.g. some of the academies and colleges of music and art.

school, liberal or vocational, primary or advanced, is to be treated solely as a preparation for some subsequent period of life (p. 61); if well conducted, it should stand as the most proper and wholesome way of living, for the time being. In the higher grades it ought certainly to assume the character of vocational training (p. 89), since young men and women, if properly brought up, ought to be eager to qualify for adult responsibilities. But there must be no bargain. Domestic life, at least, as a consequence of marriage, is quite as important a social function as a life spent in the schools; and a woman teacher who gets interested in children and in educational principles should be helped by college education, if in later years she bears children and brings them up. It is on this ground that I question the value of the scheme of indenture under which for some years students who enjoyed state grants were legally bound to give a minimum of seven or of five years' service. The plan has recently been dropped, possibly because the operation of the Geddes Axe caused a temporary diminution in the number of available posts, and hence the State could not fulfil its part of the obligation. Now that the balance between candidates and vacancies is being redressed we may hope that the government will abstain from reviving these stipulations. Instead of invoking the aid of law and of compulsion the energy of the administrator should be directed to improving the quality of higher education and to the exclusion from its benefits at an early stage of the few who show lack of qualification (either in diligence or in temperament) to profit thereby. If these conditions are fulfilled the great bulk of those who have enjoyed the benefits of training will be happy enough in the life-long pursuit of their calling; those who forsake it may be counted on to render equally important service to the community in some other walk of life.

CHAPTER IX

THE ECONOMICS OF EDUCATION

SINCE the human spirit lives in interaction with a material world all problems of social welfare may be stated in terms of wealth; and indeed they should be so stated, for the consideration of income and expenditure shows at every point how the mind and purpose of man, in making provision for the rising generation, is influenced by his attitude towards wealth and limited by his resources. This is not to say that we should estimate educational results in terms of money; to do so would be both vulgar and stupid. When questions are raised as to what the nation, or the parent, is 'getting' for the seventy-odd millions allotted to education these can only be answered by reference to moral and spiritual values—a variant of the old inquiry as to what a man gives "in exchange for his soul." If, however, the educator, in his zeal for the cause, refuses to look at the budget, either of any given school or of the country as a whole, and passes by this chapter as an affair of loaves and fishes, he also is blind to the truth of facts. Man does not live by bread only, but man *does* live by bread; furthermore, by examining accounts we can oftentimes gain a useful view of the policy which dictates expenditure.

Let us, then, constitute ourselves a committee of ways and means, noting the items of annual revenue and disbursement, in any given school.

The following list of items takes for granted the initial

expenditure on land, buildings and equipment; it is too often the case that founders, private and public, are too lavish at the start and niggardly when the demand for upkeep and maintenance are presented. Nor do the heads of this budget take account of the costs of administrative work that lies outside the sphere of an individual school. The duties considered, e.g., in Chapters X and XI involve large expenditure by one or other of the agents who manage the educational system; but no end would be served here by entering into details. It is well, however, to bear in mind that expenditure on education is by no means limited to the funds necessary to establish and to maintain schools.

Revenue and Expenditure in a School Budget

To	By
Personnel:	Income from endowments.
a. Teachers.	Subscriptions.
b. Medical service.	Payments *by* scholars:—fees.
c. Administrative (clerical work).	State aid:
d. Pension funds.	*a*. From taxes, called Grants-in-aid.
Upkeep of property, including caretaking.	*b*. From rates.
Apparatus and renewals.	Deficit (?)
Rent (when needed).	
Payments *to* scholars, including maintenance.	
Surplus (?)	

Endowments.—Let us begin with the sources of income. In the old days endowment was the normal mode of setting school and colleges on foot, and also of maintaining them in great part; they were indeed houses of God, like other ecclesiastical foundations, designed to serve the supreme end of education, as understood in those times. Some citizens in these days resent the intrusion of private

wealth into the public management of education.[1] They allege that the self-respect of ratepayers and taxpayers is affronted when 'charity' steps in to patronize places of education. They allege that many of these gifts are really offered as bribes—not consciously, perhaps, but in effect—as the modern equivalent of the death-bed bequests made by wicked barons in an earlier epoch; to-day such men are alleged to seek to propitiate *Demos* by offering a part of their ill-gotten riches so as to entrench their position against the envy of public opinion. These sentiments are not confined to Radicals, and they have to be reckoned with; they are only to be contemned when they are carried to their logical extreme. For, if we refuse the aid of the wealthy, ought we not equally to reject the tiny gifts of the poor? Many of the voluntary movements of our own day are supported by the offerings of those who have little to spare, and neither to them nor to their wealthy comrades have we a right to attribute base motives without good cause. If, and when, the visions of a socialist era are realized, and the conflict between public and individual ownership is solved in every department of life, the problem of endowment in education will be solved with the rest; but meanwhile the practical administrator sees that other principles are involved. A city corporation which would not tolerate private competition in the supply of gas or transport is justified in accepting rivalry between its municipal schools and the endowed schools, since efficiency of

[1] Adam Smith sought to discourage endowment on quite other grounds. "The endowments of schools and colleges have, in this manner, not only corrupted the diligence of public teachers, but have rendered it almost impossible to have any good private ones" (*Wealth of Nations*, Book V, Part III, Art. II). History has proved that he was in error, but the student of education should recognize, in his views, a current of thought which prevails to-day, under many disguises, on the relations between culture and wealth.

measures for lighting and heating depends upon uniformity, whereas variety is essential in affairs of education. If this view be taken we should accept the consequences and recognize the sphere of 'independent' schools and the claim of other institutions (Chapter VI) alongside of the State. But in so doing we by no means admit the claim of wealth, *as such*, to control public policy; whatever be the motives of a donor, his gift, when handed to trustees, is public property and is administered under the laws which regulate such funds. No one can doubt that in past times much injury has been done to the progress of education by allowing 'the dead hand' to cramp public effort; the voluminous reports of education commissions during the last hundred years can show how necessary it is for the State to exercise the powers now entrusted to the Board of Education and the Charity Commission. I would even go further and should be glad to see a statutory obligation placed on trustees to deposit a copy of every trust deed relating to schools and colleges in a government office so that expert control could be exercised, and possible abuses checked before they had grown to formidable dimensions. Such supervision is the more necessary because gifts may be provided which may cripple a school instead of assisting to promote its aims. Most endowments take the form of property from which rents accrue, but as often as not the donor is a 'founder' and requires that his gifts take shape in grounds, buildings, equipment which entail excessive expenditure for upkeep and renewals; furthermore, the scale of this capital expenditure may commit the managers to a certain size of school and thus involve them again in an annual outlay which is not met from annual revenue. This danger is by no means imaginary: founders and trustees are all too prone to think that bricks and mortar achieve the ends of education. I call to mind a college built

at great cost by a citizen and labelled with his name. He left his fellow-citizens to complete the task. They were expected to provide endowment for salaries and upkeep; but they were shy: "Let old F. finish his own job," they said; so for many years the place languished and finally became merged in a larger corporation. In a neighbouring county a college with similar aims was set on foot, but here the trustees were enabled to spend the income on salaries, so as to ensure a fine quality of work from the start; meanwhile, temporary premises served to house both teachers and students until results proved that the enterprise was worthy of wide support. Little difficulty was then found in raising the large sum needed to build and equip a suitable fabric.[1]

Subscriptions.—This item includes forms of aid which show the good-will of many thousands of people to education, but are not so widely appreciated because they do not appear in public statistics of educational expenditure. The non-provided schools recognized under the Education Acts are the most numerous, but to these should be added types of school (Chapter VII), e.g. orphanages and homes, boarding-schools maintained by professions and trades, masonic schools, schools for sons or daughters of the clergy, and so forth—all of these dependent upon gifts to annual revenue. The principles involved here are essentially the same as those we have noted in respect of endowments. It is often held, especially in the case of schools which are financially independent, that governors and trustees can claim entire freedom from

[1] Since the above was written the announcement has been made (Feb. 1925) of a fine endowment to found a University in the city of Hull. It is gratifying to learn that the donor is pursuing the sound policy; we may be sure that the wisdom shown to-day by providing for men in preference to bricks and mortar will to-morrow secure the erection on the east coast of university buildings which will rival those now being completed in Bristol on the west.

public supervision. In other words it is assumed that the possession of money entitles the owners to do as they please with children—with other people's children. But the assumption is wrong; an educational enterprise is a matter of general concern, whether or no its promoters need to supplement subscriptions and endowments by resort to the public purse. It seems an invidious task to thrust the inquisition of public officials into the affairs of philanthropists and governors, who devote their gifts, and, what is of more value, their time, for the benefit of other people's children; in certain circles resentment is still felt at bureaucratic interference, and sometimes the resentment may be well grounded. But a finer sense of responsibility dissipates such fears; both parties to the transaction pursue their duty in harmony when they accept their mutual relations and decline to rest their claims to power on a cash basis. In earlier days these questions were of little importance, for the nation had not realized either its duty or its power in education; now that the State, with local and central authorities, wields so potent an influence the problem of adjustment, which will concern us in Chapter XII, must not be ignored—unless, indeed we follow the collectivist principle and believe that the steam-roller of uniformity should ride roughshod over the sympathies and energies of private initiative. I, for one, believe not merely that such initiative should be tolerated, but that men of all political parties, as well as State officials, should openly welcome the alliance of all who are ready to help the cause of education from their private purse (be the gifts great or small), as well as through the compulsions of rates and taxes. I am here only putting from the financial standpoint the general position arising from Chapter VI and carried to a conclusion in Chapter XII.

For wherever people are really in earnest they are ready to support a cause with money. Under this item of subscriptions we have, so far, thought only of annual contributions to support the main work of a school. Everyone knows, however, what large sums of money are collected, in almost every type of school, to supplement the regular budget: playing-fields, games, clubs, libraries, scouting, are examples. These efforts demonstrate the main thesis of this chapter, viz. that the financial aspect of education, from the operations of the Treasury at Whitehall to the trifling expenditures of a school club, is only an indication, a symbol, of energy and of ideal: when it assumes the rôle of master and dictator we have no longer a system of education but a knowledge shop.

School Fees.—This underlying principle receives even more emphasis when we turn to the next item on the revenue side of a school budget. A fee is not the price or purchase-money for an article of exchange: the help rendered in schooling, like the advice tendered in medicine or law, is priceless; in the private practice of these callings the payments received by the practitioner must average out so as to cover all the items of his expenditure. This average, or nominal, fee is liable to be confused with price, i.e. with the exchange value of merchandise, and leads people to suppose that a market can be established in education. A just scale of fees, in any form of private practice, is the estimate, based on custom, of what the practitioner needs, divided by the number of individuals to whom he renders service.

When organization has gone so far as to enable the service to be rendered socially the relation between giver and receiver takes on another complexion. For the service rendered is no longer an individual affair; while the immediate benefit is received by the single scholar,

the single patient, the transaction is undertaken by the community, because the whole community is the better for the professional aid rendered by professional men. The community, therefore, has to ensure the adequate maintenance of all professions where the service is recognized as social and comprehensive. A fee may still be imposed if it be thought necessary to emphasize the individual aspect of the benefit, but its amount is calculated on a new basis: the practitioner is now 'appointed,' instead of being 'called in' to serve an individual client. The fee may be abolished entirely without any loss of self-respect either by receiver or giver, since both parties are members of a community organized for social and spiritual ends, in which financial arrangements only appear as a subordinate factor.

This common-sense view of the relation of fees to education service has no novelty about it; it has been recognized ever since a civilized world made use of tutors and schools. Our grandfathers engaged in lively controversies about free education, and wasted much time in arguing whether 9*d*. a week or less should be permitted as a fee in voluntary schools; it was feared that parental responsibility would be undermined if children were received in a day-school 'for nothing,' although the same parents and children were welcomed to the house of God whether or no they contributed to the collection.

When, therefore, any 'service' is socialized, i.e. when it is rendered through the agency of a company, a civic or national regime, the principle of maintenance through fees tends to be replaced by what is virtually a pooling of resources; a levy (either compulsory or voluntary) is imposed on all those whose private means enable them to support the common effort, whether or no they take advantage of the benefit for their own family. When compulsion is exercised we rely mainly on rates and taxes,

and the maintenance of education falls under the same general view of politics which guides opinion in other departments of social activity. Thus sharp conflicts come to light, novel views are presented, and the problem of school fees is solved in any given case under the influence of political opinions of a wider range. It is now recognized by all political parties that public education is a necessary 'service,' like sanitation or water-supply, and should, therefore, be provided by public authority; but it does not follow that those who receive the benefit[1] should receive it under cost price: many municipal tramways, for example, are run at a profit. A citizen may, for example, advocate the establishment of municipal schools and yet hope that fees will render them self-supporting. Another may hold that, while the higher grades of education should be maintained by fees, the lower grades should be free, since the law requires every family to send its children to school up to a minimum age of exemption. But the mere fact of compulsion does not of itself involve exemption from payment. We are compelled to take municipal water, but we have to pay for it in accordance with the presumed use which the household makes of the provision. Education is 'freed' at the lower grades not only because it is compulsory, but because considerations of cost are more and more regarded as subordinate to other features in the supply of this 'commodity,' which distinguish it from water and transport. And the higher grades may also be set free from fees, if one believes that the resources of the public should be pooled for this purpose with the same reliance on corporate effort as is shown in the public provision of libraries and museums. In many parts of Canada and the United States the entire system of

[1] Lawrence Gomme, *Principles of Local Government*, pp. 156–60, elucidates the whole problem.

public education is offered without fee by communities which would repudiate adherence to socialistic theories of government. Amid all these diversities of view the administrator has to keep one principle steadily in mind :—whatever arrangements are made about finance, these must not lower the quality of the education. You can readily test the value of good water, but it is not so easy to measure the quality of education ; while the money value of a school cannot be accepted as proof of its worth, the public are very liable to welcome the abolition or the lowering of fees without examining the budget.

Rates and Taxes.—The foregoing discussion shows how important a part is now played by the State in the control of education through finance. The central authority in England, which was content in 1833 to spend £20,000 on education, expended £24,000,000 in 1924, and local authorities duplicate this amount. Many are disposed to prophesy that the effect of this ' interference ' with private and voluntary enterprise will tend to extinguish the rôle of the latter ; but the wise administrator avoids vague speculation as to the distant future ; he aims at using the power of the public purse as a lever to raise the standard of non-state enterprises without endangering zeal and initiative. By the device of Grants-in-aid schools and universities receive money to eke out their revenue from endowments and fees ; in return they accept such regulations as public authority thinks fit to impose. If wisely administered such relations maintain " the freedom, variety and elasticity " (p. 118) which English teachers hold so dear, and lighten the burden of rates and taxes by enabling these corporations to keep their heads above water. Unless some principle of this kind is adopted a competition is witnessed between State and non-State operations which is inimical to the common good (pp. 98 to 108). We have seen how this rivalry, accommodated

in the sphere of primary education, is to-day more acutely felt in the case of endowed secondary schools. Many of these find it difficult to balance their budget and have to apply for aid to a local authority which owns schools of a similar type. If the L.E.A. refuses aid they can extinguish what they regard as a rival, or take over the ownership, and can then administer all their secondary schools on a uniform scheme, enhancing, as it is supposed, the prestige of civic rule. Ratepayers and councillors are prone to take this attitude. Why, they say, should we be burdened with the cost of schools attended by the wealthy *bourgeois* ? It is all too easy in these days for the steam-roller of municipal power to starve out a competitor, in the same spirit that a combine may ruin the independent trader. A wider ideal of citizenship (p. 100 above) would lead city authorities to decline any such competition, preferring to regard themselves as the friends and promoters of all educational endeavour found within the city walls.[1]

[1] Mr. Frank Roscoe, the distinguished secretary of the Teachers' Registration Council, has suggested a radical reform in the system of Grants-in-aid by which all types of non-State schools (including the non-provided primary schools ?) could be sustained side by side with State schools. He points out that the Exchequer already acknowledges the existence of children (when the parents pay income-tax) by making a slight remission of income-tax on each child ; he would apply this principle on a much more extensive scale by allotting a grant-in-aid to every parent for every child on the register of an approved school or college, up to the age of twenty-two, the grant increasing as the age of the pupil advanced. Every school, public and private, would then charge fees calculated to meet all its expenditure ; if this fee exceeded the grant-in-aid the parent would provide the excess from his own pocket (vide *Education*, June 10, 1921). This proposal is certainly ingenious, especially in its suggestion that it would provide " free education for all " ; but its author does not expect such a startling innovation to be speedily adopted. He launches it in order to " provoke thought," and I refer to it with the same intent, for it affects all the issues which are discussed in this chapter. It offers points of comparison with panel and private practice in medicine.

Finance takes a hand also in another sphere of competition, between the central and the local organs of government; at the present time there is much uneasiness in the relations between Whitehall and the L.E. Authorities,[1] for, while money continues to be scarce, the more progressive authorities are trying to keep pace with the advance in public demands. The Great War was an appalling disaster for mankind, but, as a slight compensation, it aroused, in England as elsewhere in Europe, a new attitude towards education, and the State is being compelled to shoulder a heavier financial burden, far heavier than in pre-war days; it is calculated that the Treasury now pays out more than three times as much as was thought necessary before 1914. As the war came to a close the country was busy with plans for Reconstruction, and welcomed the Act of 1918 as a pledge that the rising generation would secure an adequate and comprehensive education. Local authorities were bidden by this Act, and by the consequential Act of 1921, to submit schemes for the conduct and develop-

[1] See p. 103 above. "Now it is obvious to all concerned with the administration of local government that probably very little disagreement would ever arise between the local and central authorities . . . if it were not for the matter of finance. The acid test is—who is going to pay? And it is equally obvious that the body which retains possession of the purse-strings is, in effect, the real authority, so that the extent to which the duties laid upon any local authority by Parliament are carried out depends upon the financial help or hindrance of the central authority. This is particularly the case with education, which is bound to be a relatively expensive service." (From a paper by Sir B. Gott at a Conference of the Institute of Public Administration, 1924.) "That was not a position which the local authorities could be expected to tolerate. They resented a central authority policy, which deprived them of their statutory powers to develop their educational system, and which at the same time deprived the Board of Education of their full power to assist and encourage such development." (From a paper by Mr. Spurley Hey at the Conference of the National Union of Teachers, Easter 1923.)

ment of education. When once these schemes, or any portion of them, were approved by Government it became the duty of the L.E.A. to carry them out and the duty of the Treasury, through the Board of Education, to provide grants-in-aid which are now usually determined on a percentage basis.[1]

But it is one thing to prepare an expansive (and expensive) scheme ; it is another matter to find the money. Already by 1921 the Government had become alarmed ; quite apart from any additions to educational liabilities, the cost of maintaining the system, without any expansion, seemed formidable enough : salaries and wages of all descriptions had to be increased and the cost of upkeep and renewals was equally embarrassing. The Reconstruction era was followed by the 'Geddes Axe,' for the central Government appreciated, more quickly than local authorities, the gravity of the crisis in national expenditure. City and county authorities, more in touch with local sentiment, knew that the public mind was still zealous to improve the state of education, and, after being invited by Parliament to embark on schemes, they were loth to abandon them at the dictate of the Exchequer ; they were not prepared to add to the burdens of the ratepayer in order to relieve the national Budget. A piquant situation thereupon arose, which

[1] I must not pause to describe the steps by which the earlier method of *per capita* grants is being replaced by the percentage system. The story is well worth the attention of teachers as well as laymen who have taken an interest in public affairs, for it shows how greatly the fortunes of the schools are affected by sound principles of finance. Mr. Sidney Webb (*Grants-in-Aid*, 1910) gave a clear exposition of principles many years ago, and the various papers published by officials of Local Education Committees in 1923 bring the discussion up to date. The rough-and-ready rule of 50–50, i.e. 50 per cent. of the net cost to the ratepayer, to be equalled by a second 50 per cent. from the taxpayer, is now accepted as a general guide to policy, although, of course, it is subject to many variations.

was partially relieved in 1924 by the promise of the Government that "the engine is to be reversed." The controversy, at bottom, is not one of finance but of power and control; city and county authorities, relying on the ancient prescriptive rights of locality (p. 103), claim to be the best judge of local needs and of local aspirations, but they submit their 'Schemes' to the national authority, since education is a national interest as well as a local interest. When once these schemes are approved in general terms, in accordance with the law of the land, the L.E.A. is not willing for the plan to be tampered with at the instance of the Treasury, even though the cost outruns the expectations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. All they will concede is the right of the central Government to inspect and supervise in the interests both of economy and of efficiency. One cannot wonder that the Geddes Report, faced with this resolute attitude in the localities, advised that the 50–50 principle should be abandoned, for the Geddes Committee were commissioned to find methods of reducing expenditure. But, whether expenditure on education (and, for that matter, on other local services) be increased or diminished, it is not likely that the distinctive features of English local government will be abandoned in favour of principles of administration such as find favour on the continent of Europe (pp. 102–8 above).

Expenditure: (*a*) *Salaries.*—We now turn to the expenditure side of a school budget. There was a period, not so long past, when teachers were partly paid on commission, the salary varying with the number of scholars in attendance; it was supposed that such an incentive would stimulate the industry of the teacher, and it was, therefore, applied in many types of school, both primary and secondary. Adam Smith (p. 115) regarded this as the sole incentive, and therefore favoured

the ' private ' teacher or coach whose emolument depends entirely upon fees. When a teacher is paid by fixed salary education is conducted on what we must call socialistic principles; the incentive to industry and efficiency must be sought from other motives than the immediate prospect of gain. This is the problem that underlies all the efforts of the Burnham Committee. Their conclusions show that public opinion now relies largely upon higher incentives, on professional pride, on intellectual and moral interests, to secure good work from teachers (compare p. 13 above) ; but they realize also that reasonable prospects of advancement must be offered, since teachers on the whole are average people who look for material recompense. The Committee have adopted two principles: first, they apply an incentive to the teacher before he takes up an appointment. If he becomes a graduate he is paid on a higher scale; if he graduates with first-class honours he receives still more ; if he possesses a professional diploma a further increment is allowed. Secondly, they reward him for experience ; every year of service adds both to his immediate income and to the amount of prospective pension. These two forms of incentive need to be sharply distinguished, for each of them may involve injury as well as benefit. The custom of rewarding teachers for their diligence, both at college and later, has been long established and undoubtedly it acts as an incentive, especially to those who find themselves handicapped after entering on their career. I doubt, however, whether the time has not come to drop this custom, especially as the incentive sometimes operates in the opposite direction to that which is designed. When education authorities are hard put to it to meet their liabilities they are not prepared to incur the higher cost of a first-class man, any more than a patient is prepared to pay higher fees to a physician merely on

the ground of his first-class diplomas ; hence, in the keen competition for employment now prevailing, it is sometimes a positive disadvantage to an applicant to have had a distinguished career at his University ! This incentive dates from a time when it was hard to convince aspirants to the office of teacher that study was necessary ; and hence the authorities, first the central authorities and then the local authorities, adopted a policy which they are unwilling to drop, just as they retained the plan of payments by attendance and by results for many years after the incentives had ceased to be effective. In other departments of public service a sounder principle is in force ; every post in the service is offered only to applicants who show a minimum of relevant qualifications ; thereupon a fixed emolument, rising by annual increments, is attached to the post, without regard to any additional qualifications that applicants may possess. These additions are of value to the applicant on their proper ground : they give him a better chance of success ; but they are out of place if used as pawns in a wage competition. I gather that practical difficulties prevent education authorities from scaling the various posts in schools in accordance with the duties involved, and hence the Burnham Committee has been compelled to retain an incentive which in my opinion operates injuriously. The second incentive, providing increments of salary with increase of years spent in service, is sound, and the only criticism that can be made against it is in the mode of application. Employers who accept the rules of the Burnham Committee bind themselves to pay the increment for everyone whom they take into their employ ; thus, the elderly teacher tends to be rejected and kept out of employment if for any reason he finds himself thrown on the market. No one wishes to see teachers, or the members of any profession, continually

on the move[1]; but there is no need of a special incentive to keep them at their posts; on the other hand, no self-respecting employer likes to find himself compelled to hold a whip over his staff to keep them in their places. The remedy seems clear: let the principle of increase of salary following length of experience be maintained, but treat it as a charge upon the national exchequer, adjusted on the same lines as the pension scheme, for in reality it belongs to the same region of finance. The minimum salary attached to every post should be fixed, each type of post receiving its proper emolument, regardless of the age of the applicant; he should receive an increment calculated on his years of experience, but this should come from a pool, maintained by the national authority, extending over the whole area in which the teaching body circulates. It may be replied that no pool of this kind is found in other branches of public service, but I presume that there is no other service in which the operations of a scale work to the disadvantage of experienced employees. I make no pretension to expert acquaintance with finance, but set down these suggestions because criticism ought to be positive as well as depreciatory. Both employers and employed are grateful for the labours of Lord Burnham's Committee; a scale of some kind was urgently needed, both to guide Education Committees and to provide an adequate livelihood for teachers.

(*b*) *Medical Service in Schools.*[2]—School medical officers

[1] A certain amount of migration is, however, needed, especially in the early, journeyman, years; the operation of the Burnham rules seems to penalize the teacher who wants to enlarge his experience by leaving his L.E.A. area.

[2] The Annual Report of the chief medical officer of the Board of Education deserves to be more widely known, especially the recent survey entitled, *The Health of the School Child.*

do not need a Burnham Committee to inquire into their remuneration, for their own associations are strong enough to protect their interests. No one to-day questions the value of this service ; since the main ground on which it is engaged is to protect public health, the cost should not be charged to the education budget, but regarded as part of the civic expenditure incurred in sanitation. Administratively it is often conducted as a separate department, in the charge of School Medical Officers distinct from other M.O.s, and this plan may be justified because the children are collected together in buildings where examination, and to some extent treatment, can be effectively managed. Furthermore, it is obvious that Preventive Medicine shows at its best when the young are taken in hand instead of letting them wait till they have come to years. At present school medical service chiefly surveys children and teachers in schools owned or aided by the State ; if, however, the arguments of this book be accepted the same benefits should be granted to the children of the nation as a whole. Whatever pleas are advanced for or against the presence of a medical officer in one school apply equally to all.

Only in one respect can school medical service be regarded as educational in the usual sense of the word : when the physician, or a Health Department, undertakes instruction in hygiene and allied subjects. Since he knows about health and disease, the doctor seeks to prevent the latter by using the school as a means of propaganda, and takes a definite rank among the non-professional teachers described in Chapter VIII. Expenditure under this head, although usually thrown in with medical service proper, is a distinct affair, and should be kept separate in education budgets.

(*c*) *Clerical Work in Schools.*—No association can conduct its affairs without 'red-tape,' but complaints

continue to be made that many teachers and all inspectors are compelled to spend an excessive amount of time in office work. Ever since the State accepted its responsibilities for education this outcry has been made, but it was for a long time disregarded, for in the era through which we have passed the building of a system has involved all concerned in the elaboration of rules, with constant attention to reports, statistics and the amendment of these. As a result, the man to whom organization is congenial replaces the teacher in the public eye; the real work of education is left to take its chance. The remedy, if it ever comes, will not be found in depreciating the need for administration and for the due discharge of clerical tasks; but it will be allowed for, and every effort will be made to release the teacher from an undue share. The public, who are becoming more alive to the real aims of education, would be astonished if they realized how large a portion of a teacher's time and energy is evaporated apart from actual intercourse with his pupils. Business men know the advantage of using clerks, type-writers and ledgers so as to keep their minds free from an excess of desk work, and they should realize that children need the inspiration of teachers who are able to concentrate on their proper business. Principals of schools, above all, need relief; it is a sound tradition to regard a head teacher as specially valuable as the teacher and friend of the older scholars, through whom the entire society preserves a wholesome tone and discipline: as things now stand he has usually to serve as chief clerk and supervisor, thankful if he can spare a few moments in the school-day for the work to which he is called. I note this point in a chapter on finance, for it depends on the public and the educational authorities to sanction the comparatively small expenditure that would relieve the situation. For many years past the National Union of Teachers has

successfully fought against the imposition of "extraneous duties" in non-provided schools; they have a harder task in converting the public to a belief that teachers are making the best return for expenditure when they are permitted to do the work they love.

(*d*) *Scholarships:—Payments to Scholars.*—I pass over various items in the school budget, apparatus, upkeep of property and the like which may be grouped together as overhead charges.

The last two items in our account need some further notice. The British scholarship system is unique; in other countries such aids to learning play a small part, but in England it has almost become the pivot round which higher education centres. The explanation is not far to seek and can be traced to distinctive features in English life. We are democratic, and, like France and America, we preach *la carrière ouverte aux talents*; every child, however poor, must have an 'opportunity.' But while in other countries this aim is sought by diminishing or cancelling revenue from fees, we prefer to balance the account by making payments to talented pupils whom we denominate scholars. Our motives in so doing are mixed; while we are glad to foster talent we have been equally solicitous to 'eliminate the unfit' and reserve the benefit of extended schooling to those who are likely to "profit thereby."[1] We have until recently shown scant sympathy with doctrines which emphasize the rights of all children; our tradition has been to coerce them, irrespective of capacity, to attend a primary school because a minimum standard of culture is necessary; but to exclude them from the higher grades unless they can either pass through the sieve of a scholarship test, or can be taught without being a charge on public funds. The philosophy of the educational ladder stands

[1] Preamble to Act of 1918.

on all fours with that of the 'Manchester School' in economics: compete for what you secure, mount to a higher class, both in factory and college, by getting ahead of your fellows. The development of our printed-paper examinations (p. 214) worked in with the democratic demand for a ladder at a period when the whole trend of English thought was governed by a philosophy of which Adam Smith was the spiritual father. Furthermore, while our methods of paying a child for attendance at places of higher education fostered a sense of pride in his own intellect, it kept alive a sense of humility towards the donor. The distributor of scholarships, whether he be a wealthy individual or a corporation, maintains 'the superiority complex' of magnanimity, whereas if he contributes the same amount through taxation in order to make education free he appears as a mean man from whom wealth has to be extorted. Thus the proletariat view of politics regards scholarships and other forms of endowment as a cheap form of 'ransom' by which the wealthy throw dust in the eyes of 'the people' and escape the impositions which heavy taxes for education would lay upon them. It would be grotesque to suggest that such motives, even in the nineteenth century, were at work in the minds of many founders and benefactors; on the contrary, the great bulk of contributions to scholarship funds, as to missions and hospitals, springs from altruistic sentiments; but the development of class-consciousness based on the antagonisms of wealth and poverty is a political and social fact which cannot be ignored.

Payments to scholars are designed to serve two purposes: in the first place they balance, more or less, the requirements of income from fees. The school receives (either from endowments or from state aid) an income which has to be partly dispensed in scholar-

ships; this is paid out on the expenditure side of the account to the scholars, who in turn pay it back to increase the income from fees. Now a school or college treasurer does not always find that these transactions benefit his budget. With every new scholar admitted on the establishment he must budget for allowance for a possible increase in some or all the items on the expenditure side. At the moment he may not feel the pressure, but it is bound to come. Sometimes the embarrassment extends further, for if the access of such scholars involves him in new capital expenditure in land and buildings his loss in revenue becomes still more formidable. Such considerations account in part for the reluctance of secondary schools to acquiesce in the increase of 'free-place' scholarships, even when the demand is accompanied by an additional grant-in-aid. At the present moment many local authorities are voting annual subscriptions to modern universities, but in some cases they couple the grant with a demand that so many students residing in the area shall be admitted without fee. Now, if the university, with its existing 'plant,' can accommodate the newcomers, the grant is a financial benefit and will promote efficiency; but, if not, it is only a disguised form of securing university teaching for the children of ratepayers below cost price and should not be described as a generous grant-in-aid.

The second purpose which a scholarship may serve is to provide the scholar with maintenance. Here, again, Great Britain stands in sharp contrast with other countries. In America dollars are easy to come by, and social conventions respect manual labour; hence many thousands of boys and girls work their way through high school and college when their parents cannot provide them with the necessities of life. This expedient has only one drawback: the student cannot take full advan-

tage of the opportunities afforded if he has to spend much time and energy, both in vacation and during term, on earning a living; he is pretty much in the position of a British working man who seeks to emulate the efforts of a university student by attending W.E.A. classes in leisure hours. The plan also reacts unfavourably on standards of teaching and examination, for instructors are insensibly led to accept a lower grade of proficiency when pupils are thus handicapped. But the moral benefit in grit of character and the social solidarity attained by this alliance between labour and learning are well worth the risk. After all, there is great loss of power in our European places of learning, not only in sports but in many forms of that 'conspicuous waste' which Veblen[1] has so trenchantly denounced. No one desires to see youth deprived of the buoyancy and exhilaration of the play-time of life; the other extreme imposed on the working classes by excessive toil incites to rebellion, which takes ugly forms in the degradation of taste and conscience. Compromise is surely the right course to follow. I would gladly see all forms of scholarship assistance, and indeed all modes of admission to higher places of learning, coupled with the requirement that the scholar should spend a small part of his time in useful toil; and I would not exempt the youth of any class in society from this moral obligation. This may be regarded as an extreme, or even as a fantastic, view of the relations between Labour and Learning, but the reader will recollect that some of the wisest teachers of mankind, including the Founder of the Christian religion and His chief apostle, worked for their livelihood.

Meanwhile, we are not likely in Great Britain to cavil at the demand for maintaining a poor scholar, if we

[1] *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, and other later books.

accept the principle of the education ladder. It is a caricature of this doctrine to offer higher education to the children of a working man when he needs their scanty earnings to supplement a living wage. So long as industry throughout the world relies upon the labour of children and youth, so long will it be necessary to couple the offer of educational opportunity with economic provision. There are, of course, alternatives to our system; thus, the principle of a supplementary wage given in accordance with the size of the family, now common in many parts of the Continent, and proposed for Australia, affords relief also to education; but we must not digress into industrial politics.

Surplus or Deficit.—A final word is needed with regard to the balance of a school budget. Schools in private hands or controlled by shareholders on a limited liability basis (p. 115) must sooner or later show a profit. For the capital is expended with that view, and its owners regard the outlay as investment. In the case of a private proprietor salary and profits intermingle; but here, as well as in proprietary schools, loss on annual revenue must be avoided, unless the enterprise is assisted from extraneous sources. It by no means follows that such schools provide a profitable line from a business or investment point of view. Some undoubtedly do, otherwise scholastic agents who deal with this class of property would not flourish. A successful preparatory school, or a large 'house' attached to a public school, represents a large income. But outside this circle investment is hazardous; large sums are sunk every year in efforts at educational reform as well as by teachers who risk their money for the sake of independence. It was prophesied that the intervention of the State in education would put an end to private schools, by a competition as effective as is witnessed in the supply of other municipal services;

but this has not happened. So long as parents are found with surplus wealth to spend upon their children, some of them will support 'independent' schools, and it is all to the good that they should possess this freedom.

The public school here stands in sharp contrast to private enterprise; the former *cannot* show a profit, while the latter *must* do so. This position accounts not only for the replacement of proprietary schools by 'trust' schools (p. 116), but for the condition attached to all grants-in-aid awarded to non-State schools, viz. their annual accounts must show a deficit. If the receipts, either from fees, subscriptions or endowments, can meet the expenditure, a grant-in-aid is superfluous, and the State is justified in discriminating between the wealthy and the poor. This rule certainly falls hardly on non-State schools which relied with confidence upon subscriptions and endowments before the era of grants-in-aid: donors ask themselves why they should support an enterprise which will be maintained from the taxes if they shut their purse. Even Oxford and Cambridge have now accepted government money, along with a measure of supervision, and there is apprehension that appeals to private benefactors will henceforth be in vain. But the canvasser need not lose heart; so long as such contributions do not operate to diminish the scale of current expenditure non-State schools and colleges can accept benefactions without stint; most of the gifts which now accrue are designed for special purposes (see p. 177 above), which involve large annual outlay; and in this way they help to create the deficit which entitles the Governing Body to apply for state support (p. 183). The state authorities, of course, claim in return the right to supervise the accounts; otherwise a school might plunge into extravagance, and then look to

the State to come to the rescue when appeals to private benevolence fail.

On the other hand, the principle of deficit on current revenue is sound, for education seeks its returns in the future, while business expects a dividend in the present. When a man of wealth turns down an appeal for help to education (or, for that matter, help to hospitals and other modes of social service) he can find an excellent excuse for refusal by pointing to the intervention of the State in these services ; avarice could always justify itself. If many such appeals fall flat in these days it is because they do *not* appeal ; they do not reach the core of men's convictions and faith. People who believe in this or that form of education make sacrifice for it and render an account of their stewardship of wealth by " putting money in the plate " ; knowledge must precede action. Any doubt on this point is set at rest by examining the lists of founders and benefactors in the whole range of education, from non-provided schools to universities ; the great bulk of names are either those of actual teachers or of persons of more or less means who have given time and thought to the administration of education. Instead, therefore, of conducting at rare intervals a sensational ' campaign ' to reap a harvest, by shock tactics, from those who know little and care less for the aims of education, our places of education, both State and non-State, should regard themselves as perpetual beggars making a plea at all times for the extension of their activities. By explaining in full the nature of their operations they give an opportunity for those who have either large or small amounts to discharge their stewardship with intelligence.

We are thus carried back from the economics of education to those spiritual and moral principles on which the system rests. Right it is to watch the accounts and to

seek adequate provision for material equipment, and yet these are but means to loftier ends. I refuse to subject the principles on which the support of education rests to the dictates of any political or economic theory, because I believe that every source of support and every motive to sacrifice should be requisitioned on behalf of places of education.

CHAPTER X

THE OVERSIGHT OF SCHOOLING

THE above chapters have embraced many problems comprised in the general field of superintendence; I use the term 'oversight,' therefore, to include all that remains when schools and colleges have been set on foot, teachers appointed and material resources secured. What else have external authorities to do? We may group all the rest under three heads, following the career of a scholar through his school, and from one school to another: (1) he enters the school under regulations, (2) he pursues a course of education which is more or less prescribed, and (3) he makes his exit under conditions which are of interest to the outside world. Admission Progress, Discharge: I shall not attempt to cover all the topics which are raised by education codes and laws under these heads, but pick out a few points which illustrate the working of principles.

Attendance.—The first duty of the State is to see that scholars come to school and to bring them back if they play truant. Formerly the task of the Attendance Officer was heavy, but it has been greatly relieved, in all but the poorest districts and in rural areas, by radical reforms both in the attitude of teachers and in their methods. The Rota Committee before which recalcitrant parents are haled, as a preliminary to coercion by magistrates, plays a decreasing part in superintendence. It is sometimes held that the substitution of percentage grants for attendance grants (p. 186 above) has tempted authorities to be too lenient in discharging an unpleasant duty; but

the charge is unfounded; other forms of incentive are devised which are equally effective. In any case, the machinery for exercising compulsion is not likely to be dropped; even now there are some authorities that wink at laxity in rural districts, and the desire to secure children's services is not confined to the farmers or to the factory districts of Northern England. I have come across private schools whose chief merit in the eyes of their clients is that the pupils are allowed to stop away (when once the fee in advance is paid) at the parent's discretion. There seems no reason why the services of Attendance Officers should be limited to State-aided schools: the obligation should be universal, and no child in good health should escape.[1] Our national fear of officialism has so far led statesmen to shrink from the thorough-going routine to which other nations are subjected, but in affairs of routine thoroughness is everything, for the laggards escape when half-measures are adopted.

The frequency with which families change their habitat increases the difficulty of supervising attendance, and this is made still more difficult by the shortage of houses. Not a few children have on this account to flit from school to school, with long pauses between whiles. The status of the children of van-dwellers and canal-boat folk is still more anomalous; some of those have a bowing acquaintance with two or more schools, putting in an appearance on any day when trade brings them within reach. The Board of Education gives itself some trouble over their supervision, but in this case requirements for attendance count for little, even if they are obeyed; no local authority can deal with wanderers from one area to another. One would not desire to institutionalize such care-free children by shutting them up in residential schools, but one thinks

[1] For fear of misunderstanding compare p. 111, rights of parents when acting as teachers.

that the ingenuity of Whitehall might devise some plan by which they could be regarded as 'children of the State' rather than children of an area, and thus come under a supervision analogous to that exercised by the Home Office in the case of industrial schools (see p. 143 above); registration of attendance and progress is a national rather than a local concern.

Rules of Conduct.—We have seen in another connection (p. 137) how large a part is played by compulsion in the delimitation of schools: it affects also the leisure time of children, and their behaviour when away from the school premises. The secondary school can impose rules on all sorts of topics, e.g. the school colours are usually a matter of obligation; home lessons are often a troublesome problem; detention beyond the prescribed hours of attendance can be enforced; parents can be required to enter their children for public examinations. Prudent teachers are careful not to draft rules which Governors may not endorse if appealed to; and they will take pains, in due course, to secure the good-will of parents (p. 237); for the sanction of the community is implied in all arrangements for conducting the social life of a school community, although teachers are justified in claiming a large measure of professional independence. The character and scope of such rules are taken from the aims of education: conventional morality (p. 52) demands that children shall fall into line, and the teacher helps his young folk to accept a minimum of social discipline. The point I wish to make clear is that these matters of behaviour and of internal management, which arise in every type of school and college, are, in the long run, matters of public concern, and, therefore, come within the ambit of oversight. They are a part of the Practice of Education, and fall for further consideration in the next volume.

Health.—The same division of interest, between teacher and public, is seen in attention to health: the nation is now more alive than formerly to the importance of physique as a factor in development, and therefore includes the care of the body among the constituent values (p. 46). Since the average teacher, trained or untrained, cannot be expected to know more about hygiene than a nurse or a careful parent, the health expert is called in.[1] The factory was the first community to be brought under medical supervision; the school followed suit so soon as administrators realized the benefit that could be gained by getting at the foundations of health before children are grown to years. The effectiveness of the doctor's advice is not to be measured solely by the willingness of the public to pay for it, or by the stringency of the regulations drawn up by authority; he may stress the importance of ventilation in primary schools and the risk of nervous fatigue from home lessons in secondary schools, but his success depends upon the development of a health conscience, both among teachers and parents. The advance is notable, as the reports of School Medical Officers bear witness: rules governing conduct and curricula may be questioned, for it is hard to relate cause and effect, but statistics which prove the diminution of disease are convincing.

Progress in Attainments.—If the psychologist were as sure of his ground as the physiologist, science would exert much more influence in dealing with curricula than it does at present; but the lack of exact science does not imply a dispensation from responsibility for oversight; empirical rules, therefore, have to be adopted governing the pupil's attainments at admission, during progress and on discharge.

Conditions for admission to a higher stage are con-

[1] Various references to medicine in earlier chapters. See Index.

sequent on those imposed for discharge from a lower stage ; in all stages except the lowest, where the infant or child begins his course of education. The university requires the student to matriculate before entering on a degree course ; the secondary school often complains that primary and preparatory teachers send up their scholars inadequately prepared to undertake the new curriculum ; and the teachers in the standards transfer the protest to the infant school.[1] And the public outside, merchants, manufacturers, professional men, make their voice heard—not without right—if the school has done little to relate the attainments of its pupils to the requirements of a vocation.

Thus a constant pressure is exercised from above downwards and a large part of the control exercised by supervising authorities is directed to reconciling the differences that arise. They lay down minimum standards which the average scholar should attain on exit from this or that stage and draw up regulations for the management of tests or examinations which certify that each individual scholar has qualified for exit from a lower and admission to a higher course. The issues here raised provide a standing quarrel between the teaching profession and all the other parties concerned in the achievements of a school, for many insist that the teacher alone can estimate the quality of a scholar's work and that the body of teachers alone possess the expert competence to regulate examinations.[2] The administrator, on the other hand, refuses liberty to the teacher (except in the university grade) to " brand his own herrings." It is of capital importance that compromise should be sought, for the

[1] *Suggestions*, etc., loc. cit., p. 17.

[2] Examination papers are, of course, corrected by teachers or ex-teachers, and they have large powers in advice; but they have little to say as regards their own pupils.

issue involves not merely contest for power in the conduct of examinations; it raises the further question, whether any system of inspection and examination is not fraught with dangers which cannot be avoided, whoever control the procedure. The first criticism is that children and teachers may be subjected to a perpetual inquisition; inspectors and examiners tend to multiply; zealous of good works, they incite both teachers and children to be always on the *qui vive* to show results: if of a confident and masterful temperament, they rejoice in their power to 'make' teachers accept their enlightened views on progress. I am not exaggerating; wherever an active system of supervision is organized the frailties of human nature tend to run it to excess; in England the Central Authority has on the whole repented of its former vices; in the Elementary Branch it has for twenty years past been content to issue *Suggestions*,[1] which are definitely put out as "a challenge to independent thought," and by no means "designed to impose any regulations supplementary to those contained in the Code." But it has not yet succeeded in convincing all its servants that restraint in the use of power is the first condition for success in educational supervision. I am combining inspection and examination in one review, the main difference in their effect being that the inspector wields his influence as a personal force, whereas the examiner is impersonal. One cardinal principle, however, applies to both, a general principle in all branches of government:—since the nurture of the human spirit (p. 39) depends in part on the exercise of freedom, authority should always seek to reduce its inquisition to the minimum consistent with public safety. And, as a corollary, you can reduce this oversight step by step as you find that the subjects of inspection advance in

[1] Loc. cit., p. 2.

capacity and character, until they are fitted to discharge their task from motives of self-respect, without requiring the incentive of an inquisition. For example, you employ factory inspectors to abate the smoke nuisance and to protect women and children from excessive hours of labour, because you cannot trust *some* employers to refrain from seeking unlawful gain; teachers have been put under the supervision of principals and inspectors because *some* teachers have failed in duty. If, however, you can succeed in raising the professional standard, so that fear is replaced by higher sentiments, you have revolutionized the life of school. Wise rulers of education, therefore, have always stressed the value of professional training and professional organization, for they know that the more they can rely upon the skill and conscience of the teacher the less need for outside authority to interpose. Professor Adams[1] has shown what dangers we incur if education becomes increasingly manipulated by 'mechanical engineers' who supply the intelligence and outlook which is sought at present in the rank and file of teachers.

These principles are already in operation as regards many examinations. The minimum demand is for a test to be imposed at the close of a course of education, *and at no other time.* The authority indicates a standard of age and attainment for admission; it prescribes in general outline a code of progressive studies and approves a time-table: at that point it holds its hand, or should do so, until the scholar is about to be discharged. What happens in the interval should be left to the initiative of principal and staff since their methods and their diligence are sufficiently tested by the evidence of a Leaving Examination.

I am well aware that on this last point authorities in

[1] *Evolution of Educational Theory*, chap. xii.

this country at present hold the contrary opinion; it is perhaps presumptuous in me to pit my conclusions against those of civil servants of long experience; but onlookers are sometimes the best judges of a game, and I have now for many years looked on at this game, after having for many previous years taken an active part, sometimes as teacher, sometimes as a supervising agent. Let me at least give reasons for my judgment. Looking back, one sees that vigilant inquiry at short intervals was necessary in the days when the other modes of supervision and advice such as we have noticed above were unknown.[1] In the secondary schools, e.g., success in 'Locals' and in scholarship competitions was the only means by which the public could judge of the quality of a school; but good teachers have never held that such achievement is of itself a warrant of efficiency. Nowadays, when so many other ways are employed by authorities, and by the teaching profession itself, to maintain adequate standards, it ought to be unnecessary to keep teachers in leading-strings.

But, it is said, why should a teacher object to the visit of supervisors, if he and his colleagues are confident that their work will stand inspection? Why should he be afraid? Sometimes he is by no means afraid: men of a confident temperament will always welcome such visits and will hold their own; but many others are not of that disposition, and the fear of being misjudged inhibits their powers to an extent of which many inspectors have no conception. They believe that the inspector's power extends far beyond what it actually is; they think (and this is sometimes true) that his judgment may influence promotion, and they accept his advice, although professional men and women ought to be trained (as indeed the Board of Education agrees) to rely upon them-

[1] Graham Balfour, *Educational Systems*, p. 8.

selves. Teachers tell me again and again that the progress of a whole group of schools is hindered because the agents of an Authority, central or local, practically dictate methods which are notoriously out-of-date; the teachers are not courageous enough to insist upon their rights, and lose heart. It would be untrue to allege that many inspectors are of the masterful type, or that they assert their well-founded claim in scholarship and experience at the expense of those who ought to be regarded as colleagues; but the best of men are liable to partiality, and the uncertainty attaching to a personal view tends to vitiate a decision which, of necessity, is based upon a slender acquaintance with the victim. The retiring teacher, who makes no show in the class-room, and is dumb in the presence of strangers, distrusts the visitor and is liable to be condemned. If the sketch made in Chapters III and IV of the aims of education be accepted, how little can the best of supervisors discover of the moral and spiritual influence which the teacher, consciously or otherwise, may be wielding. This criticism is often admitted to have force, and hence the official ground for conducting the visitation is shifted. The inspector presents himself rather as a visitor, offering advice and putting at the disposal of the staff the fruits of experience which teachers who work only on one spot cannot so easily garner. From this point of view a strong case can be made out; I can offer my personal testimony to the value of such visits.[1] And yet, to be so received,

[1] I write here under a sense of gratitude to one of the greatest schoolmasters of a bygone generation, and, at the risk of appearing egotistic, may venture on reminiscence, to show how far we have travelled in forty years. As a young head master I felt the need for the kind of visitation here discussed, so we inquired of the University whose Local Examinations were taken by our boys whether they would send us a wise inspector. The Delegacy replied that they could send us plenty of examiners, but they had never been asked for inspection; the secretary did not know of

would he not be more effective if divested of power, offering his suggestions only with the weight attaching to his reputation and the good sense of his opinions? In these days the distribution of professional knowledge is secured otherwise. We have already noticed (p. 154) how increasingly active teachers' societies have been, for a half-century past, in the exchange of ideas, and now our Authorities emulate them: Conferences, Summer Schools, Supplementary Courses for teachers abound.

There is, however, another plea for sending the agents of an Authority into schools and colleges. They are sent to observe what is going on in order that they may gain the information adequate for the performance of their functions. Authorities have to gain a general acquaintance with school practices; how can they otherwise prepare statutes and regulations with confidence? And the Local Authority must have a more intimate acquaintance with the personnel, and with the methods by which its teachers pursue their aims, since it is responsible for many appointments; directors and secretaries cannot work in the dark. This is, of course, true, and all one would plead is that the ground for visitation should be made clear; the title 'inspector' smacks too much of the watchdog (I hazard a guess that it was originally chosen

anyone in Oxford who could undertake such a task. But I knew that Arthur Sidgwick, of Corpus, had lectured to Cambridge men *On Discipline* and *On Stimulus*, so I suggested that he be invited to attempt the new rôle. There were, of course, Oxford men employed in Government service as H.M.I.'s, but their range was limited to primary schools; another fifteen years elapsed before the reforms mentioned on p. 246 came about. This delightful inspection was not only of immediate service to the staff and to the Governing Body of that school; as an educational experiment it afforded a conception of the service that could be rendered to colleges and schools by the provision of oversight and counsel, through the agency of central authorities.

on the precedent of factory inspection). An officer of State who seeks information assumes a different character from a judge or assessor. It cannot, for example, be maintained that the visit of five or more officials to every secondary school at intervals of a few years is necessary in order that the Board of Education may be informed of the general progress of the country in that sphere; the policy is based on a mistaken belief that the vigilance of the State requires the Board to investigate, and if need be to intervene, in the affairs of every school. In our universities the visitation assumes a different character, more in consonance with the principles I have sought to establish for all types of school.

It must be granted, however, that cases may occur in which public officers may have to act as police; when grave complaints arise, when friction is reported that cannot be composed without intervention, the State must do its duty, and secure materials for an impartial report. Hence one cannot expect an Authority to pass a self-denying ordinance in abrogation of its power; but what is needed as a reserve for emergencies should no longer be pursued as the normal procedure.

This excursion on inspection is also relevant to the topics of Chapter VIII, but I insert it here because of its close bearing on the supervision of scholars as well as of their teachers. Returning to the use of Leaving Examinations, I have suggested that every 'leaver' should be examined before discharge and a review made of his capacity and attainments during the whole period of attendance.

We are slowly coming to accept this as an obligation incumbent on all schools; it should not be left to the discretion either of parent or of teacher; the scholar is

not treated with justice if this requirement is evaded, for evidence of attainment is being looked for more and more, not merely as a passport to some place of further education, but as an indication of capacity to enter on a career.[1] It is at this point, and only at this point, that the 'results' of education can be properly set down by a supervising authority (so far as any record *can* be made of a process which in its essence defies the rules of measurement). An illustration from secondary education is to hand in the organization of School Certificates. As people at large come to understand the intention of this reform it will, I am convinced, be applied to all types of school and college. In the primary schools one already finds the beginnings of such plans, for the Employment Exchanges rely upon evidence furnished by head teachers to help them in finding suitable work for 'leavers.'

Certificate Examinations.—The extension of this principle opens the door to other evils, and these are so mischievous that many people would like to see examinations done away with altogether. Briefly they may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) The examination only embraces a few subjects of study, to which authorities, or the public, attach special weight; other subjects, not recognized in an examination syllabus, tend to be neglected. To some extent this is inevitable, but the harm is diminished especially where teachers are trusted to discharge their duty in a professional spirit and are not judged solely by the number of successes gained by their pupils. In one respect this competition between subjects has an advantage, for it compels those who attach value to this or that study to plead for it at the bar of public opinion and secure its recognition. Thus music and drawing were, until recently,

[1] *Suggestions*, loc. cit., p. 2.

depreciated in the secondary school; but they are now admitted to a minor rank in the regulations for Matriculation. The advocates of freedom point to the American system of electives in high schools, under which every scholar can elect to study what he or his parents prefer; we offer a great variety of choice in universities, and give a more limited freedom in the higher forms of secondary schools. The German device is to found different types of school: Gymnasium, Real-Gymnasium, Realschule, each with a distinctive leaving-certificate (*Abiturienten-Zeugniss*) admitting successful 'leavers' to an appropriate sequel in further education or in a professional career. But the best of machinery breaks down; few parents or children can forecast the future so precisely as to make sure that present interest can square up with the programme of later life. Nor is it a real kindness to boys and girls to exempt them from every discipline that they find irksome; no one should impose, e.g., Latin for the sake of discipline, but if it stands in the Time-table and is well taught, intellectual interest can be aroused in the pursuit, except among the dullards; when these have tested their wits on the study or have shown that their powers lie elsewhere they can fairly claim an alternative menu. Further discussion of curricula must be reserved for a later volume. When the certificate of discharge records not only the performance of a scholar during examination week, but his progress in all the activities of school life, the risk of injury is substantially diminished. At the present time the grants for promotion from primary to secondary schools are awarded almost wholly on tests of skill in English and arithmetic.

Stress should be laid on the record of progress as much as on a final examination; principal and staff are often too industrious in conducting internal examinations; the

warnings on this point given in the *Suggestions* are much to the point. In some secondary schools, where the pupil is, quite rightly, left to prepare much of his work in his own time, the teacher has tended to become a perpetual examiner. Further discussion of this problem will be more appropriate in the next volume, when we deal with the Practice of Education.

(*b*) Methods of examination are still more open to criticism. A cheap printing press enabled the H.M.I. of former days to distribute test-cards in each of the Standards; and for secondary schools a presiding examiner was equipped with printed papers which achieved the same result in raising the standard of work to a respectable level. But a heavy price was paid for these services; the ease with which an examination office can operate its machines, the impartiality with which a uniform paper test can standardize ten thousand scholars in three hours, has led educators to ignore the need for freedom, variety and elasticity.

Some studies, e.g. mathematics and classics, can be adequately tested on paper; but, as the curriculum has enlarged, new subjects demand methods of examination for which the printed paper test is unfit; and the attempts of examining boards to get round the obstacles do grave harm to the scholar's progress. They make strenuous efforts to reduce the mischief, but every advance in the quality of teaching displays more conspicuously the imperfections of centralized schemes of examination. The remedy is to be sought not only by diminishing the number of examinations and by taking the scholar's record into account, but by research into more scientific methods of examination. The merit of the older systems of test, apart from their cheapness, lay in standardization and in the certainty that the verdict would be honest. Now that the teaching profession has advanced in self-respect

it can claim to be trusted, both to maintain a reasonable measure of uniformity and to abstain from showing mercy to the incompetent; safeguards can be adopted which prevent abuse without subjecting a whole group of schools to being strangled by printed papers. In our universities, for example, degrees and diplomas, awarded solely by the body of teachers (assisted by an external examiner), are accepted both by Government and by professional councils as equivalent to the tests which these corporations conduct on their account. In the United States the universities offer the same privilege to approved schools, so that the great majority of American boys and girls are under no necessity to undergo a week or more of matriculation papers; the privilege of being retained on the list of approved schools is withdrawn if the subsequent record of the students (carefully registered for the purpose) proves that the students have been improperly educated. In Germany the principle of employing an external examiner or assessor is applied throughout the whole system of leaving certificates. The teaching body of each school is entrusted to examine and award certificates, for they alone possess the requisite knowledge of their pupils; but, to avoid partiality and to maintain standards, the State associates its inspectors with the proceedings (p. 219 below). In Great Britain we are reluctant even to research into the working of such alternative plans, for our system has gained a thorough hold both on teachers and laity; we are grateful to Whitehall and the universities for the energy with which they engaged the printing press and the railways to take the first steps in supervision; and we are reluctant to challenge their prerogative.

At this point the advancement of psychology has recently enabled teachers to make use of Intelligence (better called Mental) Tests as a mode of valuation

which may avoid the evils on which we have descanted. They follow the example of the physiologist who, by quantitative measurements of bodily functions, can describe a scholar's physical capacity ; they have devised series of mental measurements which elude both the whims of an examiner and the momentary disposition of the examinee. They point out that the attainments of a scholar at this or that juncture will vary owing to all sorts of environmental influences, while his capacity, his alertness of mind, can be gauged by a scientific inquisition, without reference to the course of study. For, they allege, the growth of a mind is, in part at least, the outcome of inheritance ; they take to some extent the position of the eugenists (see Chapter I) and insist that inherited capacity is the first feature of an individual which needs investigation. They do not deny that nurture can affect this growth, any more than a physician will question the value of appropriate 'nurture' for the body; but both maintain the value of 'nature,' and seek to describe the scholar in terms of what nature has endowed him with : normal growth of mental powers can be discovered for each successive year and relied upon in professional practice. Research began in Paris with Binet and Simon, who were concerned to diagnose mental deficiency in children ; their methods have been copied and improved both in America and Great Britain, and applied, especially by Professors Cyril Burt and Thomson, to school children in general. The method has also been adopted to aid in the selection of adults and adolescents for employment both in industry and in public service (e.g. U.S. Army, 1917–18). This reversal of our ideas about examinations has not passed without challenge,[1] and some educators question the validity, as well as the benefit, of the

[1] E.g. Principal Raymont in *Educational Movements and Methods*, 1924 ; on the other side see Dr. P. Ballard, *The New Examiner*.

entire procedure. I think the sceptics go too far; they may well criticize the imperfections of the tests and refuse to employ them until the experts stand on a firmer ground in psychology; but the principle at stake should be clearly envisaged. While I agree with Mr. Raymont that philosophy must never give place to natural science, we must always be ready to accept the conclusions and methods of science, as an aid to the treatment of our fellow-men. For, after all, are we to identify mind with spirit and regard mental power as something sacrosanct which must be exempt from the measuring-rod? The plain fact is that we have constantly to discriminate between both men and children as regards mental ability, and our empirical verdicts are uncertain because we work in the dark, and often rely with unwarrantable assurance on our intuitions; some men possess remarkable gifts in this direction, but while one hits the mark a dozen may go wrong. One reason why we make so much use of examinations is that the public will not trust personal verdicts based solely on intuition, and, therefore, accept these customary tests of attainment as constituting at the same time a rough-and-ready assessment of general mental power: your first-class candidate, even if he be only examined in one subject, is likely to be of higher mental stature than the man who just scrapes through in many subjects.

This comparison displays the limitations of Intelligence Tests. Examinations in attainments test diligence as well as mental power; your first-class man is usually, although not always, more industrious than those who take a lower place in the list. They test incidentally forms of skill that have to be acquired in order to display the candidate's power; papers in History and Literature show that a candidate can express himself; laboratory examinations show that he can use his hands and eyes.

The Intelligence Test, at its best, isolates one kind of ability, and, even if the evidence on that head be unchallenged, it should not be accepted for more than it is worth. This limitation in scope is the soundest justification for caution in making use of them; the very title 'Intelligence' is a danger-signal.[1] For what is 'Intelligence'? Does the term include a practical intelligence which enables one man to see the working of a machine better than his fellows, and another to discern the harmonies of a fugue? Or does it favour the man or child who handles words with facility? Since most of the tests are concerned either with words or figures it is not surprising that the records obtained from schools bring out a grading pretty much the same as that reached by teachers in the ordinary paper examinations. The psychologist is, however, extending his range and now seeks to test inherited faculty in all its branches; when you want a measuring-rod for rhythmic response, for colour sense—even for character—he will devise one for you, if you will have patience. But we shall ask him to define character with more lucidity than he has defined intelligence before we accept his examination as valid.

All this criticism only shows that the psychologist must not exaggerate his claims; much of his work is still tentative, and is of greatest value in dealing with the abnormal, where variations in capacity are wide; where also a clear demarcation is evident between capacity and attainments, between nature and nurture.

For we must stress once more the comparison between mind and body; the tests both of physiologist and psychologist are at their best in discovering endowment; they are inexorable, like finger-prints; they admit the possibility of improvement, but their main effect on the subject is to make him conscious of his limitations, and if

[1] See footnote to p. 216.

abused they lead him to inhibit his energies in directions where the diagnosis suggests that he will not excel. Now we already have too much of such deterrent influence on children and young people; one child is told that he 'can't sing' and so makes up his mind to resist the influence of music; another is scolded because he 'can't do mathematics' and so continues to 'fail.' At the other extreme clever children get to believe that they are in a select class and that they can rely upon their mental inheritance to carry them through regardless of conative powers. Why should either teacher or scholar spend weary hours in study when the psychologist has already certified him as first-class? Let us pick him out at once and give him a scholarship!

This absurd conclusion only gives point to the discussion: as a check upon the abuses of old-fashioned examinations, as a supplementary guide to other means of classification, these Mental Tests in expert hands can do good service to the community. At present the scope is limited because the psychologist is only beginning to control his tools; as he becomes more sure of his ground we shall accept his aid with exactly the degree of confidence that we give to the medical officer who reports on the physical condition of our pupils.

(*c*) If, however, all possible reforms in examinations were carried out, the final objection would still hold: they lay a heavy burden on young shoulders, they may cause unnecessary anxiety to teachers as well as to scholars. Let no one suppose that if, for example, we shaped our methods of awards on the continental pattern, overpressure would be diminished. The reports of suicide by German schoolboys, terrorized by the fear of failure, show how the best of systems cause disaster unless parents and teachers are in sympathy with young minds. Some

readers of this chapter will be alarmed at my suggestion that every scholar, on quitting a school, should be docketed with a record of his progress; such a thoroughgoing inquiry seems to portend a multiplication of the evils to which some of them are now exposed. But there is no alternative; the most ardent of reformers cannot claim such a measure of freedom, either for himself or his pupils, as shall exempt them from any supervision in the public interest. Instead of inveighing against the social order to which all masters must submit, his wisdom is to study principles of organization, and thus help the administrator to adjust the balance between the evils of overpressure and the waste of power when children and students are still permitted, as they were so often in former days, to dawdle through their years of education instead of responding with active intelligence to the claims of culture. In this, as in all problems of oversight, the reforms for which the teacher pleads depend upon an instructed public; as parents, members of education committees, governors, inspectors come to see the important part which examinations take in the national system, and discern both the benefits to be derived and the abuses to be avoided, they will cease either to denounce them as an oppression or to laud them as means of salvation. Here, as in all the topics which have engaged our notice from Chapter VI, we find ourselves thrown back on the need for harmony in the relations between the schools and those who sustain and organize them. Already some of the worse defects in this field have been eliminated; the competition of Universities with each other, and with the various boards of examinations which act on behalf of professions, was formerly a standing grievance in the secondary schools, but the establishment of a Secondary Schools Examinations Council, uniting the interests of all concerned, has already reduced the area of

mischief. As teachers and administrators step by step study the foundations of policy and widen their sympathy, the functions of superintendence will become more and more welcomed as an indispensable aid to the school, both in the lesser matters of the Law and in the liberty of the Gospel.

CHAPTER XI

ADVISORY AND REPORTING FUNCTIONS

IT is only necessary to add a few lines on the place assigned to advice in our English system, since it has already been noted (p. 162) as an important feature in all institutional life.

"In 1896 Mr. M. E. Sadler was appointed to the new post of Director of Special Reports, and a central educational library was opened at Whitehall. Up to the present time eleven volumes have been issued by Mr. Sadler and his assistants, dealing with various educational questions at home, in the Colonies, and abroad. Few countries had more need of an Educational Intelligence Department than the United Kingdom; hardly anywhere has its creation been so rapidly and so amply justified."[1] This office is only one example of an activity which is by no means confined to the Central Authority, as the labours of Sir Michael Sadler testify, for when he relinquished it, he was invited to investigate and report upon the work of many Local Authorities whose functions had been recently enlarged by the Act of 1902, while he was able also to conduct research on similar lines from a university chair.

Taking a broad view, we discern this garnering and distribution of information as a function of all who are concerned in education, even though corporations whose position enables them to survey a wide area have a special responsibility. Every school principal is a reporter, both to those who employ him and to the parents and public who should be concerned with the welfare of his school.

[1] Graham Balfour writing in 1903, loc. cit., p. 38.

In the widest view these efforts are not confined to what appears in print. The speeches of an official, for example, where he is free to open his mouth, are equally serviceable in informing the public mind. Where he addresses teachers, his discourse may be regarded as a contribution to the training of teachers; the extent to which he should speak his mind on the public platform is a matter on which authorities differ.[1]

We have noted that the justification for taking pains over such work rests on the dynamic nature of social processes; authorities undertake it from various motives: sometimes they merely want to have reports for their own benefit; sometimes they feel their dependence on public opinion, and know that they cannot make changes of consequence unless an instructed opinion is behind them; they then become solicitous about the distribution of ideas, and take to propaganda. They may go even further, and give high rank to these functions, in the belief that authority can best achieve its ends through influence[2] rather than by commands. Great Britain has by no means gone so far as the Federal Government at Washington, with its Bureau of Education, which exerts its influence almost wholly through the distribution of information; but a start has been made. The establishment of the Consultative Committee, and the sanction of a Teachers' Council, under the Act of 1899, show that the Central Authority welcomes the organization of professional opinion; and various Local Authorities have taken steps in the same direction. While these provisions may be viewed in relation to the status of the teacher (p. 161), they are equally in place here as

[1] The quotations on p. 185 show that the servants of local authorities have a freer hand than civil servants.

[2] Elmer Brown (Education Bureau of the United States), *Government by Influence* (1909).

exhibiting the value of advice and of the organization of specific channels of opinion for that purpose.

It is the attitude of mind of the organizer and teacher which determines both the kind of information he collects and the extent to which he imparts it. If he is impressed by the permanent validity of his principles and desires to extend their force, he will not be eager either to reshape his own habits of thought or to distribute ideas which may run counter to them. If he has the intellectual habits of an investigator and can pursue the imperatives of practice while admitting the fluidity of theory, he will use all the resources of the printing press to publish the records of education. It is often alleged that the bureaucrat is less sensitive to these needs than other men; but I doubt it. Inherited temperaments, inclining this way or that, are found in all groups, and these may be modified by acquired habits. Our scholastic tradition has done little to foster such habits, but we are reforming our ways; the same principles which favour self-government, so-called, within the school are reshaping the attitude of Authority outside the school (Vol. II, Chap. V).

The reactionary is ready to cavil at expenditure under this head, whether of time or money; he points out that, as soon as you begin, you find it difficult to fix a limit; still, everyone agrees nowadays that the administrator must at least produce a few figures, and give some explanation of them; every now and then a problem becomes so urgent that a special commission—if only a Geddes Committee!—is felt to be in place. When, however, it comes to any further elucidation, either by comparison with other countries, by reports on educational novelties, or by interpretation of phenomena in the light of philosophy, people who are not reactionary may differ. They may prefer to leave many inquiries to the volunteer efforts of enthusiasts, or to the unorganized expression of

opinion in the Press; and when they admit these functions as a necessary part of government duty they may differ as to the authority to which this or that field of inquiry should be assigned. Any such differences are of small moment at the present time, for it is certain that the general public, as well as parents, know far too little about what is done on their behalf. The Education Week movement referred to in another connection, and publications like *The Londoner's Education*,[1] are signs that both central and local authorities are becoming alive to the need of reporting to 'the people' in the language of the people.

And, while I desire to stress this feature in the organization of education, which has been largely overlooked, I would not for a moment deprecate the value of volunteer movements which stand in friendly competition with public authorities as agents of propaganda. At this moment (1924) Copec and the W.E.A. are conspicuous both in studying principles of national education and in seeking to win the popular ear; all political parties lend a hand in the same direction, although they differ in the advice they tender. With so much amateur and voluntary effort, authorities might well stay quiescent and take for granted that the public knows as much as they want to know, or ought to know. This would be a grave mistake, for with the best of good-will no other corporations can give a fair account of national effort or report upon the facts of education so well as those to whom the nation has specially entrusted the affairs of education.

[1] Published for the L.C.C. Education Committee by P. S. King & Son.

CHAPTER XII

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES, THEIR COMPOSITION AND DUTIES

In the note attached to Chapter II I pointed out that all Authorities are representative of institutions; if their constitution is democratic the persons exercising control are elected or nominated under the terms of statute and ordinance. Since we live in a democratic society we need not consider principles of representation in types of community other than the democratic; the reference is only necessary because in the next volume we shall deal with the inner corporate life of school, which is by no means democratic, although many useful efforts are made to equip the young with qualities adequate to service in a democratic world when they are older. We have also seen that while institutions seek power through direct representation, i.e. through groups which elect or nominate representative persons, their power is effectual quite as much through indirection. By this we mean that sentiments and causes which find no voice in direct representation are none the less cared for by various persons who enjoy power as members of Authorities. The Act of 1902 constituting the L.E.A. illustrates the whole position. The Authority, itself, i.e. the deciding court of appeal in all matters of local public education, is the County or Borough Council directly representing the institutions of locality in all affairs of local government, and indirectly representing other interests which take an active part in the elections. But, since Education is a unique form of civic activity,

the Act requires the Authority to constitute as its agent a special Committee, called its Education Committee, and on this Education Committee co-opted membership may be assigned to persons who stand for all sorts of institutions which are felt to have a claim to speak in matters of education, although they make no such claims in regard to other local concerns. Thus it has come about that, while locality has a predominant voice, with a small voice at least assigned to women, the interests (Chapter VI) of religion, vocation, culture, teaching can all be directly represented. If these institutions are not recognized, none the less they will be represented, just so far as their advocates among the inhabitants take steps to secure the election or nomination of such persons as will share this or that sentiment. For example, the institutions of property affect public policy in education although no recognition of them may be made in schemes or statutes ; representatives are often chosen avowedly on the ground that they will curtail (or enlarge) the scale of expenditure, and for one representative who avows such intention a dozen will be known to sympathize. These elaborate provisions for co-option and nomination which have become so pronounced a feature of local education in England succeed to some extent in applying the doctrine of representation of institutions and have to that extent assisted in harmonizing their conflicts ; but it is clear that the utmost ingenuity in framing schemes and charters will never cover all the interests that may wish to influence education : and such interests, although excluded from *formal* representation, will notwithstanding exert their influence indirectly, and must do so if they mean to be effectual. And they can do this, since every individual in Authority, however narrow-minded or single-minded he may appear, has many interests, many sides to his personality, and therefore

puts his weight on the side of this or that interest, often without a clear consciousness of what he is doing. A man may, e.g., be elected with a special mandate to reduce the cost of education, but when elected it may be found that he is a stout champion of technical instruction and spends all his energy in helping that branch of an Authority's work.

Now these features in the make-up of representative persons follow us when we consider the two divisions among persons who exercise control, viz. the members of the Authority and their agents (p. 21), officials of all sorts, secretaries, directors, clerks. These last are not representatives in the ordinary sense; but it is important to bear in mind that their functions are assumed to be discharged in the spirit of representation; they are chosen to stand for and to execute the mind of those who set them to work, of the Authority which itself is representative. An official person does not, in theory, possess a mind of his own; he is the voice, the employee, as some Authorities are fond of describing him. During office hours he knows no creed, no party. But this is a counsel of perfection, for an official person, in spite of the rigid training of official life, cannot fail to have sympathies with this or that institution. Occasionally these sympathies break out, causing trouble in many quarters, as in the famous instance of the Holmes Circular. And since holders of office cannot help having attachments, it becomes one of the chief anxieties of Authorities to select officials with the right kind of attachments; although when appointed they are expected to be impartial and neutral over against all conflicting interests! Here, indeed, is a dilemma which the teacher and civil servant train themselves to resolve as best they may.

Their difficulty is no doubt somewhat reduced by keeping apart the three functions of Authority (p. 31),

discussion, legislation and executive. The official is assumed to keep to the last of the three; his superiors discuss and make laws; he takes these as they are given to him, and sees that they are obeyed. But it is evident that the three do not stand in watertight compartments; a capable head master or secretary to an Education Committee does much both to guide discussion and to shape legislation; and he is so trusted because he is something more than an official—he is a person of ideas—in other words, he is moved by attachments to various institutions, however impartially he may harmonize their influence both in his own mind and in the behaviour of his Authority.

To dwell further upon the relations between discussion, legislation and executive would carry us too far into political theory; all we need note is the extraordinary pains taken to elaborate the machinery for discussion and advice in affairs of education: in Chapter VIII we saw how the claim of the teacher as adviser in organization has been increasingly acknowledged, and in Chapter XI we extended the principle to cover many institutions outside of those represented by the teaching profession. Besides these permanent forms of authoritative advice the State seeks the aid of temporary commissions and committees, e.g. the Bryce Commission and the many Committees of more recent years to which we have referred. Meanwhile, endless discussion takes place in the Press and among private persons; this unorganized flow of opinions, albeit with much froth and waste of breath, cuts a channel for the more precise deliberations and acts of appointed bodies.

'Legislation' is an omnibus term to include all comprehensive directions, from Acts of Parliament to a set of school rules; they are valid, so far as they do not run counter to the decisions of a superior authority.

When we come to the actual performance, the carrying out of rules and law, distinctions are made between 'the administrative' and 'the executive,' but the line drawn is not always clear. The Education official, properly speaking, is always administering, i.e. he does not perform educational work,[1] but has to see that it is done; and yet the administrator proper who deals immediately with the laws and edicts of an Authority and explains how these are to be carried out can be distinguished from the executive who visit schools and see that the law is carried out in detail. These distinctions apply particularly to Authorities over a wide area: in each school, as we shall see in a moment, the principal (and staff ?) have a status in organization as well as control of another kind within the school.

Reference to principles on which civic organization is conducted is of practical importance; for lack of harmony between the external and internal agencies that control scholars is reflected in the daily conduct of school affairs, as a glance at the past will show. I am perhaps repeating what has been put forward in Chapter VI, but it may be well to restate the position for the purpose of this chapter. When the schools began to be organized in the first half of the nineteenth century, two theories fought for acceptance both of them relying on age-long tradition. The institutions of religion claimed the school as a spiritual society, but failed to make good their claims because they could not incorporate those objective, constituent, elements analysed in Chapter IV; also because the Churches were in conflict with each other. The institutions of democratic politics undertook to make good the deficiency, and a crude theory gained strength, a theory which regarded the school as a factory, with

[1] Sometimes he does, e.g. H.M. Inspectors not only organize Part-time Courses for teachers, but give instructions in them.

the State (local authority or managers), as the employer, the teacher as the employee, the child as raw material provided by parents, and the citizen as consumer. Under this theory social evils may be combated by bidding the teacher insert instruction in this or that subject into the machine. Is betting or strong drink felt to be injurious? let us turn to the State to supply lessons on these evils and on the corresponding virtues of temperance and thrift.

Between the two the institutions of property thrust forward and sought to found a system of education determined by rates and taxes. As opinion developed the issues revealed the force of other institutions which we have reviewed; locality asserted its voice; the teacher had to be reckoned with, and finally parenthood is beginning to be recognized as an entity distinct from citizenship. The statesman has composed these conflicts of opinion as best he can, thinking of the immediate end to be achieved; but the time is surely come for a more detached and conscious regard for principles. In general social theory reflection has gone far, but so far as I know the specific application of political philosophy to education has scarcely been attempted; we have lived from hand to mouth, trusting to the subconscious working of the mind, having no time to examine our processes of thought in the light of a comprehensive survey.

We can now review the different types of Authority, noting in each case their composition and the duties which they discharge. We shall only include Authorities which take actual responsibility for places of education; there are supplementary authorities, such as Examining Boards and Trusts, whose functions are important; but to give attention to these would carry us beyond our tether. There appear to be five typical forms of Authority over places of education: the first two have

jurisdiction over one school or college only, (*a*) principal and staff, (*b*) managers or governors. The third, which I have to call self-governing, are concerned with many schools and may extend their interests throughout the country. The fourth, the L.E.A., embraces all the schools within its area, and the last includes the whole nation. If the reader accepts the organization of advice within the ambit of Authority he will include as a sixth the International Survey of Education, now brought within the scope of the League of Nations.

The Teacher as Authority.—In Chapter VI we included teaching among the institutions which claim a voice in organization and in Chapter VIII we saw how the calling has come to be trained and recognized as a profession, acquiring a legal status. The teacher as 'authority' within his school, which works though personal relations with the scholars, is distinguished from his relation to other authorities. The first kind of control operates in all schools, although it varies greatly in different types of school; we shall consider this in Vol. II, as an important problem in school-keeping. When we are dealing with the organization of education 'Authority' is used as a technical term derived from modern law rather than scholastic tradition.

Used in this sense, it is evident that the classification of schools based on the nature of the ownership involves widely different functions for the teacher viewed as an authority. In a private school (p. 114) no one intervenes between the teacher-owner and the supreme authority of the State. This at least was true until the Act of 1918 empowered the Local Authority to view and report upon every kind of school within its area. Authorities have not as yet gone far in the exercise of their powers, nor would public opinion perhaps approve such intervention, for the confidence placed by parents in private

establishments is partly due to the belief that their merits are enhanced by keeping aloof from the public system. If we turn to the topics included under Oversight in Chapter IX we see that the private school falls chiefly under public regulation in matters of health and of public examinations. Among the institutions which claim a voice in private-school education the family is most in evidence, for the proprietor must win the regard of those who entrust their children to him. But neither the family, religion, vocation nor culture exert formal control; their influence, however great, is indirect and unorganized. The principal is a law unto himself and sole executive. I myself think that all the benefits of private ownership could be retained even if the private schoolmaster shared his responsibilities to some extent with public authority.

It would be tedious to survey the position of the teacher as an authority in the various types of school distinguished in Chapter VII; the other extreme is witnessed in many primary schools and departments of schools, where the State, for good and bad reasons, sometimes reduces the teacher almost to the level of a clerk (p. 192), allotting both to head teacher and staff the minimum of administrative power consistent with retaining sufficient control in discipline. A difference is acknowledged between primary and secondary schools, because the adolescent (p. 68) is not so submissive and requires the controlling hand to be more manifest in the personality of those who take charge of him. When he approaches maturity in college or university, he needs yet another kind of discipline, and sometimes this new attitude is recognized, as e.g. in the charters of certain modern universities where a legal position is assigned to a Students' Representative Council.

Corporations for higher education usually allot a far higher status to the staff, as distinguished from the head

teacher, than do our secondary or primary schools. The ancient universities, Oxford and Cambridge, may be contrasted with many American colleges where the president is often the sole executive. Modern universities in Great Britain occupy a middle position and their charters and statutes are well worth studying in detail as exemplifying many principles of organization. For example, officers of administration are assigned a distinctive place, some of them, the Vice-Chancellor and the Deans, being both teachers and administrators, while others may be solely concerned with official duties. The staff, organized in Faculties, possess statutory rights in internal affairs, and the senior members, grouped as a Senate, undertake external duties (e.g. in recommending persons for appointments), that elsewhere are wholly outside the province of a staff. This recognition of ' the assistant ' as something more than an assistant is one of the points in which, as I believe, reform in organization lags behind the spirit of our time. It has relations to the movement in industry which seeks to improve the status of the worker over against the employer or company director, and is easier to attain, since a school or college is under no obligation to show a profit (p. 198). And it has a close bearing on the efficiency of the teacher, for the best can only be got out of him when he finds that his value as an expert is appreciated in Oversight as well as in the practice of his profession. On the continent of Europe the status of the staff is better appreciated, for they have long acted as a faculty in awarding certificates (p. 215). In the upheaval of authority consequent on the war, the experiment is here and there being tried of making the post of *Direktor* or *Rektor* an annual office, occupied in turn by members of the staff. It would be premature to recommend the innovation, for time is needed to judge of its effects ; as

an old head master, I see difficulties in adopting the plan in English secondary schools. The system at Oxford and Cambridge, where the Vice-Chancellorship is held for a three-years' term, offers points of analogy. Such devices, diminishing the authority of a chief and exalting the status of his colleagues, can at least only be adopted when public opinion holds the teaching profession in high esteem. In England the same sense of regard for the teaching office has been shown in another way, as we noticed in Chapter VIII. The principle of representation is employed with us to allot some voice to a *group* of teachers on a governing authority (see p. 163). In universities this is a statutory right, and local authorities since 1902 are empowered to reserve places on Education Committees to persons nominated either from primary or secondary groups or from universities (see p. 227 above). While the effect of these measures certainly enhances the prestige of the teacher, the motive is quite different from the plans above noted for dealing with the executive functions of principal or staff. Such representatives enjoy full membership on an Education Committee or on a University Council, but their presence is regarded both by themselves and by their lay colleagues as mainly serviceable in deliberation. From this point of view they usually render capital service, but the plan is not a substitute for an Advisory Body, and they do not usually undertake the functions of such bodies as I have described in Chapters VIII and XI. They are adopted as a ready means of putting a Committee or Council in touch with the minds of those whom they employ without the formalities involved in setting up advisory machinery such as we see in the Faculties and Senate of a University.

Managers or Governors.—We have assumed above that each college and school should be managed by some

group which takes it in charge; such a group, whether called Managers or Governors, or Council, are usually also Trustees, a 'juristic person' in law; but this is not of the essence of their position. They stand on behalf of all the institutions, other than the teaching profession, which are considered in the well-being of that one school. Thus, the managers of Council Schools under the Act of 1902, Clause 6 (1), do not own the school property, and in boroughs there is no obligation to appoint such a body at all, i.e. the L.E.A. Committee may itself discharge the duty of management for a whole group of schools (Clause 12 (6)). Why, then, are managers required? Why add to the machinery unless some important principle is at stake? I conceive that the practice rests upon the two aspects which the school as a community displays. First, each school has a life of its own: it is a permanent association, enduring in time and fixed on some spot which symbolizes its permanent character. Every school society therefore displays a distinctive outlook and expresses its own needs; these cannot be known or fully met from a distance, even in modern days when communication is so much more rapid than it used to be. Those who hold that the teaching staff can alone attend to its needs, and can communicate them to an education office, depreciate the benefit that accrues when a small body of laymen are placed in a position to share with the staff in promoting its corporate activities. I know that teachers are often of the opposite opinion, for conflict in any social situation may replace harmony; and they are already cumbered with authorities; the L.E.A. and the officers of Whitehall are ample. Our principle reverts to the conception we form of the aims of education: if we regard schooling mainly as occupied with the growth of intelligence, with courses and methods of study, controlled by codes and regulations,

management may be dispensed with; if we regard the association as a mode of life for children, we shall stress the importance of a managing authority. I therefore uphold this link in the chain of authority as invaluable even in those which receive abnormal scholars (p. 129): it being, of course, premised that the mode of selecting the managing body and its duties will vary according to the type of school.

The second aspect springs from the external relations of a school with the institutions, especially those of Family and Locality, which are concerned in the advancement of education. This point refers more especially to day-schools, and I regard the problem as one of capital importance at the present time, for it is often ignored. A city school does not draw its scholars wholly from one small area, such as a ward or parish, but as a social unit its members are neighbourhood folk who often come to know each other better because their children make friends at school. The institutions of Family and Locality are, in fact, closely identified, although the source of interest in the local school differs in the two cases. I have handled this theme in Chapter VI and wish that space permitted of an extended exposition, for it has engaged my attention for more than thirty years, ever since I realized how the spirit of Pestalozzi had inspired teachers here and there in Central Europe to win the regard of parents as the first factor in a vital system of organization. In later years I have been privileged to test the theory in the affairs of two schools of which I have had charge, and have watched closely the slow (alas, too slow !) development of similar ideas elsewhere in this country. I am well aware that most of my fellow-teachers distrust any plea for recognizing parents as a group, although the best teachers have always welcomed interchange of ideas and advice from individual fathers or mothers; and this

distrust is supported by the tendencies in our epoch (p. 78) which challenge parental authority. But the most fearless of revolutionaries will not deny that their parents are useful up to, say, sixteen years of age; so they should not disdain the argument here advanced, so far as primary and secondary schools are concerned.[1] It rests indeed on a solid base of fact, which there is no necessity to weaken by over-emphasis. The friction so often reported between teacher and parent is a witness to repressed sentiments; when these find a natural outlet both parties are the happier. I picture the child, in his unconscious feelings, as longing to take the parent by one hand and the teacher by the other, so that they may all unite in a triple alliance.

There are belated signs that our legislators are becoming conscious of this situation. Up to 1918 there was no recognition of the parent, so far as I am aware, in English law except as the provider of educable material (p. 201), to be coerced if need be by penalties and magistrates. The Act of 1918 discovered him as a person, along with "other persons interested," and, therefore, entitled to share in deliberation. The discovery was greater than they knew; for when the Board of Education drafted its Circular[2] instructing L.E.A.s how to secure parental advice, they failed to apply the doctrine of institutions. and treated all these persons as individuals rather than as group persons (p. 31), who express their mind through representation. They were content to notify that the law would be complied with by publishing an invitation to these persons to acquaint themselves with

[1] Colleges and universities are excepted, for the student is more independent (in mind even if not in purse) of his home. Old Students' Associations sometimes serve the same purpose in these corporations that a Parents' Association serves in a school.

[2] Board of Education, Circular 1140, Dec. 18, 1919.

the L.E.A. Schemes, and, if they chose, to tender advice. The immediate result, so far as parents were concerned, was trifling, for the parent, *qua* parent, is not interested in a Scheme as a whole, but only in those parts of it which affect the school which his child attends. But the clause has served a useful purpose; on the strength of it some persons interested in education united as a Central Parents Committee, which sought to stir up public interest on behalf of parents; the fact that such an effort (the successor of other associations with a similar title[1]) resulted from the Act of 1918 shows the strength of the principle, although its sponsors, in my opinion, were misled as to the field of parental interests.

Granting, then, that the proper *venue* of the parent is in a single school, our unit of educational organization, what part should he play? He can assist, first in advice and deliberation, secondly in management. As we have seen, teachers and sometimes governors often welcome the views of individual parents; but this relationship is unorganized and casual. A great step is taken when the body of parents are invited to come to a school and exchange views with the teachers; even when the exchange of views is only casual, as, for example, at a prize distribution or on a Sports' Day or an Open Day, much is gained, for the 'group' is already in being when the members of it meet face to face. When, however, the teachers summon courage (very little is needed!) to recognize the group as collectively interested in school affairs and to invite them to discussion, a great step forward is made. The group

[1] The Parents' League (about 1900) promoted by Dr. Knox (at that time Bishop of Coventry) aimed at supporting the institutions of religion in education: The P.N.E.U. founded by Miss Charlotte Mason was concerned with Class, but it came much closer to the real status of the parent, for it united parents who maintain a school in the home (p. 113).

is now organized, it comes quickly to consciousness of its solidarity; it finds itself. In a few schools this step has already been taken, and the L.E.A. in Middlesex gave the problem an important place in its Scheme. Usually the organization takes the shape of a Parents' Evening, where discussion follows on music or drama, furnished by the scholars both as entertainment and as evidence of attainments. In the Hornsey County School a vigorous Parents' Association[1] exists, and this is a further step which few teachers would as yet be prepared to sanction; until they are I would deprecate any proposal by other Authorities to intervene, for these plans cannot succeed unless the teachers are ready for them: the leadership in any such meeting must be taken by the head teacher, for he and his colleagues are masters in their own house. Even in the presence of royalty Busby refused to doff his college cap; much more would he have kept his place were the Chairman of his Education Committee a visitor.

An alternative, or additional, plan relies on representation; a parents' committee is formed, elected by the parents and guardians, or, as in Bradford, a committee called by that name but containing representatives also of the L.E.A. and of the school staff. I am told that this organization was dropped after a year or two because the L.E.A. was embarrassed by the extensive requests made by the parents for improvements involving expenditure; but the failure can be adequately explained from the circumstances under which this plan

[1] The development of such associations in America would repay careful study, but if my analysis be accepted they are not so effective because they are federal, uniting a number of schools in an area instead of being based on the separate activity of each school. On the continent of Europe most interesting experiments are in process, and I am indebted here to investigations made by Miss Arscott and recorded in a thesis not yet published.

was devised. A superior authority cannot successfully order representative groups to confer unless it knows that the mind of those whom they represent is prepared. Now there is much interest in public education among the citizens of Bradford, but this will not display itself in parents' committees until more exchange of sympathy and counsel has taken place between parents and teachers in this and that school.

This stricture applies still more forcibly to any proposal for including representatives of parents on a board of managers or governors. If the representation is genuine it can only spring from the corporate sense of unity created by gatherings such as we have noticed. Even if the persons chosen were not parents of children actually attending at the time, their voice would be effective, so long as it expressed the common mind ; but if the sense of unity has not been created the representation is a farce, for you cannot represent the mind of a community which is not in being. I doubt, therefore, if schools generally are ripe for the formal recognition of parents as sharing in managerial functions,[1] although I believe that, some day, two parents, a father and a mother, will find a seat on all such boards ; meanwhile, the family will continue to exercise its influence indirectly, and through organized plans for deliberation, such as Parents' Evenings.

In these last paragraphs I have had day-schools chiefly in mind ; in boarding-schools (pp. 79 and 140) corporate sentiment among parents is slight ; locality has some weight in county secondary schools, but the public schools draw their clients from all parts, and might be better described as national. The governing bodies of public schools always include representatives of culture,

[1] The Middlesex Education Committee, however, are prepared to take this step at once, for Parents' Unions as well as Parents' Evenings are well on their way in that county (*Scheme*, 1920, pp. 12–15).

and sometimes persons nominated on behalf of religious bodies or of the State; indirectly their members necessarily foster the institutions of class, since such schools cultivate corporate sentiment even to excess. Most of the members of the governing bodies have been former scholars.

The influence of other institutions than those of family and locality in the sphere of management need only be glanced at. Ecclesiastical corporations are directly represented in all schools which are on a religious foundation; non-provided schools must, however, admit two managers to represent locality. The claims of vocation are directly represented in all technical schools which enjoy the support of Chambers of Commerce, Trades Unions and the like; they are naturally predominant in schemes for apprenticeship and for professional training, which suffer sometimes because they lack the broader outlook that might come from institutions of culture. Indirectly these claims are prominent in the minds of many managers in all types of school and college, for public opinion is still disposed to over-value the bread-and-butter aim in education. Learning finds direct representation through the nominees of universities on the governing bodies of endowed schools, and on the L.E.A. Committees which control a large number of municipal secondary schools, colleges of art and technology.

We have dealt already (p. 232) with the representation of teachers. The influence of political institutions has been illustrated throughout these chapters; indirectly, through discussion and deliberation, citizens take what part they will in shaping the opinions of their representatives; the extent to which these representatives should pass beyond their functions in administration and discharge executive duties as managers has been considered in Chapter VI. Wherever a State Authority is owner or

trustee of a school it will certainly make sure that its representatives have a majority voice in management; the claims of other institutions to a minority voice in management is naturally contested by those who believe that democratic government can only be practised on a collectivist theory of politics (p. 22).

These arrangements for representation become at times very complicated: many public men spend most of the working day attending committees or councils; others have their names down as representatives and are summoned, but only attend at rare intervals to qualify, or on some special occasion, and can then only give a silent vote, for they have not kept track of affairs. Vigorous administrators who want to get things done grow impatient with these elaborations. There is no doubt that there is a vast expenditure of time, much of it wasted; but what is time for? Men who like wasting their time may as well spend it on committees. If we accept the principle of representation we must work it through. Even if a nominee carries no weight he stands for an interest; harmony and confidence are sustained by giving a direct voice to groups which can stake a claim. Devices have been invented to help representatives in doing their work: sub-committees undertake the chief labour in discussion[1]: since oral group-dialectic can only be effective among a few, the large body is refined down until the minimum for face-to-face intercourse is reached; then the typewriter and printing-press put the results before the larger body.

Duties of Managers.—The grounds on which this or that institution should find a voice on a board of managers are based on one's conception of the functions the board

[1] This branch of sociology merits further study. Cooley and Graham Wallas pay great attention to it. I discuss it under the category of Number (Chapter II in *Introduction to Sociology*).

will discharge. Thomas Arnold laid it down quite emphatically that his governors had nothing to do except to select (or, if need arose, to dismiss) the head master[1]; in a primary school, when questions of child welfare and employment become prominent, the L.E.A. appoints committees whose members will be helpful in that direction. Such committees are not identical with the managers contemplated in the Act of 1902, but it would simplify local administration if management were arranged so as to include them. The question most in dispute is the right of a managing body to choose the teachers of its school: how can we manage teachers, it is said, whom we do not appoint? The position illustrates the contrast I have noted between government by influence and government by command; there are many useful duties, at least in day-schools, that an authority can discharge even if it has no direct voice in the selection of staff. There was lively controversy on this point in Parliament during the years 1902–3, and the Acts of 1902-3 solved it by leaving to managers of non-provided schools the right to select teachers, but granting to the L.E.A. that finds the salaries the power to reject selection, *on educational grounds only*; the importance of this clause has recently come to light (1924) in the action taken by the Sheffield L.E.A., which has been contested in the law courts. A similar right of confirmation is retained by the central government as regards the principals of various colleges to whom it allots grants. Such intervention by a higher authority causes friction if it is made much of; on the other hand, the existence of the rule is a guarantee that, if scandal does arise, the higher authority can intervene. Other modes of compromise are found: the higher authority may select a few names from a list of applicants and then leave managers to

[1] Stanley's *Life*, chapter iii.

choose from these the candidate who is most likely to suit local needs ; plans of this kind are specially adapted in selection for minor appointments.

I need not tabulate a list of the multifarious duties that a body of managers can undertake, apart from choosing teachers. If they own the school property they will look after it ; if they do not they can still look after it and lay their requests before the owners. But bricks and mortar are not their chief concern ; our view of their duties will be governed by our appreciation of the nature and needs of school life (p. 6).

Self-governing Authorities.—Passing from the needs of the single school, we consider a group of schools, noticed from the standpoint of ownership, in Chapter VII. I use the term ' self-governing ' for want of a better to comprise all corporations which comprehend a number of schools, but are organized on the voluntary principle, although many of them share their powers with representatives of local, or, in a few cases, of central authorities. Some of these have been already mentioned.[1] Each takes a complexion of its own according to the special purpose for which it is incorporated ; hence the composition and duties of the governing bodies are equally diverse.

The university and a few academies for science and art of university rank can be more readily identified, especially as the oldest of them inherit traditions which reach back to the time when Parliament itself was taking shape and included university burgesses among the members of its Lower House. This long tradition accounts for the unique position which universities hold

[1] The National Society, the British and Foreign School Society, the Girls' Public Day-school Trust. The chartered corporations controlling professional education and apprenticeship are even more important. Other examples are the W.E.A., with its rivals, Labour Colleges maintained by Trades Unions, the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, Barnardo, Stephenson Homes, etc.

in the educational system of Europe; this is also true, to some extent, of the older universities of America, in contrast to the State universities. Since the days when London University was founded and evoked lively controversies,[1] the public mind has awakened to the services these corporations may render both as places of education and as authorities (compare p. 94). Our modern British universities, when starting on their journey, are protected by charters and statutes which afford a capital illustration of the distribution of authority between institutions. Although each university is named as if it were a single group of teachers and scholars, it is really a collection of schools, departments, colleges, called by a diversity of names, and united in a bewildering variety of relations. Since it is evident that universities are increasing both in numbers and resources, the conditions on which they are established become of increasing importance to the public: such questions, e.g., as whether the organization should be federal, on the plan proposed for a Midland University (Nottingham, Leicester, etc.), or should only comprise a single body of students and teachers.

It is often overlooked that corporations of university rank are entrusted with authoritative duties in the control of other schools through inspection and examination. As regards inspection the Oxford Delegacy and the Cambridge Syndicate did pioneer work for some twenty years after 1887, but when the Board of Education (1899) and the L.E.A. (1902–3) assumed authority over secondary schools, the universities, to their own advantage as I think, diminished their activity in that field. But their control of secondary school examinations (p. 220) though still paramount, is now shared with representatives of other bodies on the Secondary Schools Examination Council.

[1] J. H. Newman's *Idea of a University* was the most striking contribution to these debates.

The Local Education Authority.—After what has been said in previous chapters I need not dilate on the powers of the various authorities set up by the Balfour Act, nor on the promising development in representation for advice (Chapter XI). The rivalry between central and local authorities in recent years concerned us in Chapter IX, since it is viewed mainly as a financial issue. The discussion has also brought into relief the difficulty of defining duties and powers as distributed between this and that corporation. The situation which has arisen is due to the circumstance that the Board of Education had only been created three years before 1902, when the L.E.A. came into being; both authorities, in the interval, have grown more conscious of their capacity, and desire to execute their own will. The need for harmony is evident when the Association of Education Committees thus describes the present position of the Board of Education: "Practically independent of Parliament, outside the jurisdiction of the courts of law, the Board to-day enjoys a measure of autocracy, within their own sphere of operations, greater than that possessed by the Crown itself." The Board might retort that autocrats are to be found in the provinces as well as in London!

A sharp distinction is now made between duties which *must* be performed by an authority and permissive powers which it *may* exercise for the extension of education, subject, or not subject, to the approval of the national government. The Board of Education takes power to issue regulations which confirm its right to approve: the decision of the Board shall be final. This is resented by the L.E. Committees; but I imagine that the claim is based on the congested state of parliamentary business; programmes which in earlier days were "laid on the table of both Houses" cannot now receive parliamentary attention. The Board, therefore, takes on the

functions of a parliamentary committee, and the L.E.A. objects to having to plead before permanent officials or presidents, subordinating the rights of locality to the views of a central office. If, however, local government is to submit its plans to any form of government, what alternative kind of judicial court can be devised to meet the case? And what evidence should it submit to prove that its plans are warrantable? I think the principles on which these queries could be answered are contained in Chapter VI, but I must not take up more space with a theme which is as much an affair of general politics as of education.

We have seen (p. 107) that large L.E.A.s are only quasi-local; they therefore set up many sub-committees. The greater the population the more necessary does devolution become and the nearer this form of government approximates in character to the national form, until in the case of London, whose population tops that of Scotland, a separate Act of Parliament (1903) was needed to provide that huge 'wen' with a special scheme of government. Every county and borough works out its own policy, with variations partly dependent on statutory arrangements between larger and smaller areas as laid down in the Act of 1902. Some difference is witnessed in the attitude of county and of borough authorities in respect of co-operation with voluntary groups. This is not to say that the voluntary service of individuals in cities is refused; on the contrary, voluntary, i.e. unpaid, work is performed throughout Great Britain for social welfare of all descriptions to an extent unknown in other countries. But in some of our cities education offices are disposed to ignore educational work conducted apart from their control (p. 184), except in non-provided schools, which hold a strong position in public regard and are strictly protected by the Act of 1902. The

advance in local authority has been one of the significant features of English politics for the last eighty years; with the growing consciousness that its position is unassailable it can afford to share some of its power with groups that rely on the force of other institutions. Most cities grant some power to other groups in the constitution of their education committees, and are beginning to accept co-operation in other ways.[1] This process cannot be hastened by polemic; as the conviction becomes widespread that harmony and good-will are of more value than the display of power, suitable measures will evolve to unite officials, councillors and all types of social workers in the common cause. Looking back over forty years since I first had the privilege of teaching in a large city, the advance has been marvellous; no one can doubt that large numbers of citizens are now imbued with a worthy ideal of education, and will achieve results of which to-day we can only dream.

The National Authority.—A separate chapter would be needed to examine adequately the operations of national control in education. The fountain-head for deliberation and legislation [2] in Parliament is well understood, but the complex arrangements by which various departments of government take a hand in education are not so easily disentangled; they only excite public attention when a controversy, such as that recently composed between the Ministry of Labour and local authority, comes to the surface. The Privy Council, the earliest organ of central government for education as for other matters, still takes a hand, e.g. as the authority for granting and revising

[1] See, for example, p. 163.

[2] As regards executive functions, the direct intervention of Parliament, although small, is quite important, e.g. in schemes for endowed schools, which are 'laid on the table.' Once and again the provisions have provoked debate.

charters. The Treasury directly deals with universities through its Grants Committee; the defence services[1] look to their own departments, War, Admiralty, Air, to regulate the educational concerns of soldiers, sailors and airmen. The Home Office[1] and the Board of Health[1] each has its distinct province; the Secretary for Scotland, quite properly, regards education as one of the institutions in which national independence should be safeguarded; and Wales has secured a separate establishment. The Board of Education thus stands as only one among several partners, although its title should give it pride of place. An onlooker might question the wisdom of this distribution between departments; it seems simpler to put all schools and educational corporations concerned with culture under one branch of national service; but even in Central Europe, where the *Kultur-ministerium* looms larger than our Board of Education, division of authority is accepted. Thus, as regards the armed forces, the deciding factor is the unique quality of corporate life on a battle-ship or in a battalion. The autocratic disposition fostered by military control, which 'institutionalizes' officers and men to an exceptional degree, is certainly to be deplored; but it is an inevitable outcome of the institution of war, and cannot permit of interference by other departments of government, although to an increasing degree the soldier avails himself of civilian aid in his schemes of education, and no doubt the War Office and the Admiralty exchange views with the Board of Education. This principle, however, need not apply to the functions of the Home Office (p. 130), for when once the magistrate has passed sentence on children and young persons, their career should be the concern of that branch of government which deals not with police but with education. The

[1] Compare references in earlier chapters (Table of Contents and Index).

same opinion would separate poor-law children (p. 143) from the control of the Board of Health and of Guardians. The principle is clear: while the aims of military life postulate a separate control, the aims of the educator with these groups of children should be to banish from their minds those class distinctions which keep them apart from the rest of the civilian population. Opinion is moving in this direction, for already the Board of Education takes a hand both in consultation and in inspection; but here is a case where a transfer of authority seems in place, for, with the best of intentions on the part of officers of State, the 'taint' of a workhouse or of a prison cannot be removed so long as the administration is conjoined with those who manage the life of these children along with the adult criminals and paupers.[1]

The Board of Education comes also under criticism, especially by the teaching profession, in respect of its composition; both parliamentary chiefs and the permanent officials are charged with a lamentable ignorance of education. I dare say the charge can be sometimes sustained; and a similar reflection has often been cast on other departments of State. Was it not a Prime Minister who, during the course of the Seven Years War, discovered that Cape Breton was an island? It is therefore proposed to constitute what is called a 'real' Board, containing experts, professional and lay, who know the business. In other words, it is desired to remove education from the forms of administration adopted in other departments of government, as a sacred enterprise; but, if you do, you remove it out of politics. "So much

[1] This reform is set down only as a principle of policy. Even if I had the information I should not be concerned to criticize the efforts of Boards of Guardians or the like. As regards the Home Office the advances made in the administration of its educational work are admitted to be substantial and go as far as public opinion would warrant.

the better," replies the expert, and he would appeal with confidence to the present writer after reading Chapter III. But, on the contrary, I ask him to read on to Chapter VI, and admit that a man who meddles with education should hold the balance between *all* the institutions which affect the scholar's life; and, for that matter, I would look with no less confidence to a President of the Board or to a civil servant to cherish the supreme ends of education than I would to a Bishop or a schoolmaster. "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!" No; we do not extend the influence of ideals by treating public men and officials as secular and confined to mundane affairs; if our ideals are worth anything they should be common property, and, instead of looking for an exclusive display of professional wisdom and virtue in this one department of State, we should seek to extend these throughout the body politic, and thus, with politicians and officials soundly educated, we should have less anxiety in seeing them handle affairs of culture and social welfare. Still, it will be urged, you will surely expect a special experience in school affairs from men who discharge these high responsibilities? Again I dissent, and I adhere to the general practice of public life, which keeps the expert to his rôle as adviser and subordinates him to executive control, which in turn must obey the Legislature. There are, of course, exceptions; an expert may sometimes turn out to be a fine administrator and even a statesman; the names of Bryce and Arthur Acland are distinguished examples of university teachers who have played a statesman's part in English politics, and have rendered conspicuous service to education because they were much more than teachers. (The reader may think of others who have never been to college, well qualified to render equal service if the opportunity came their way.) All that we ask, both of officials and politicians, is that they

should execute their duties with a sincere belief in the work ; but that the nation looks for in all its servants.

When this is granted we may recognize distinctions between different grades. The Board of Education consists of parliament men, and they cannot get our wishes fulfilled unless they know the arts of (British) government. Their officials are administrators, and they must know the art, if not the science, of administration. When they begin their work as young civil servants they need know as little of the job as other men and women who can pass the qualifying examination : experience gives them the knowledge they want, and if belief and enthusiasm grow they will find their own occasions for study. I hazard the opinion that this interest grows among the education officials of all authorities up and down the country ; comparison with other Departments of State would be invidious. It is this specific acquaintance with his own Department that distinguishes one officer, whether at Whitehall or at the Town Hall, from the officers of another Department. All alike cultivate the personality that marks the good administrator, viz. the judicial frame of mind. From the men in the field, the inspectors, one looks for something more ; nowadays a man is seldom appointed to this branch of the service unless he has actually done school work.[1] A teacher is justified in looking for expert knowledge in those who visit his school to assess his work.

As regards the powers and duties of the Board, these have come under notice at every point where we have considered the functions of the State in education. Efforts have often been made to define these powers and duties, but in vain. The law constituting the Board (1899) avoided putting any limit upon the range : it used the term 'superintendence,' which implies

[1] Graham Balfour, loc. cit., I, 1, a.

undefined supremacy, within the limits prescribed by other measures of Parliament or of customs which a court of law would uphold. Authorities and individuals who have relations with the officers of the Board may accuse the latter of taking action which is beyond the scope of 'superintendence' and may protest; but the only remedy, if they cannot persuade, is to voice their grievance through representatives in Parliament. The legal limitation on its powers were specified in the Acts of 1902, 1907, 1918, etc., where the powers and duties of the L.E.A. were laid down; and it has also to respect the functions of the Privy Council and of the other State Departments mentioned above. I presume that sometimes the educational functions of these Departments are also specified in Acts of Parliament; but I have not looked them up, for they are only of interest to the special student of politics. In any case, "dog does not eat dog" in public: we know, e.g., what difficulties were created when the Ministry of Labour engaged in educational enterprise which at other times would have been in the hands of the Board of Education; but these domestic differences are usually and very properly composed within doors.

Within these limits, I take it, the Board is supreme, for no doctrine of national government can evade the constitutional position of state supremacy. Some duties it *must* discharge; many others it can undertake if it is so disposed. As national representative of the people's will in education, it deliberates and researches, prepares the ground for legislation, administers and superintends, in response to the general desire for progress. If it neglects to make this response it is not complying with the spirit of the Acts which have endowed it with power; but, apart from the mastery of Parliament, no one can challenge the rights of the central government. Its mission, in the

field of education, is to give scope to all citizens and all other authorities who seek in education the path to a finer mode of life.

International Education.—We have now reviewed all the forms of authority which extend their jurisdiction over young folk in England and Wales: the same principles of organization have been at work in the neighbouring nations of Scotland and Ireland[1] and the daughter nations of the commonwealth. I have made no reference to them in these pages, because the exposition of principles is best achieved by taking one's illustrations from the home field. Scotland, with an educational history all its own, has done much to influence the course of development in England, and although Ireland has followed a course still more her own, I cannot but think that the experience of English statesmen in dealing with Irish education influenced them a good deal in handling the most thorny problem that confronted them in both countries up to 1902—I mean the relations between the institutions of religion and of the State. It will be recalled that the Act of 1902 was due to a Prime Minister who had been for some years an Irish Secretary. The Education Act recently passed by the Northern Parliament of Ireland would serve as a useful commentary on all these chapters.

When one goes farther afield to Canada or the nations under the Southern Cross one sees how diligently the leaders of education in those Dominions have followed the steps taken in the homeland, and sometimes, to my view, adhered to them too closely. In India the stamp of British education was imposed (especially by Macaulay and his contemporaries) with a confidence which we can no longer entertain in the sufficiency of European in-

[1] Graham Balfour, loc. cit., takes Great Britain and Ireland into his survey; but the scene has changed since 1902.

stitutions when confronted with the wisdom of the East. All these nations are still united under the supremacy of the King in Council, a rule which extends to education along with all other business of the State; but no attempt has been or could be made to standardize educational procedure, even if that were thought desirable. The only sphere for co-operation is in the preliminary field of inquiry and deliberation which I have included as essential to progress in government. From the '90s onwards we see this exchange of ideas developing, sometimes under official patronage in imperial conferences, still more through voluntary associations such as the Universities Bureau of the British Empire; the most recent step, the exchange of teachers, goes further, for it places teachers of one nation for the time being under the education authorities of another.

When we pass beyond the bounds of our commonwealth of nations, we find that the influence of foreign conceptions of education upon England began at a much earlier date (p. 76), and proved a wholesome check upon national conceit. Indeed, the modesty of some teachers led them to believe that England had everything to learn from Europe and nothing to teach. There was certainly much to learn: Kay-Shuttleworth was a disciple of Fellenberg and Pestalozzi, and it would have been well for his successors if they had sought such enlightenment; Matthew Arnold taught the country the meaning of secondary education, in the light of his journeys in France and Germany. In the '90s the value of comparative studies came to be fully realized; Mr. Bryce sent his Assistant Commissioners east and west to gather reports, and Mr. Sadler, from his office in Whitehall, left no channel of information unexplored. The example was not lost on the teaching profession itself; while most of us took such excursions in order to get at principles concerned

with curriculum and method, we found that organization also could be rescued from 'chaos'[1] by taking thought. Finally, these travels became authorized and were supported by funds. Nor was this pursuit wholly one-sided; even in the '40s Dr. Wiese had discovered Rugby and told Germany about the English conception of corporate life in schools; and nowadays many visitors from all over the world acknowledge that we are not wholly a nation of barbarians. Statesmen and citizens encourage these international studies because they know that chauvinism can only be defeated when scholars are educated by teachers who know the world; for the purposes of Organization, with which we are here concerned, the value is no more and no less than that secured by comparative research in every branch of political science. It is by no means necessary that the explorer should set down in report or print the results of his inquiry; often enough he could not do so, for the process works largely in the subconscious. I need not labour the point; those who are content to sit at home will not walk abroad for my bidding; Bacon long ago said the right thing.[2]

In the last four years the world has taken a new step in International Education. The League of Nations has realized that the best way to breed out the vice of war is to occupy men's minds with worthier thoughts: "the expulsive power of a new affection" is[3] being tested on the international scale. The cause of child-welfare has already given matter for deliberation at Geneva, and history here repeats itself, for our national authority controlled the attendance of women and children in factories before it made a start with general education.

[1] The fashionable term twenty years ago to disparage our system, or lack of system, in England.

[2] Essay *On Travel.*

[3] A fine phrase from Thomas Chalmers.

It is neither likely nor desirable that this, or any other international agency, should trespass on state prerogative; but, with the example of the federal Bureau of Education before us (p. 223), we can readily picture what an enormous influence the League might exercise in education if it were widely supported as a world-centre for counsel and report, which the nations would support, throwing their resources into the common stock.

With this glimpse into the future we complete the circle; at this moment in Geneva a visitor will find investigators collating data in law and organization gathered from all over the earth, next door to the institutes conducted by Claparède and Dalcroze who busy themselves with the nature and need of children.[1] The organizer and the teacher too often live in separate worlds, and regard each other's labours with distrust. But here, by a happy chance, they are found side by side, although their efforts are unrelated; side by side in a country which has no enemies, and which gave us Rousseau and Pestalozzi to renew the foundations of education. The coincidence is but the image of a future harmony, when the teacher, watching the development of a single soul, will join hands with the statesman, watching the evolution of a world of souls. The day will come; we are only at the dawn.

In England, if not abroad, this separation has been pronounced: it looks as if we could only keep one aspect of education in mind at a time. During the thirty years from, say, 1894 to the present time, the majority of active minds engaged in education have turned to the organization rather than the practice of education,[2] for they

[1] The J.-J. Rousseau Institute of Pedagogics and the Jacques Dalcroze Institute of Eurhythmics.

[2] This refers only to men; women teachers have not been drawn in this direction to anything like the same extent. And see Note II below.

felt that all the resources of politics must be summoned if the work of scholars and teachers was to bear good fruit. The problems which will engage our attention in the second volume were by comparison disregarded. Teachers in all grades welcomed the chance of service as inspectors, committee-men, secretaries, if only as an escape from conditions within their schools which offered little satisfaction to energetic minds. I believe that this period is drawing to a close ; a balance has now been struck between the inner and the outer aspects of education ; organization will suffer further change, school practice will not stand still, but the gulf between them is being bridged. For without question the work of organization has been well done, and when the history of the period comes to be written this verdict will be endorsed. Teachers of the genuine type, who would always rather be with students and children than in committee-rooms, should not be impatient at the long delay, or even at the seeming obstructiveness of red-tape. This mountainous load of boards and laws, of conferences and reports, was all necessary: even the waste, which was sometimes prodigal. I have, therefore, felt justified in devoting a large part of this volume to principles of organization in the belief that both teachers and educationists[1] are ready to apply their minds to the social and political ideas on which the structure is based. In the second volume we shall enter the school doors and take up threads which we dropped in Chapter V.

[1] A monstrous term, coined during this period, which one avoids when possible ; but who will furnish a substitute ?

NOTE I

JUVENILE UNEMPLOYMENT

(To p. 148)

On Feb. 24, 1925, the House of Commons resolved, "That it is desirable that all possible steps should be taken to prevent the demoralization consequent upon juvenile unemployment"—a striking confirmation of what is said on p. 148 above. The Board of Education is seeking around for methods by which oversight can be ensured for the multitude who leave school at fourteen years of age without employment, and the President, Lord Eustace Percy, expressed the hope that Parliament would give power to Local Authorities to compel the attendance of all young persons who are under sixteen years of age, *and are out of employment*, at some place of education. It may be worth while to offer some comment on the situation, for it will certainly claim a large share of public attention during the next few years, and may possibly raise questions of acute controversy.

In the first place, many teachers and some administrators object on principle to any form of part-time education. They would request the Legislature to meet the unemployment difficulty by raising the compulsory leaving age to fifteen or sixteen all over the country. To the organizer this is an easy solution : he much prefers to have the young wholly under his supervision, without dividing his control with that exerted by employers. And he distrusts (often with good reason) the quality of the education provided in the factory and shop, which are not mainly concerned with the benefit of society, but with individual profit.

They should, however, note that the proposals now being considered by the Government do not conflict with the policy of extending the compulsory leaving age : compulsion for the unemployed young person during part-time may well be viewed as the first step towards the more complete compulsion that is their

ideal. It is evident enough that this policy is only an ideal at the present time: the public mind, both among the working class and the employer class, is a long way from assent to any extension of the compulsory inferior limit for whole-time schooling.

The extension of whole-time compulsion to fifteen or sixteen would in fact leave the problem of part-time versus whole-time exactly where it is now, except that the time of transition between school and industry would be postponed to an older leaving age. The employer, in the great majority of industries, wants a number of young people who, for a year or two, are doing somewhat inconsequential work; if he does not get such help at fourteen, he must take it on at sixteen. So the half-time or part-time problem will still have to be faced, only the age will be sixteen instead of fourteen; similar difficulties of unemployment and of division of responsibility between school and industry will still confront the nation.

The legislation which Lord Eustace Percy foreshadows is an extension of the powers of the L.E.A. [The Act of 1918 empowered every L.E.A. to compel young persons, whether in or out of employment, to attend school for an average of 320 hours per year, before 7 p.m. Only one such Authority, namely Rugby in Warwickshire, has adhered to that clause of the Act of 1918, and it may be hoped that this remarkable exception will be fully reported upon for the public benefit.] The new proposal will give them power to enforce attendance for any number of hours, provided (*a*) that the young person is out of employment, and (*b*) that the attendance does not prevent him from securing employment. Let us see what is involved in this change.

Firstly, this proposal follows the example of the Act of 1918, and leaves the L.E.A. to decide whether it will enforce the new rule or no. Now we ought to cherish the rights of locality (pp. 102–108) above), but the experience of what happened in London and elsewhere shows that compulsion to attend is a power that cannot with success be imposed in one area while it is declined in neighbouring areas. The demoralization deprecated by the House of Commons is a national evil: no locality should be permitted to neglect its juvenile unemployed, but all should be required to join in finding a remedy for a ***national*** misfortune.

The cost should not be divided between L.E.A. and Whitehall on the 50–50 principle (p. 186), for the locality is not responsible for the decline in industry which has created the liability. The new law will, therefore, have to be imposed on all families throughout the land, if it is to achieve the purpose of its advocates.

Secondly, the law must define 'employment.' This in itself shows the necessity of making the compulsion national from the start. For a Local Authority can only supervise the doings of young persons within its own area, and if the home (on which compulsion is imposed) is in one area, while the industries where employment is sought and found are situated over the boundary, in a non-compulsion area, the task of administration will be intensified. I do not think the difficulties of defining employment for the purposes of this Act will be insuperable, but they will not be easily mastered. They will involve an inquisition by the L.E.A. into the activities of all sorts of small businesses, some of them domestic and semi-domestic, which may be expected to resent the inquisition, especially as the inquiry implies the registration of the employment as being such as comes within the terms of the Act. For,

Thirdly, the carrying out of the clause implies what I hold to be the one great step in advance for which it is worth while to enforce it. Every young person throughout England will henceforth (assuming that the proposal becomes law) be under public supervision and receive the necessary guidance and care of 'authority' up to sixteen years of age. As soon as he leaves school (public or private, be it noted) at the age of fourteen the L.E.A., which already has his name enrolled on the register of some school, transfers his name to the 14–16 register, and for the ensuing two years keeps track of him. If the boy or girl goes at once to a job, the employment is registered and (assuming it to be genuine employment, as defined by the law or by consequent by-laws), no further action is taken ; but, if he leaves the job, the L.E.A. intervenes, and requires him to attend school again.

Fourthly, when these legal aspects of the registration and control are dealt with, the problem of how to educate the young person during these weeks or months of enforced 'idleness' will need great consideration. The experiments already made here and there have been disappointing in the extreme ; they serve at

least to show that a mere extension of the curriculum of the elementary school will be of little service. The problem is not one of curriculum so much as of personal guidance and stimulus : —the best work of Lads' Clubs, Boy Scout and Girl Guide troops (p. 166) probably affords a safer indication of what is needed than anything that has so far been attempted. The teacher for these unemployed should, in fact, be as much a 'social worker' as a teacher trained for the regular school service. And I cannot but think that some association with the voluntary efforts of good Sunday-schools, in their senior departments, would be wise, making use, where feasible, of Sunday-school buildings throughout the week. Such organization would have this great advantage, that the young people, when leaving the temporary school to enter on work, would not be lost sight of, but would retain social contact with their teachers. It is well known that many of them only remain in their first employment a few weeks or months ; the task of getting them back to school for another breathing-space before obtaining new work will be immensely facilitated if the school is a sort of institute to which they are continuously attached by affection, as well as by the compulsions of attendance officers.

No doubt a great distrust still prevails (often, alas, too well founded) of the association of religious corporations with the work of L.E.A. Committees, but compromise has been achieved before (see pp. 86 and 120 ff.), and, if the need is felt, a way out will be found again. For it is clear enough that what the adolescent desires above all (p. 68) is the guidance of an elder friend, tutor rather than official teacher, whose influence will touch the springs of the inner life. And, while one has no right to say that such guides cannot be found among those whom State Authorities are likely to appoint, it is quite certain that a system of control instituted wholly by State functionaries is likely to be least effective in the sphere of unorganized personal relationships, such as should play the chief rôle in the care of young persons. One fears that very few religious corporations recognize the urgency of this call to duty : it is for them to offer a helping hand, to show their willingness to be pioneers in a new realm of educational adventure, as their forerunners were in the earlier stages of elementary education a century ago.

Fifthly, some difficulty may be experienced in adjusting the relation between the Juvenile Labour Exchange and the education proposed under this scheme. The idea, as Lord Eustace Percy says, is 'simple,' but the execution will be complex, and will defeat its own end unless the Ministry of Labour (p. 254) and the Board of Education can devise between them a harmonious scheme.

Finally, a word of warning is needed against proposals to associate national insurance with the duty of registration of and control over adolescents. It may be right or wrong to include juvenile labour within the province of insurance; but the principles on which the State assumes a measure of authority over employer and parent in control of young persons has no concern with wages or deductions from a wage. This association has already created difficulties in some areas where young persons of sixteen years of age are being compelled to return to school when 'on the dole,' after being absent from school for two years.

References.—I ought to acknowledge my obligation here to former colleagues, writers of papers in *The Young Wage-Earner* (Sidgwick and Jackson, 1918), and also to an unpublished thesis by a former student, Mr. George Guest, Deputy-Director of Education, Manchester (see p. 235 in *The Children of England*).

*

NOTE II

THE TREND OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

(To pp. 157 and 259)

It may be well to enlarge a little on the last paragraph of this book, for, as will be seen from the Preface, it presents a review of experience through which the writer has lived ; and we have now reached a time when the end can be seen from the beginning. It is fairly correct to say that in the '80s of the last century there was no research in Education : a few enthusiasts made contributions, here and there in the training colleges efforts were being made, but the three groups which would naturally foster such studies were openly indifferent, and even contemptuous of the value of what is sometimes called 'theory.' The first group, the teaching profession itself, could scarcely be called a profession, for those of its members who possessed the requisite attainments (p. 158) had no training, and those who received training in the colleges designed for that purpose fell sadly short in attainments.[1]

The second group, the organs of Government at Whitehall and in the localities, were equally indifferent, and had scarcely begun to realize that problems in Education merited the same care in research that was bestowed upon Medicine or Technology. Universities, which compose the third group, were equally unconcerned. Except for a Teachers' Examination instituted at Cambridge, along with a few lectures (see p. 210), there was no trace of interest in pedagogics, although in foreign countries the

[1] There had been slight attempts at reform. The College of Preceptors was designed (1846) to advance the profession on lines analogous to those of the College of Physicians, but it soon found that its chief sphere of activity would lie in the conduct of examinations for schoolboys and school-girls.

study had received some attention in university quarters right through the nineteenth century.

These strictures on the indifference of groups and corporations must not be taken to imply that no one engaged in teaching or in administration took pains before 1890 to think about such work, or to write upon it. There were a few books to be had, going back to the Renascence, with Erasmus and Ascham, or earlier, and ending with Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, Thring, Fitch, Quick, to mention a few names of authors who were read. But one must distinguish study from research. I take it that research is just a more elaborate and organized kind of study. The researcher usually works either under direction or in the company of fellow students engaged in his own or in allied departments of study; he holds himself responsible for surveying what has already been arrived at in his chosen field, and he produces sooner or later some statement of results. Furthermore (and this constituted the chief hindrance to effective research in Education) he brings his work into relation to larger, more fundamental, studies.

Now it has taken this period of roughly forty years to establish Education as a respected field of research in this sense of the word 'research,' i.e. as distinguished from empirical or disconnected studies. To-day one can look in each of the quarters referred to above and see signs of genuine advance. As regards the teaching profession there are not a few men and women, actively engaged in teaching or administration, who give their leisure time to advanced study in education, often in co-operation with a University Department of Education, exactly as some medical men, clergy, or scientific men do when they have 'gone down' from college. In another respect there has been a still more marked change. Hundreds of the most reputable secondary schools now welcome students-in-training, sent to them either by the Universities or through the agency of Whitehall. I say 'welcome' advisedly, for until recently they were tolerated but scarcely accepted as colleagues. The change has been most marked in secondary schools: in the primary schools it had come at an earlier date. The significance of this change can scarcely be exaggerated, for you cannot thrust study and research upon a profession any more than upon an individual. So long as the

teachers themselves were satisfied with their attainments, and declined to regard the calling as open to investigation, neither the State nor the Universities could effect much; but as the general body of teachers come to a sincere belief in these studies the rate of progress will be greatly accelerated.

In University Departments the study of Education obtained entry by a side-wind, so to speak, in the early '90s. It suited both the Board of Education (of that day) and the provincial colleges (which were on the road to becoming Universities) to receive a number of aspirants for the work of elementary teaching within the larger body of students. The ground for admission was that it would be a great advantage for these young people to enjoy university teaching in Arts or Science (Arts was mostly in favour at first). The professional training was not regarded as of great importance, and was assumed to be adequately looked after by a junior member of the staff, called Master or Mistress of Method. As the work expanded it was found necessary to put it in the hands of more important people and in the newer Universities Chairs of Education were established. Some of the advocates for this advance were genuinely anxious to promote the study of the subject on lines accepted for other university departments, i.e. they believed that Education or Pedagogics was a proper field for research, and that professors of education would enter upon it with the intention of being something more than foster-parents to young scholars. It is worth noticing, however, that another view was entertained, and avowed quite frankly in some cases by vice-chancellors and principals. They were sceptical about research in education, but realized that university staffs needed supplementing by men of capacity, who could both handle the Day Training College and could lend a hand in the multiplied relations which sprang up between a new or provincial University and the various schools and authorities in its neighbourhood. A double task was, therefore, thrown upon these professors: as colleagues of men of eminence in various departments of research they could not help being stimulated to study of the subject in which they held a 'chair'; but they had, at the same time, to fulfil all sorts of duties of an administrative nature. In spite of this handicap a great deal of reputable research has been undertaken; and it

may be now safely asserted that members of Education Departments in Universities (if not in Training Colleges) will be expected to take rank side by side with all other university teachers as capable of advancing the studies appropriate to their profession. There is still no doubt considerable distrust of the whole business in academic circles—distrust similar to that witnessed in earlier days when Science first asserted its claims to academic prestige on an equality with Arts. But the atmosphere has changed : partly because it has become clear that the pursuit of ' Education ' as a specific study by school teachers can only advance by the aid of scholarship and research in other branches of learning. Education is not a study that can be evolved *in vacuo* ; it can only find a firm foundation on the basis of progress in philosophy and history, in psychology and physiology, in medicine and law.

The third group which might have been expected to promote this study was the State, in its Central and Local Authorities. The development here has been of unusual interest, for a revolution has been effected without those concerned realizing what they were doing. This is perhaps an exaggeration, for the first Director of Inquiries and Reports (see p. 222) was fully aware of the importance to the State of an organized department for research into problems of administration. But the circumstances under which Mr. (now Sir Michael) Sadler left the Government service in 1903[1] showed that Authorities were by no means prepared to establish for public use a machinery by which the study of Public Education could be promoted under Government auspices. What has happened in the intervening years is that the Board of Education itself, its inspectors and other officials, have themselves become, on their own behalf, serious students of Education. A great deal of the work of research done at Whitehall is of necessity confidential, and I can write of it with no more knowledge than that of the general public, but the published reports and documents issued in recent years, if compared with the scanty and superficial stuff produced in the '80s, is evidence enough. There were certainly a few exceptions in the old days : Moseley, Kay-Shuttleworth, Matthew Arnold may be recalled. Here again, as in the

[1] *Vide* Report to the House of Commons of that date.

instance of the Universities, the example of other State Departments has no doubt acted as a spur ; the spirit of the times has made a call upon the intelligence and research of public officials which was only occasionally displayed in the last century.

The situation at the Board of Education has been paralleled in the provinces : the clerks to the School Boards of the '80s were excellent clerks ; the secretaries and directors of to-day are usually men who know Education, studying it as keenly as the schoolmasters.

I must not extend this note into an essay : a book might well be written to survey the advances which have been made since Bain published his now forgotten volume on *Education as a Science* (1870).

The point I have made in the text (pp. 258-9) is, however, worth elaboration. I am convinced that in days to come the years from 1894[1] to, say, 1908 will be recognized as a period of unique activity, as regards study and research in the organization of English Education.

[1] Bryce Commission.

END OF VOL. I

INDEX

abnormal children, *see* defectives
abstinence in exercising control, 99–101
Acland, Arthur H. D., 252
Acts of Parliament:
(1870) 120, 126
(1899) 155, 162, 223, 246
(1902) 87, 103, 153, 222, 226, 236, 246, 248, 254
(1903) 248
(1907) 254
(1918) 1, 67, 97, 103, 114, 137, 147, 185, 193, 232, 238, 254
(1921) 185
Adams, John, 3, 75, 207
Adamson, 114, 119
administrative duties, 192, 230, 253
admission, 201
adolescence, 67–70, 91
Adults' Education, 3–5, 138, 146, 166
adults, 5
advice, organized, chap. xi
right to offer, 162
advisory bodies, 234–235
Agassiz, 58
Air Force, education in, 124, 250
American education, 83, 84, 121, 125, 134, 147, 182, 193, 195, 213, 215, 216, 223, 234, 240, 246, 258
anthropology, 58
appetites, 47
apprenticeship, 89–91, 148
Army, education in, 124, 250
Arnold, Matthew, 51, 256, 268
Arnold, Thomas, 39, 60, 68, 69, 244
Arscott, Miss C., 240
Art, 48–50
art teachers and universities, 172
artists, their aims, 15
Ascham, 112
association, in a technical sense, 31, 110
association of teachers, 154
attainments, 158, 161 169, 264
attendance, 111, 262
officer, 111, 201, 263
Australia, back-blocks, 112, 197
authorities defined, 31
five forms of, 231

Bacon, Francis, 257
Badley, J. H., 142
Bain, Alexander, 269
Balfour, Graham, 208, 222, 253, 255
Ballard, P., 216
Barker, Ernest, 96, 107
benefactors, 175–180, 194, 198, 199
Bentham, Jeremy, 90
Binet, 20, 216
boarding-schools, 79, 140–144, 241
body-mind, 46
Bose, 50
Boy Scouts, 144, 166, 245, 263
Bradford, Yorks, 240
British School Society, 118, 245
Brown, Elmer, 223
Browning, Robert, 15, 43, 56, 60
Bryce, Viscount, 107, 252, 256, 264
Commission, 76, 118, 154, 229, 264
budget for Education, 183
for a school, 175
Burnham scales, 188–191
Burt, Cyril, 216
Butler, N. M., 58
Butler, Dr., Master of Trinity, 118

Caldecott Community, 143
Cambridge, 198, 210, 234, 246
canal-boat children, 202
caste, 20
central schools, 134
certificates, school, 212, 220, 234 (*see* Leaving Examinations)
citizenship, 51, 97
civil servants, 253
civilization, 31
Claparède, 258
class, 20, 82–86, 150, 168–170, 242, 251
Clay, Henry, 161
clergy as non-professional teachers, 167

clerical work by teachers, 192
Cockerton judgment, 108
co-education, 150
commerce and education, 92, 115, 242
community, 31, 103
comparative education, 76, 256
comprehension, 89, 120
compulsion, 137, 148, 203, 263
conflicts of institutions, chap. vi and 230
conservatism, 25–28, 82, 88, 118
continued education, 124, 139, 145, 149
convention, 52
Cook, Caldwell, 66
Cooley, 243
co-opted membership, 227
Copec, 225
corporation (technical term), 31
correspondence teaching, 146
cottage homes, 143
cotton trade, 149
Council (provided) school, 119
Cowper-Temple clause, 120
crime and education, 130
culture as an institution, 92–95, 242
culture-epoch theories, 57
curricula, 138–140
Curwen, 66

Dalcroze, 66, 67, 258
Dalton Plan, 1, 22
Darwin, 16, 17
deaf, education of the, 129
defectives, 5, 128, 132, 218, 237
deficit, 198
deliberation, organized, *see* discussion
development, individual, chap. v
Dewey, John, 15, 40, 65
Dicey, 22, 123
diplomas for teachers, 188
discharge from school, 201
discipline, defined, 52
discussion, 31, 229, 235, 248, 256
Dissenting Academies, 113
division of labour, 12
Dominions, British, 255
drawing in the Leaving Certificate, 212

economics and ethics, 11
  of education, chap. ix
educand, 3
Education, Board of, 162, 202, 211, 222, 238, 246–254, 268
  and the L.E.A., 184–187
Education, Board of—*continued*
  Consultative Committee Reports, 52, 57, 151, 162, 223
  Suggestions, 14, 136, 206, 212, 214
education, defined, 2–5, 32
  division of study, 6
Education Society, The, 155
  Week, 225
employment exchanges, 212, 264
endowed schools, 117, 175, 198
endowments for scholarships, 194
eugenics, 16–21, 47, 216
examining boards, 214, 246
Examination Council, 220, 246
Examinations, defects of, 212–215
  Leaving, 207, 211–221
  Local, 208
Executive (technical term), 31, 229
experience, teacher's, 158, 161, 188

faculty training, so-called, 53, 213
family, 77–82, 233, 237
fees, 180–183, 194
Fellenberg, 256
France, 121, 123, 141, 193
Follett, 30, 109
free education, 182
free places, 195
freedom, 19, 29, 30, 44, 68, 118, 183
  spiritual, 52, 206
Freud, 40, 47
Friends' Schools, 142, 150
Froebel, 40, 62, 64
functions of education authorities, 108, 109

Galton, Francis, 16, 21, 128
"Geddes Axe," 153, 173, 186, 187, 224
Geddes, Patrick, 111
Geneva, 258
Gentile, The Reform of Education, 34, 37
Germany, 111, 123, 139, 141, 213, 215, 219, 250, 257
gifts in aid of schooling, 176
Girl Guides, 145, 166, 245, 263
Girls' Public Day Schools Trust, 115, 116, 122, 245
Gomme, Lawrence, 182
Gorell, Lord, 125
Gott, Sir B., 185
governing bodies, 235
grades of attainment, 133
grants-in-aid, 116, 119, 183, 184, 186, 195, 198, 201
group, defined, 31
Guild theories, 161

Haldane, J. S., 79
Half-timers, 81
Hall, Stanley, 57, 64, 68
Handicraft, 67
Harmony, 38, 56, and chap. v
Health, Board of, 251
Henley, 56
Herbart, 29, 39, 43, 53, 112
Herbartian pedagogics, 57
Herbert, George, 14
Heuristic Method, 44
Hey, Spurley, 185
Hobhouse, L. T., 8, 31, 32
Home lessons, 203
  school, 110–113
Home office, 250, 251
Homer, 43
homogeneity, 87
Hornsey County School, 240
Houses in Public Schools, 197
Hull, city of, 178
Hullah, John, 66
Humanism, 43

incentives applied to teachers, 187–9, 207
  to attendance of scholars, 202
indentured teachers, 173
independent schools, 99, 177–180
India, 255
individuality, 22, 23, 28, 30, 38, 86
Industrial Revolution, 89
Industrial School, 143, 203
infancy, 48, 49, 51, 58, 62, 64
Inheritance of " characters," 16–18
inner and outer, 35–45
inspection, 206–210, 253
Institutions, defined, 31, 50; represented, chap. xii
intelligence, 52–55
Intelligence Department, 222
Intelligence Tests, 19, 53, 215–17
International Education, 255
Ireland, 255

James, William, 38, 65
Jung, 10, 36, 40, 54
juristic person, 31

Kay-Shuttleworth, 154, 256, 268
Keatinge, M. W., 30
Keble, 12
Kent, L.E.A., 163
Kerschensteiner, 58

labour, manual, 196
Labour Colleges, 138, 147, 245
Labour, Ministry of, 249, 254, 264
Lads' Clubs, 166, 263
ladder, educational, 193, 197
Lambourn, 66
" lay " teachers, *see* non-professional teachers.
League of Nations and child welfare, 257
" leavers," 212
Leaving Examinations, 207, 211–221
legislation, 32
leisure, education for, 11
" liberal " education, 139
libraries, education, 222
literature, its appeal, 43
locality, 102–108, 118, 187, 227–237, 248
Local Education Authority, 108, 114, 124, 184–7, 201, 202, 222, 226, 232, 246–249, 254, 263
  Committees, 227, 235, 236
Locke, John, 62, 112
London C.C. Ed. Committee, 124, 225, 248
  University, 246

Macaulay and India, 255
MacIver, 31, 32
maintenance, scholarships for, 195
managers, 235–245
Manchester, L.E.A., 163
Martineau, Harriet, 16
Marvin, F. G., 24
Mason, the late Miss Charlotte, 113, 239
Massingham, 49
Mechanics' Institutes, 4
Medicine and education, 128–131, 190, 191, 204
Middlesex, L.E.A., 163, 240, 241
migration and locality, 106
  of teachers, 190
  of families, 202
mneme, 25, 58
Montessori, 22, 62, 64
moral instruction, 120
morals and education, 29, 50, 51
Mosely, 268
music teachers and universities, 172
music in the Leaving Certificate, 212

National School Society, 118, 245
  Union of Teachers, 154, 159, 192
Navy, education in, 124, 250
Newman, J. H., 246
New Zealand, 84, 112
non-professional teachers, 145, 164, 164–167
non-provided schools, 87, 119, 136, 178, 244, 248

non-State schools, 198
Nunn, T. P., 22, 23, 25, 56, 64

officials, 31, 228–230
opportunity, 193, 197
organization, defined, 31
orphanages, 143, 178
oversight, chap. x
ownership of schools and colleges, 110–127
Oxford, 198, 234, 235, 246

parents and school rules, 203
parent as teacher, 111
parents, as a group, 237–239
Parents' Evenings, 240
Parents' Leagues, 80, 239
  N.E. Union, 113
  summoned, 201
parents with wealth, 198
Parkes, Irene, 114
Part-time Education, 123–149, 230
penal reform, 130
Percy, Lord Eustace, 260
persons, 31
personality, 36, 61, 227
Pestalozzi, 62, 237, 256, 258
physical education, 46–48
physiology and child study, 57
play, 62, 196
Plato, 15
poetry, 49
Poor Law Guardians, 143, 251
pragmatism, 65
precocity, 59
Preceptors, College of, 154
preparatory schools, 197
Press, the, and education, 225, 229
principal teacher, 192
  in private schools, 233
in secondary schools, 233
prisoners, education of, 5, 130
private schools, 83, 113, 180, 183, 197, 202, 232
  tuition, 83, 113, 188
Privy Council, 123, 126, 249, 254
professional training and privileges, 90, 91
professions, aims of, 9, 14
profit, 198
progress, 24–26, 30, 38, 41, 45
  of scholars, 201, 204
property, 77, 227, 231
proprietary schools, 115, 197
provinces and counties, 106, 127
psycho-analysis, 41
psychology, genetic chap. v
Public Schools, working-class boys in, 144
  governing bodies of, 241

rates, 183–186
Raymont, T., 216
Reconstruction, 186
Reformatory schools, 143
religion and education, 29, 37, 42, 86–89, 119–122, 242, 263
reporting function, chap. xi
representation, 226–228
  of parents, 241
research, under Government auspices, 125
  in education, 265
resistance to authority in education, 102
retardation, 60
Rivers, the late Dr., 40
Roman Catholic boarding-schools, 150
Roscoe, Frank, 184
Rota, of L.E. Committees, 201
Rousseau, 258
Royal College (Art and Science), 123
rules, school, 203

Sadler, M. E., 76, 222, 256, 268
salaries, 187–190
Sandiford, Peter, 76
Schemes, 187
scholarships, British system of, 193, 197, 213
school, defined, 32
  as property, 110–127, 197
  types of, chap. vii
schooling, an institution, 31
science and spiritual values, 44
Scotland, 141, 255
Scott, R. P., 154
secondary education, 134–136
  schools, competition between, 184
  under inspection, 211
  self-government, 164, 224
self-governing authorities, 232, 245
Semon, 25
Sex education, 18, 19, 47
Sheffield, 244
Sheriff, Lawrence, founder of Rugby, 117
Sidgwick, Arthur, 210
Simon, 216
Smith, Adam, 115, 146, 176, 187, 194
Smith, Frank, 154
Smith, Dr. Hamlin, 130
social workers, 11
sociology and local government, 106, 243

sociology and school life, 141
Socrates, 36
specialists in learning, 93, 113
  in teaching, 165
Spencer, Herbert, 56
spiritual life, 36–39
stability, period of, 65
standards of attainment, 205
State, the, 51, 97–108, 179, 247–254
  and the parent, 80
statistics, 192, 224
Students' Council, 233
subscriptions, 178
substitution, 121
Suggestions to teachers, *see* Education, Board of
Sunday-schools, 144, 166, 263
  system, 1, 2, 6

tax, income, and education, 184
taxes, 183–186
teacher as Authority, 232, 235
teachers, chap. viii
teachers as examiners, 205, 215
Teachers' Guild, 155
  non-professional, 144, 164–168, 181
  societies, 154
Teachers' Registration Council, 155–162
teaching, as an institution, 93–96
technology, 90
Thring, Edward, 154
Thomson, J. A., 21, 26, 46
Thomson, W., 216
Thompson, Francis, 34
toleration, 88
trades unions and education, 92, 242
Traherne, 62
training of teachers, 119, 123, 158, 267
transition, periods of, 64, 133
Trevelyan, Charles, 169
trust deeds and trustees, 177–180
tutors, 112, 146

unemployment, juvenile, 148, 149, 262
Universities as representatives of culture, 94, 267
  and research under Government auspices, 126
  as chartered bodies, 126
  as education Authorities, 94, 127, 245
  and specialism, 139
  and co-education, 151
  on Teachers' Council, 159
  awarding degrees, 170–2
  receiving grants-in-aid, 195
  under visitation, 211, 248
  branding its own herrings, 205
  organization, 234
University Extension (extramural) 4, 138, 145

van-dwellers, children, 202
Veblen, 196
vocation, 47, 89, 131, 171
voluntary effort in education, 122, 248

wages and schooling, 197
Wales, 151, 250
Wallas, Graham, 122, 243
Webb, Sidney, 186
Weissman, 16
Wiese, 257
women and higher education, 173
Wordsworth, 62
Work, for children, 81
Workers' Educational Association, 147, 225, 245

Y.M.C.A. in the late war, 124
  and Y.W.C.A., 144
"young persons," 59, 67, 114, 148, 260–264