THE STRUGGLE FOR MORAL EDUCATION IN ENGLISH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS 1879-1918

SUSANNAH LISBET WRIGHT

OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the award of Doctor of Philosophy

November 2006

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines moral education in English elementary schools from 1879 to 1918. It investigates why there was widespread interest in character formation in the elementary school at this time but not support for one particular sort of programme. It investigates how moral education was perceived, approached, and implemented by the education department, the general public, School Board and Education Committee members, and teachers in schools, offering a comprehensive and detailed investigation into these issues. Much of the study focuses on one distinctive approach to moral education in this period – secular moral instruction. A range of sources are interrogated, allowing access to the different, but sometimes overlapping, perspectives of policy-makers, educationalists, the organisations and individuals who promoted moral education (particularly the Moral Instruction League, George Dixon and FJ Gould), authors of teaching material, and inspectors and head teachers in schools. Chapters One to Three have an England-wide focus. Chapters Four to Six discuss local studies of Birmingham and Leicester which allow a detailed analysis of educational policy-making, activism and practice in schools. This thesis concludes that moral educators were energetic, skilful at promotion, and engaged in innovative curriculum development. Nevertheless, they faced a range of ideological, political and practical barriers and were ultimately unable to translate generalised interest in character formation and the moralising function of the elementary school into widespread support for their programmes of moral education, or to ensure that statements of interest were translated into effective activity in schools. The issues they grappled with are being worked through still in relation to moral education and citizenship in English schools: the struggle for moral education continues today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all my friends for helping to see me through to the end of this thesis. Particular thanks to Kerry Davies and Simon Baalham for conversation, encouragement, and jogging, Jo Hazell, Alis Oancea, Stephanie Sturdy and Stephanie Wilde for sociable cups of tea – and a break from the thesis – at work, and Camilla Leach for chats and taking on more than her share of our joint History of Education Society duties in the last few months.

I would also like to thank my supervisors Steve King and John Stewart for their invaluable advice at different stages of the thesis, and especially my Director of Studies, David Nash, for inspiration, wisdom and encouragement to have confidence in my ideas throughout, and reading hundreds of thousands of words of drafts. Carol Beadle, Harriet Irvine and Jill Organ have helped me navigate the paperwork and procedures associated with writing and submitting the thesis. Outside Oxford Brookes, Richard Aldrich, Jane Buckley, John Gay, Peter Gordon, Ian Grosvenor, and Richard Pring have generously offered their time and wisdom. I am very grateful to them all.

I have used many archives and libraries in the course of my research, and would like to thank the staff at the British Library (St Pancras and Colindale), the British Library of Political and Economic Science, Brunel University Library, Deansgate Library, the library and archive collections at the Institute of Education, London, the Labour History Archive and Study Centre, the Public Record Office, University of Strathclyde Archives and Wisconsin Historical Society Archives. Particular thanks to the staff at Oxford Brookes Library and the Bodleian Library who have dealt professionally and helpfully with my often complicated requests, and to the staff at Birmingham City Archives (especially Sian Roberts), Birmingham Local Studies Library, and the Record Office for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland for their friendliness, support, and invaluable knowledge of their collections on my many visits.

I would like to thank everyone who has very kindly given their time to read and comment on drafts of my work: Richard Aldrich, Anne Bloomfield, Kerry Davies, Jo Hazell, Henry

Acknowledgements

McGuinness, Alison Waller, Ruth Watts, Stephanie Wilde, Elisabeth Wright, Malcolm Wright. I promise bottles of wine once I am finished.

Finally I would like to thank my parents Elisabeth and Malcolm Wright and my sister Judith Wright for their constant encouragement. Especially I would like to thank my partner, Henry McGuinness, for living with me, and with the joys and frustrations that have come with this thesis, for six years, and for his love and support throughout. My Grandad did not live to see this finished, but has always supported and inspired me. This thesis is dedicated to him.

ABBREVIATIONS

BCA	Birmingham City Archives
BEC	Birmingham Education Committee
BLPES	British Library of Political and Economic Science
BLSL	Birmingham Local Studies Library
BSB	Birmingham School Board
CMEL	Civic and Moral Education League
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector/His Majesty's Inspector
HMSO	His Majesty's Stationery Office/Her Majesty's Stationery Office
ILP	Independent Labour Party
LEC	Leicester Education Committee
LSB	Leicester School Board
LSS	Leicester Secular Society
MELQ	Moral Education League Quarterly
MIL	Moral Instruction League
MILQ	Moral Instruction League Quarterly
NA	National Archives
NEL	National Education League
RLLR	Record Office for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
WCAA	Working Class Autobiographical Archive
WHSA	Wisconsin Historical Society Archive

INTRODUCTION

> The question of moral education is the heart of the modern educational problem. If this is neglected, education is a peril. Economic and social changes, the inrush of new knowledge and new ideas, the weakening of ancient traditions, the shifting of old landmarks of custom and belief, have thrown upon the schools a responsibility beyond precedent and expectation.[1]

So wrote Michael Sadler, previously employed at the Board of Education, and one of the country's eminent educationalists, in his introduction to the report of the international inquiry into moral instruction he chaired from 1906 to 1908. As this comment indicates, moral education in English elementary schools was clearly a matter of national interest around the turn of the twentieth century. It was the subject of a major international congress in 1908, enshrined in the education codes of 1904 and 1906, and addressed in examination questions for trainee teachers. Yet in 1914 the educationalist Eva White wrote about the "parrot cry of character-training". Educationalists, she argued, all claimed that character formation was important, but there was no substance behind these claims. Her comment points to a lack of commitment not only to her favoured method of moral instruction but to any particular method. It also probably implies a lack of activity behind all the talk about moral education.

This activity and debate were stimulated by a deep, and widespread, concern about the moral condition of society. Politicians, churchmen, social reformers and others felt that social stability had been eroded by the intellectual and political developments of the second half of the nineteenth century (such as Darwinian thought and the rise of socialism), the breakdown of family and community ties attributed to urban and industrial problems, and the apparent decline of organised religion. The press and literature revealed fears about delinquent youth. The decades around 1900 also witnessed concerns about physical and moral degeneracy, influenced by eugenicist theories of racial deterioration, and amplified by the spectre of political and economic competition from other countries. The role of the state was also changing, at both the national and the local level, leading to alterations in the nature of the relationship between state and citizen, and in what was required of the individual as a citizen.

---

[1] M. Sadler, Introduction, in M.E. Sadler (ed.), *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volume I*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908, xiii-xlix, pp.xxi-xxii.

Fears of the consequences of these developments led many politicians, churchmen and social reformers to put their faith in the school as the institution that would moralise the rising generation and improve the state of the nation in the future. The churches, equating morality with Christianity, concentrated their efforts on religious instruction. However, non-believers (and even some Christians) sought a purely ethical solution. Thus in England, as in other parts of Europe, the United States, and the British Empire, there were significant attempts to introduce secular forms of moral education into state schools from the late nineteenth century.[2]

There was a struggle for moral education in the elementary school. Two aspects to this conflict emerged: a struggle to ensure that statements of intent were transformed into action, and a struggle over content and method. First, campaigners for more systematic and effective forms of moral education (and these were mainly but not exclusively secularist) faced many barriers – ideological and administrative – in their efforts to publicise their cause and sway public and official opinion. Second, moral education could mean very different things to different people. For some it was an attempt to restore traditional attitudes and aptitudes in order to stem national moral decline; for others it was an opportunity to sweep aside irrelevant traditions and values in the search for a new social order. For some it should be an intellectual enterprise, for others it should form habits. For some it could not be divorced from Christianity, for others it should be based on a purely social morality acceptable to individuals of all religions or no religion. For some it was the school atmosphere, or the personal influence of the teacher on the taught; for others it was a new subject in the school curriculum. The underlying ethical or religious basis of moral education, the values which should be passed on to the rising generation, and the way in which these values should be inculcated, were all contested.

This thesis explores these issues. What explanations can be offered as to why, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was widespread interest in character formation in the elementary school but not support for one sort of programme? How was

---

[2] W. Brickman, The Teaching of Secular Moral Values in the Nineteenth Century: USA, England, France, *Paedagogica Historica*, 12:2, 1972, 370-85.

moral education perceived, approached, and implemented by the education department, the general public, School Board and Education Committee members, and teachers in schools?

This thesis will attempt a more comprehensive and detailed examination of moral education in English elementary schools than hitherto attempted. The analysis will have national and local dimensions. It will look not only at policy-making at the national level, or the ideas and activities of famous pressure groups and educationalists, but also at the relationship between these policies and ideas, curriculum development, and implementation in schools. This relationship has apparently, to date, been somewhat neglected. Local studies facilitate such an investigation and are therefore a crucial part of this thesis. Much of it focuses on moral instruction, one of the many approaches to moral education. This is not, however, to deny the importance of other approaches to moral education, or indeed the interconnectedness of various approaches.

Despite the depth of concern about the moral condition of the population in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries already noted, moral education has been under-researched. It is, however, a subject that could offer important insights, not only into neglected areas of educational history but also into the social history of the period. Moral education looked explicitly outside and beyond the four walls of the school: to the development of the pupil as an individual and a citizen of the future. Central government policy, the activism of local School Boards, pressure groups and individuals, curriculum development, and implementation in schools could all illuminate broader religious, political, and social debates and activity. An in-depth study of moral education could also reveal the mechanisms by which educational reforms more generally were devised, promoted, and enacted, but also resisted, and ignored.

This investigation is also important because of present concerns. The issues addressed one hundred years ago are still being worked through today. Complaints about a delinquent and apolitical younger generation are common. There are fears of a lack of social cohesion and lack of community involvement. Schools are again called on to address these problems,

through citizenship education (which in this country has a strong moral element),[3] and a range of other means. A historical perspective might shed useful light on some of the thorny and seemingly intractable problems related to these aspects of education.

Moral education (broadly defined) in settings outside the English elementary school has received some attention from historians. Tholfsen has examined moral education in Sunday schools,[4] while Paula Bartley has explored the work of philanthropic organisations, particularly Ladies Associations, which aimed at moral regeneration among young girls.[5] The educational endeavours and moral agendas of various youth organisations have been addressed in a number of studies.[6] There is also a body of research on public schools which discusses moral training in public schools, particularly through organised games.[7] These other educational agencies and settings will be discussed in more detail as part of the context for moral education in elementary schools in the next chapter.

Moral aspects of elementary schooling have, arguably, received less attention, and certainly not the degree of attention accorded to the politics of education, and educational administration. For example, the disputes over religious instruction around the 1870 and 1902 Education Acts have been presented as power politics and inter-denominational disagreements over educational approaches.[8] Most studies, with Stephen Platten and Benjamin Sacks as notable exceptions, neglect the moral dimension to these debates.[9]

---

[3] The Crick Report recommended that education for citizenship in schools should contain three main elements: 1) social and moral responsibility; 2) community involvement; 3) political literacy. Advisory Group on Citizenship, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools. Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September 1998*, London: DfES/QCA, 1998, pp.11-13, 40-41. These elements of citizenship have been incorporated into the Citizenship National Curriculum.

[4] T.R. Tholfsen, Moral Education in the Victorian Sunday School, *History of Education Quarterly*, 20, Spring 1980, 77-99.

[5] P. Bartley, Preventing Prostitution: the Ladies' Association for the Care and Protection of Young Girls in Birmingham, 1887-1914, *Women's History Review*, 7:1, 1998, 37-60; P. Bartley, *Prostitution: Prevention and Reform in England, 1860-1914*, London: Routledge, 2000, pp.73-115; P. Bartley, Moral Regeneration, Women and the Civic Gospel in Birmingham, 1870-1914, *Midland History*, 25, 2000, 143-61.

[6] For example see K. Orr, Moral Training in the Boy Scout Movement, in E.L. French (ed.), *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 1963, 283-320; M. Rosenthal, *The Character Factory. Baden Powell and the Origins of the Boy Scout Movement*, London: Collins, 1986; J. Springhall, *Youth, Empire and Society. British Youth Movements, 1883-1940*, London: Croom Helm, 1977.

[7] J. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977; J.R. de S. Honey, *Tom Brown's Universe. The Development of the Public School in the 19th Century*, London: Millington, 1977; J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

[8] Moral dimensions to debates over religious instruction have been underplayed in many key texts such as M. Cruickshank, *Church and State in English Education. 1870 to the Present Day*, London: Macmillan, 1963; N. Daglish, *Education Policy-making in England and Wales. The Crucible Years, 1895-1911*, London:

Where moral education in English elementary schools has been addressed in the research literature, its treatment mirrors attitudes in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the one hand, the general agreement about the importance of moral education is reflected in the many – often brief – references within general history of education texts to the character forming possibilities of elementary schooling. On the other hand, reflecting the lack of agreement over methods, there is rather less research which focuses specifically on moral education, and particularly moral instruction, in the English elementary school.

In the former category of generalised references to the moral function of elementary schooling, early histories of education, including those by HC Barnard and C Birchenough, discussed the ideas of key educational thinkers.[10] Later researchers focused much more on practices of moral education in the elementary school. For example, Harold and Pamela Silver note that moral education was prominent in mission statements, prize schemes and a variety of other educational practices in Lambeth National School in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Pamela Horn similarly alludes to the emphasis on the moral condition of schoolchildren in classroom practice, specifically the teaching of obedience and humility.[11]

Alternative theoretical approaches to educational history, developed since the 1970s, have affected the way in which moral aspects of schooling have been investigated and explained. A number of works influenced by Marxist viewpoints presented the moral element in

---

Woburn Press, 1996; J. Murphy, Religion, the State, and Education in England, *History of Education Quarterly*, 8:1, 1968, 3-34; E.A. Payne, The Religious Educational Dilemma, *Baptist Quarterly*, 23:8, 1970, 360-76; D.R. Pugh, English Nonconformity, Education and Passive Resistance 1903-6, *History of Education*, 19:4, 1990, 355-73; D.W. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience. Chapel and Politics 1870-1914*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982, pp.127-52; S. Koss, *Nonconformity in Modern British Politics*, Hamden, Conneticut: Archon Books, 1975, pp.23-26, 51-54, 76ff.

[9] S.G. Platten, The Conflict over the Control of Elementary Education 1870-1902 and its Effect upon the Life and Influence of the Church, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 23:3, 1975, 276-302; B. Sacks, *The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-1914*, Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1961.

[10] H.C. Barnard, *A Short History of English Education from 1760 to 1944*, London: University of London Press, 1947, pp.43-45, 171-73, 178-79; C. Birchenough, *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day*, 2nd edition, London: University Tutorial Press, 1925, pp.134-35, 311-12, 377-79.

[11] P. and H. Silver, *The Education of the Poor. The History of a National School 1824-1974*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974, pp.30-33, 60-62; P. Horn, *The Victorian and Edwardian Schoolchild*, Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1989, pp.30-31.

elementary schooling as social or even class control.[12] Stephen Humphries, for instance, sees what have been labelled acts of disobedience on the part of pupils as part of "a fierce class-cultural struggle over the form of social relationships that were to prevail in schools." In a similar vein, Anna Davin wrote "The education of working-class children was presented as their rescue from the abyss ... Socialization, more than the imparting of knowledge and skills, was the point of this schooling. The children were to be 'broken in'."[13] Such studies challenge earlier interpretations of educational history that perceived the introduction and expansion of elementary education as an indisputable benefit to young people and to society. More recently, research from a broadly Foucauldian perspective – much of which draws on moral regulation as a central analytical concept – has highlighted both explicit and implicit disciplinary practices of elementary schooling. This research usefully explores the many linguistic and physical practices embedded in timetabling and the material culture of schooling – administrative dictates, timetables, the design of school buildings, the "choreography" of moving pupils within and between lessons – which not only disciplined individuals but led individuals to discipline and regulate themselves.[14]

Neither of these approaches has examined in detail the explicit and deliberate attempts at moral education which are the focus of this thesis. Also, the positive educational intentions of those interested in moral education, which co-existed with the controlling tendencies emphasised by research within social control and Foucauldian perspectives, are, arguably, underplayed.

A much smaller body of research, though a growing one, pertains specifically to approaches to moral education and moral instruction in English elementary schools. EB Castle's *Moral Education in Christian Times* traces the development of ideas about moral education over time, but says very little about practice.[15] There are brief references to the work of the Moral

---

[12] For example, S. Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981, pp.28-130; A. Davin, *Growing up Poor. Home, School and Street in London 1870-1914*, London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996, pp.115-53.
[13] Humphries, *op cit.*, p.89; Davin, *Growing up Poor*, p.134.
[14] B. Eggermont, The Choreography of Schooling as Site of Struggle: Belgian Primary Schools, 1880-1940, *History of Education*, 30:2, 2001, 129-40; K. Rousmaniere, K. Delhi, N. de Coninck-Smith (eds.), *Discipline, Moral Regulation, and Schooling: A Social History*, London: Garland Publishing: 1997.
[15] E.B. Castle, *Moral Education in Christian Times*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1958.

Instruction League in some notable history of education texts,[16] and histories of secularism.[17] Articles or chapters about the League by FH Hilliard, Robert Bérard and RJW Selleck focus on the League's pressure group activities.[18] The growing body of research on individual moral instructors like Frank Herbert Hayward[19] and Frederick James Gould addresses the development of their educational and other ideas.[20] The moral instruction curriculum is addressed to a greater extent in the work of Peter Gordon and Dennis Lawton, Robert Bérard and most recently Nathan Roberts.[21]

Although useful research has been conducted, there remain significant gaps in our knowledge and understanding about moral education in English elementary schools. Research to date has not adequately explained either the level of interest in moral education in English elementary schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, or why moral instruction lessons were favoured in some places but not in others. It also tells us little about the resources developed for classroom use or about school practice. Probably the most significant omission in existing research is the lack of a local dimension. We know very little about what happened on School Boards and Education Committees, about local activists and broader local opinion, and about what happened in schools. Dewsbury includes moral

---

[16] For example, B. Simon, *Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965, pp.144, 274.

[17] S. Budd, *Varieties of Unbelief, Atheists and Agnostics in English Society 1850-1960*, London: Heinemann, 1977, pp.245-46; D. Tribe, *100 Years of Freethought*, London: Elek, 1967, pp.198-99; E. Royle, *Radicals, Secularists and Republicans: Popular Freethought in Britain, 1866-1915*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980, pp.314-16; I.D. MacKillop, *The British Ethical Societies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp.165-73.

[18] R.N. Bérard, The Movement for Moral Instruction in Great Britain: The Moral Instruction League and its Successors, *Fides et Historia*, 16:2, 1984, 55-73; F.H. Hilliard, The Moral Instruction League 1879-1919, *Durham Research Review*, 12, 1961, 53-63; R.J.W. Selleck, *The New Education, 1870-1914*, London: Pitman, 1968, pp.299-328. This organisation changed its name to the Moral Education League in 1909, to the Civic and Moral Education League in 1916 and again to the Civic Education League in 1919. For clarity Moral Instruction League is used throughout the text of this study.

[19] D. Leinster-Mackay, Frank Hayward, British Neo-Herbartian Extraordinaire: An Examination of his Educational Writings, *History of Education Researcher*, 69, 2002, 26-48; R. Rawnsley, *The Celebration Movement and the Influence of J.F. Herbart on Moral Education in England through the Work of Frank Herbert Hayward (1872-1954)*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Manchester, 1998.

[20] R.N. Bérard, Frederick James Gould and the Transformation of Moral Education, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 35:3, 1987, 233-47; K. Manton, 'Filling Bellies and Brains': The Educational and Political Thought of Frederick James Gould, *History of Education*, 30:3, 2001, 273-90; K. Manton, *Socialism and Education in Britain 1883-1902*, London: Woburn Press, 2001, especially pp.9-10, 94-97; D.S. Nash, F.J. Gould and the Leicester Secular Society: a Positivist Commonwealth in Edwardian Politics, *Midland History*, 16, 1991, 126-40; S. Wright, *Morality without Theology. The Movement for Moral Instruction with Special Reference to the Ideas and Influence of Frederick James Gould*, Unpublished MA dissertation: Oxford Brookes University, 1999.

[21] Bérard, *Frederick James Gould*; P. Gordon and D. Lawton, *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978, pp.98-106; N. Roberts, Character in the Mind: Citizenship, Education and Psychology in Britain, *History of Education*, 33:2, 2004, 177-97.

instruction as part of an analysis of religion and Huddersfield School Board, while Gould's promotion of moral instruction in Leicester is addressed, albeit briefly, by Robert Bérard, Angela Gill, and David Nash.[22] Nevertheless, more detailed local studies are required to supplement this research.

Moral education in English elementary schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries therefore merits a more comprehensive analysis than it has, to date, received. In 1990 Bruneau noted that few had turned to the work of a history of moral education.[23] This thesis will make a start on this work. Through an examination of moral education at the national and local level, using a range of sources hitherto not utilised for this purpose, it offers alternative perspectives to those offered in previous research. The focus of the first part of this thesis is on England, a limit determined by boundaries of educational administration.[24] The second part of this thesis focuses on Birmingham and Leicester for reasons elaborated below.

The main categories of sources examined are:

- official papers (education department reports and regulations, parliamentary debates);
- Moral Instruction League publications (syllabus, pamphlets, other publicity materials, *Quarterly* newsletter and circulars, files of correspondence from different archives, other publications by League members);
- biographical and autobiographical sources on individual moral educators;
- moral instruction handbooks;
- educational and secularist periodicals, newspapers;
- Birmingham and Leicester School Board and Education Committee records, the local press, log books and inspection reports for a sample of fourteen schools in the two cities, and other relevant sources in Birmingham and Leicester archives.

---

[22] Bérard, *Frederick James Gould*, pp.235-36; M. Dewsbury, The Teaching of Religion and the Huddersfield School Board, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 11:2, 1979, 22-28, pp.25-27; Nash, *F.J. Gould*, pp.132-33; D.S. Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992, pp.61-71,113, 119-21; A. Gill, The Leicester School Board 1871-1903, in B. Simon (ed.) *Education in Leicestershire 1540-1940*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1968, 156-77, pp.165, 168.

[23] W.A. Bruneau, The 'New' Social History and the History of Moral Education, *Paedagogica Historica*, 30:1, 1990, 7-33, p.19.

[24] These boundaries were crossed by debates and activities, so Scotland and Wales, Great Britain as a unit, and other countries, are referred to where relevant in this thesis.

This range of sources is intended to give access to the views of promoters of moral education, other educationalists and educational officials (in Leicester and Birmingham and throughout the country), the broader public, and teachers in schools. I examine these different sources not primarily for purposes of cross-checking information, or even primarily to fill the gaps which an examination of only one category of sources would leave. I aim to use these sources in a cumulative way, putting together a multi-dimensional picture of moral education in elementary schools by drawing on the different perspectives the sources offer. These different sources, and the different constructions of moral education and educational work behind them, are not necessarily oppositional (though this is possible), but address common issues and even acknowledge one other.[25]

There are, potentially, methodological difficulties in using these different sources, put together for a variety of purposes and for a variety of audiences, offering personal, public and official, national and local, perspectives. Indeed, part of my intention is to explore the potential of these assorted sources for the historian trying to piece together as comprehensive a picture as possible of the struggle for moral education in late nineteenth and early twentieth century elementary schools. For this reason the sources used are discussed explicitly at various points in the thesis.

Local studies are central to my methodology. Not only is a local dimension a serious omission from previous research, but local studies are also appropriate for the detailed investigation of educational policy-making and practice in schools, which is required for a better understanding of moral education in this period. Local studies can illuminate the national picture, substantiating generalisations, and helping us find out "what did happen rather than what was supposed to be done."[26] They also offer scope for viewing moral education in elementary schools in different ways than would be possible if we focused only at the national level. Local studies enable us to ask different questions, and to focus on

---

[25] My thinking here is informed by the discussion of combining oral and documentary sources in P. Cunningham and P. Gardner, *Becoming Teachers. Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950*, London: Woburn Press, 2004, especially pp.7-10, 232-33.

[26] Margaret Bryant quoted in D. Bishop, E. Gabbett, I. Grosvenor, S. Roberts, M. Stephens, P. Taylor, B. Winsor, *The City a Light and a Beacon: A Guide to Birmingham Education Archives*, Birmingham City Archives: Birmingham, 2001, p.1.

different aspects of the picture. And, as William Bruneau suggests, local studies may be a useful starting point for tackling absences in the research base on moral education.[27]

Birmingham and Leicester have been selected for the local studies. They are not intended to be representative or typical of other large towns or cities in this period in the way they approached moral education. Indeed, as will become clear, they are in some ways atypical. Nevertheless there are good reasons why a comparison between the two could yield fruitful insights. First, there are good surviving educational records in both. Second, we can compare the broad socio-economic and political contexts, and ideas about moral education, in 1879 and 1901 (the years in which moral instruction was introduced in Birmingham and Leicester respectively). Third, both Leicester and Birmingham introduced moral lessons before the influence of the Moral Instruction League peaked. Therefore they provide the opportunity to look at longer-term developments and from a somewhat different perspective than that of the work of the League.

The combination of similarities and differences in the way in which organisational and political life developed in Birmingham and Leicester offers considerable scope for enlightening comparisons and insights. Common features include a Midlands location, rapid population and spatial expansion in the nineteenth century, the dominance of workshop-based industry and a comparatively late move to the factory mode of production, the dominance of Liberal elites in local government, and strong traditions of radicalism. Significant differences include the late move to independent labour representation in Birmingham compared with Leicester, and the nature of radicalism in Birmingham (which emphasised cooperation between classes) and Leicester (which developed through working-class organisations).

Much of this thesis focuses on moral instruction. Limits of time and space make it impossible to subject all forms of moral education to the level of detailed, and localised, scrutiny deemed necessary in this study. Moreover, moral instruction was perhaps the most novel development in this period, and was certainly the most contentious. The activity

---

[27] Bruneau, *op cit.* p.17. This study does not adopt all Bruneau's methodological suggestions, but concurs that local studies potentially offer the most useful starting point from which to deal with neglected areas in the research base.

around moral instruction has left a range of sources related to pressure groups and individual educationalists, and materials for the classroom, through which we can investigate contemporary attitudes both to moral instruction and to moral education more generally. In the final chapter, which focuses on a sample of Birmingham and Leicester elementary schools, a broader definition is adopted, in order to reflect the range of morally educative activities and approaches to moral education revealed in the primary sources.

The time frame 1879 to 1918 emerged from the primary sources. 1879 was the year that Birmingham School Board introduced moral instruction lessons, and thus, given the decision to use Birmingham as one of my local studies, seemed particularly appropriate.[28] A suitable finishing date was harder to identify because the organisations and curriculum developments analysed in this thesis tended to peter out rather than come to a decisive and deliberate end. Nevertheless, 1918 seemed a sensible choice. First, the important and innovative developments in the area related to the First World War could be captured. Second, by 1918 the ideas of moral educators were moving closer to citizenship and civic education. This development would be worthy of study in its own right but could not be captured adequately in this thesis.[29]

The language surrounding moral education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries could be confusing. It is therefore important to define terms. It seems sensible to base the definitions to be used in this thesis on the way terms were used at the time rather than on present day understandings.

"Moral education", "moral instruction", and "moral training" were all common in the decades around the turn of the twentieth century. At times these various terms were used interchangeably. "Formation of character" is another phrase which permeated debates of the period, and which could be used to denote any one, or all, of the above terms. However, there were some differences of emphasis in the terminology used.

---

[28] Birmingham appears to have been the second English School Board to introduce moral lessons (after Burton-on-Trent in 1878). There is, however, a far wider selection of primary source material available for Birmingham than for Burton-on-Trent.

[29] Bérard notes a shift in ideals of moral education from about 1880 to 1918, from roots in fixed standards of personal morality to a tool to inculcate a civic, social morality. Bérard, *Movement*, pp.69-70.

Moral training was the more common term at the start of the period covered by this thesis, and was embodied in a question to witnesses to the Cross Commission which reported in 1888. In the evidence presented, moral training was thought to be achieved in many different ways, including through "precept", "example", the "moral influence of the teacher", "religious instruction", "general training", praise and censure, rewards and punishments, and "constant supervision".[30] By 1908, it appears that moral training was understood in a more precise sense. Professor Findlay defined it as "the suggestive influence of the school society rather than the formal processes of teaching" while Michael Sadler noted, the same year, that it aims at imparting habits as opposed to ideals.[31]

Moral education was defined more broadly. According to the Moral Instruction League

> it seeks to give a dominant ethical tendency to the whole process of the child's training in the home and school by lessons that call out the social sentiments, by studies that exercise the moral judgement, by occupations that discipline the will to mutual consideration and service, and by impressing on the imagination the duty of subordinating all intellectual and practical activity to the common welfare.[32]

This concept has been captured in rather simpler terms in a recent dictionary as "the conscious attempt to contribute to a child's moral development."[33] The breadth of what was understood as moral education can be seen in the highly ambitious programme of the 1908 International Moral Education Congress.[34]

Moral instruction, by contrast, had a more restricted meaning. The Moral Instruction League described it as set lessons or conversations "definitely directed to moral subjects."[35] Michael Sadler noted an intellectual emphasis in his comment that moral instruction aimed at

---

[30] *Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. Statistical Report*, London: HMSO, 1888, pp.59-171.
[31] J.J. Findlay, *The Growth of Moral Ideas in Children*, in M.E. Sadler (ed.) *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volume I*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908, 22-35, p.32; Sadler, *Introduction*, p.xxxix.
[32] Moral Instruction League (henceforward MIL), *Moral Instruction. What it is not and What it is*, London: Moral Instruction League, n.d., p.1. Deansgate Library Social Pamphlets R188585.
[33] D. Lawton, P. Gordon, *Dictionary of Education*, 2nd edition, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996, p.147.
[34] See *Record of the Proceedings of the First International Moral Education Congress*, London: David Nutt, 1908; G. Spiller (ed.), *Papers on Moral Education Communicated to the First International Moral Education Congress*, 2nd edition, London: David Nutt, 1909, pp.vii-xiii.
[35] MIL, *Moral Instruction*, p.1.

"imparting moral ideas."[36] The Moral Instruction League also suggested an emphasis on teaching concrete "moral principles" rather than more abstract "theories about morality."[37]

There are, inevitably, limits to what can be done within one thesis. It is concerned with the elementary school. Other important sites of education in the home and the community are not addressed in detail, though they are discussed at various points throughout. Also, the documentary sources examined do not give adequate voice to pupils and parents. Head teachers' voices are captured in log books – this is one of their strengths as a source – but otherwise evidence on the views of teachers is limited to what filters through in the press and in School Board reports. A different approach to the one I have taken would be required to capture parents', pupils', and classroom teachers' perspectives. Oral history has been usefully employed with groups whose views and experiences are absent from the documentary record, but this would not be possible for the period examined.

This thesis contains six chapters. The first half pertains to developments at the national level, the second half relates to local studies of Birmingham and Leicester. Within each half the three chapters are sequenced to provide a broad context, followed by more detailed analysis of activism and policy, and finally by an investigation of teaching in schools (as revealed by teaching materials in the first half, and school log books and inspection reports in the second). A national perspective is important as background for the local studies, which in their turn further illuminate the national picture.

Chapter One provides a broad ideological context. It indicates the varied ancestry of the many voluntary and state-sponsored responses to moral concerns in the nineteenth century. It explores an educational context that favoured indirect methods and moral education on a religious basis. Chapter Two investigates policy and propaganda. It examines the relationship between the central education department and individuals and pressure groups that aimed to promote moral instruction, and in particular the most prominent pressure group in this area, the Moral Instruction League. The third chapter scrutinises the pedagogy and content of the moral instruction curriculum through a detailed analysis of teaching materials.

---

[36] Sadler, *Introduction*, p.xxxix.
[37] MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, London: Moral Instruction League, 1900, p.3, Pamphlet Collection – Special, British Library of Political and Economic Science (BLPES).

Moving on to the local studies, Chapter Four outlines aspects of the socio-economic, organisational, political, religious, and educational background in Birmingham and Leicester, revisiting some of the themes discussed in Chapter One but at the local level. It places George Dixon and Frederick James Gould, the two figures most instrumental in the promotion of moral instruction in Birmingham and Leicester, in these local contexts. Chapter Five analyses moral instruction in Birmingham and Leicester: the ideas and promotional activities of Dixon and Gould, the debates around the introduction of moral lessons, and evidence relating to implementation. This chapter explores, at the local level, issues discussed in relation to the Moral Instruction League in Chapter Two. The final chapter examines moral education, more broadly defined, as practiced in a sample of Birmingham and Leicester schools. It investigates what forms moral education could take. This chapter highlights most clearly the need for detailed local studies which enable us to examine what actually happened as well as what was intended or thought.

Before such detailed investigations, it is important to see moral education generally – and moral instruction particularly – in a broader socio-economic and ideological context. This will be the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER ONE:

MORALISING THE POPULATION: THE CONTEXT FOR THE STRUGGLE FOR MORAL EDUCATION 1879-1918

As noted in the introduction, perceived urban and industrial problems, the apparent decline in organised Christianity, and delinquency, along with the expansion in the functions of the state, led politicians, social reformers, and churchmen to work to remoralise the population. Many focused their efforts on the elementary school. These advocates of moral education in various forms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were influenced in their efforts by a number of ideological perspectives – philosophical, religious, political and educational – which were dominant in this period. This range of concerns and varied ideological ancestry, I argue, is essential to an understanding of the widespread interest in moral education at this time. It also helps us to understand why this interest was scattered and unfocused, and failed to translate in the long term into widespread commitment to a definite and coherent programme of action.

This chapter looks first at important concerns about the nature of society in the late nineteenth century that fuelled the demand for improved moral education. Next, it examines the political and social context: the practical efforts by the state and by voluntary organisations to moralise the population, and the ideological perspectives – political, religious, secularist – behind such efforts. It then focuses specifically on the educational context. It outlines the varied traditions of moral education which developed in England through the nineteenth century in public schools, state elementary schools, and outside the formal educational system, and educational theories which highlighted in different ways the 'formation of character'.

The moral condition of the population

In order to understand why moral education was thought important by thinkers of different complexions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, it is necessary first to outline some of the features of society at this time which stimulated concern about the moral condition of the population.

The role of the state was changing. In this period as at other times, people disagreed over the proper boundaries between the citizen or civil society and the state, or on how far the state should intervene in the lives of individuals. Nevertheless, by the last quarter of the nineteenth century the state at both the central and the local level had taken over, or played a significant part in, many functions hitherto undertaken by the church and voluntary agencies (including education). It was argued that new educational means were needed to ensure that citizens were able to fulfil their new functions under the expanded state effectively. The Moral Instruction League repeatedly cited the changing needs of the state in its literature as a key reason why new and different forms of secular moral instruction were needed in elementary schools. Moral instruction based on the Bible alone, the League argued, was inadequate for meeting the requirements of the age.[1]

Urbanisation and its impact on the life of individuals, and indeed the country as a whole, was another matter of grave concern. Between 1801 and 1911 the proportion of the population living in urban areas rose from 20% to 80%. This massive change was thought to have various social effects, including a weakening of bonds of kinship, a decline in the social significance of the family, and an undermining of traditional methods of social control.[2] Cities were widely seen as volatile, and physically and morally degrading. This is evident in the many negative depictions of the city in art and literature. It is also evident in the belief of socialists like William Morris, Harry Lowerison, and Edward Carpenter that cities were inherently unhealthy places in which to rear children who, as more natural beings than adults, would thrive better in a more natural setting.[3] Both the lurid 'travellers tales' which 'social explorers' brought back from the slums and the 'scientific' mapping of poor areas

---

[1] See Chapter Two.
[2] G. Stedman Jones, *Outcast London*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971, pp.13-14. See also Bérard, *Movement*, pp.55-56.
[3] J. Marsh, *Back to the Land. The Pastoral Impulse in Victorian England from 1880 to 1914*, London: Quartet Books, 1982, pp.2-6, 12-22; Manton, *Socialism and Education*, pp.101-05; D. Reeder, Predicaments of City Children: Late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society, in D. Reeder (ed.) *Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Taylor & Francis, 1977, 75-94, p.93. See also Margaret McMillan's argument that the city stifled the imagination of the young, and this was unhealthy for their moral development, in her address to the Moral Instruction League in 1910. M. McMillan, The place of imagination in moral education, *Journal of Education*, September 1910, pp.627-29.

undertaken by Charles Booth among others contributed to perceptions of the poor as a 'race apart', and of moral and physical squalor in the poorest areas.[4]

Contemporaries commented on serious 'social evils' in urban areas in the late nineteenth century, drinking, prostitution, and juvenile delinquency chief among them. These evils were not new. Researchers suggest plausibly that what changed was not so much the emergence of new problems but public awareness of them.[5] Reeder points out, for instance, that direct contact between voluntary workers and elementary school pupils in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries contributed to anxieties about child life in the city.[6]

Contemporaries also perceived a decline in organised Christianity. For some this was seen as a threat to the fabric of society, to others it was a welcome opportunity to sweep aside irrelevant tradition and superstition.[7] This decline was noted particularly among the working-class in urban areas. Though many artisans went to church, attendance among the poorest elements of the working-class was generally low.[8] A range of factors – from sheer poverty, to overbearing and unsympathetic clergy and the moral absolutism of lay campaigners, and the alternative leisure activities on offer – have been cited to account for this trend.[9] This awareness stimulated efforts to evangelise in neutral spaces through, for instance, Sunday schools, working men's missions, the Salvation Army. Nonetheless, churches acknowledged that they struggled to reach the very poor.[10] Historians have argued that failure to attend church, or what Searle labels a "watering-down of religious practice", did not necessarily

---

[4] Stedman Jones, *op cit.*, pp.10-14; J. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, London: Virago Press, 1992, pp.15-39. The classic novel on life in the slums is A. Morrison, *A Child of the Jago*, London: Methuen & Co., 1896. The vast social exploration literature includes J. London, *The People of the Abyss*, London: Isbister, 1903 and C.F.G. Masterman (ed.) *The Heart of the Empire*, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901. For a selection of the writings of social explorers see P. Keating, *Into Unknown England 1866-1913. Selections from the Social Explorers*, London: Fontana, 1976.

[5] Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, pp.13-14.

[6] Reeder, *op cit.*, p.87.

[7] See Selleck, *op cit.*, p.300.

[8] D.W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain. A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1989, pp.110-11.

[9] Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, pp.112-14, 134-6; Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, pp.15-16; S. Gunn, The Ministry, the Middle Class and the 'Civilizing Mission' in Manchester, 1850-80, *Social History*, 21:1, 1996, 22-36, pp.34-35.

[10] H. McLeod, *Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City*, London: Croom Helm, 1974, especially pp.42-100; D. Hempton, Religious Life in Industrial Britain, in S. Gilley and W.J. Sheils (eds.) *A History of Religion in Britain*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994, 306-21, pp.310-11; B. Haynes, *Working-Class Life in Victorian Leicester. The Joseph Dare Reports*, Leicester: Leicester Libraries and Information Service, 1991, pp.13-29. See Chapter Four, p.138 below on this issue in Birmingham and Leicester.

mean hostility to or lack of knowledge of religion, or indeed a lack of belief.[11] But whatever people's private beliefs might have been, contemporaries were concerned that the improving influence of Christianity was failing to reach the very poor, and there was a feeling that this lack of Christian influence was a prime cause of the social evils described above.[12]

It was not only among the poor that Christianity was thought to be losing its hold. By the late nineteenth century a number of alternative ways of seeing and interpreting the world were emerging. The intellectual challenges of higher criticism and the evolutionary theories of for instance Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer stimulated what Bebbington has described as "honest doubt" among middle-class adherents.[13] Howard Murphy argues that of greater importance than these theories was the shift from ideas of rescuing humanity through salvation, towards ideas of meliorism, as the means of improving the condition of the human race. An emphasis on life after death was replaced by an emphasis on applying knowledge for the betterment of the world.[14]

A range of alternatives to Christianity emerged, which took on a bewildering variety of ideological and organisational forms.[15] The best known and most influential were probably organised secularism,[16] positivism, and the ethical movement, and these will be considered here. As Susan Budd notes, the various organisations were united by the negative assumption that supernatural religion is erroneous, and by the positive belief in morality as guide to

---

[11] For example see Hempton, *op cit.*, pp.316-17; H. McLeod, *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1984, pp.9-16; G. Searle, *A New England? Peace and War 1886-1918*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004, p.538.

[12] This was an argument which came up in the debates over moral instruction in Birmingham and Leicester examined in Chapter Five. See particularly *Birmingham Daily Gazette* 30 March 1901, Birmingham School Board (Henceforward BSB) Newspaper Cuttings Scrap Book, December 1900-May 1901, SB/B/1/11/12, Birmingham City Archives (henceforward BCA). See also John Stewart's discussion of the views of Scottish Presbyterian ministers in the Edwardian era: J. Stewart, 'Christ's Kingdom in Scotland': Scottish Presbyterianism, Social Reform, and the Edwardian Crisis, *Twentieth Century British History*, 12:1, 2001, 1-22.

[13] Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, p.142.

[14] H.R. Murphy, The Ethical Revolt against Christian Orthodoxy in Early Victorian England, *American Historical Review*, 60:4, 1955, 800-17; Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, pp.141-42.

[15] W.S. Smith, *The London Heretics 1870-1914*, London: Constable, 1967, *passim* gives a flavour of the range of organised freethought organisations around in the late nineteenth century.

[16] The terminology of British non-Christians is confusing. Members of the three branches of organised freethought mentioned above will be labelled 'secularist' (with lower case s) in this thesis, as the term freethinker can imply a rather different philosophy. Secularist with a capital S will be used to refer to members of the National Secular Society or the British Secular Union (and their local branches). See Budd, *op cit.*, p.8 for a discussion of terminology.

behaviour and the power of men to shape their world and determine their futures.[17] These organisations were not numerically strong, but provoked a reaction among Christians disproportionate to their numbers.

Secularism was the first of these freethought movements to emerge on British soil in the 1840s (though after the 1880s it was numerically in decline). It was organisationally and ideologically rooted in Owenite radicalism.[18] The organisational roots of positivism in this country can be traced to the emergence of the Positivist Political and Social Union in London in 1867.[19] Based on the philosophy of Auguste Comte, positivism was a complete and precise system of thought, containing aspects of ritual and worship. Positivists also developed a clear political programme and tradition of social activism.[20] The ethical movement emerged in London in the late 1880s. Modelled on the New York Society for Ethical Culture inaugurated by Felix Adler in 1876, it also had roots in the liberal theism of South Place Chapel in London under the leadership of Moncure Conway. The thinking of the ethical movement contained elements of philosophical idealism, Emersonian transcendentalism, and social activism (in some cases socialism), though no definite political programme was formulated.[21] Secularism was philosophically and intellectually individualist. This contrasted with the more holistic and spiritual approach of positivists and ethicists who sought to develop an alternative 'religion' (of a non-theistic and non-supernatural kind) as an alternative to Christianity, and who developed elements of ritual and worship in their meetings.[22] Ethicists and positivists were also less combative in their style than secularists, and sought to cooperate with rather than negate Christianity. Given this similarity between

---

[17] Budd, *op cit.*, pp.8-9.
[18] Budd, *op cit.*, pp.22-23.
[19] Smith, *London Heretics*, p.90.
[20] T.R. Wright, *The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p.4.The positivist programme involved support for trades unions and work with the Working Men's College. R. Harrison, *Before the Socialists. Studies in Labour and Politics 1861-1991*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965, pp.251-342; Budd, *op cit.*, pp.190-99; J.E. McGee, *A Crusade for Humanity. The History of Organised Positivism in England*, London: Watts & Co., 1931, pp.68-84.
[21] Philip Thomas argued that the notion of 'Humanity' offered "a more concrete focus of faith" than the moral ideal of the ethical movement. P. Thomas, Positivism and the Ethical Movement, *Positivist Review*, April 1908, pp.87-88. See also MacKillop, *op cit.*, pp.38-39, 143-45; Wright, *Religion of Humanity*, pp.4, 156-57.
[22] Budd, *op cit.*, p.189-90; T.R. Wright, Positively Catholic: Malcolm Quin's Church of Humanity in Newcastle upon Tyne, *Durham University Journal*, 75:2, 1983, 11-20. See the range of documents cited and reproduced in G. Spiller, *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain. A Documentary History*, London: Farleigh Press, 1934 for an emphasis on unity and a holistic world view.

the positivists and the ethical movement it is unsurprising to find an overlap of personnel and joint activities from the 1890s.[23]

Christians feared that religious apathy among the working-class, and ideological and organisational alternatives to Christianity, would erode the religious basis (and, because they elided religion with morality, the moral basis) of English society. However, even if levels of church attendance had declined, Christianity remained an influence in other ways.[24] Religious bodies – particularly the Church of England – remained a powerful influence in the decision making of successive education departments.[25] Also, squabbles between denominations over the funding and control of elementary education, and over the nature of religious instruction, dominated local and national educational politics from the late 1860s. Moreover, the cultural influence of Christianity and Christian churches was, according to Hugh McLeod, spread "very widely, even if sometimes rather thinly" in nineteenth century English Society. Sunday schools, elementary schools, mission halls, church-sponsored clubs were all ways in which many who did not attend church could come into contact with Christianity.[26] This continued power of Christianity, both politically and in a more diffuse cultural form, had a profound effect on efforts to promote moral education in elementary schools.

Finally, there was the perceived increase in juvenile delinquency, and the definition of adolescence as part of the 'social problem' of the Edwardian years.[27] Concerns about the bad behaviour of young people featured in the debates over moral education in Birmingham and Leicester outlined in Chapter Five below. Why did these concerns emerge in this period? First, there was the popularisation of the term adolescence in popular and official discourse in the 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century (much of which has been

---

[23] Budd, *op cit.*, p.189; Wright, *Religion of Humanity*, p.248; W.M. Simon, *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century. An Essay in Intellectual History*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1963, pp.81, 228-30. The cooperative basis of ethicism is demonstrated in Stanton Coit's idea of ethical absorption. He believed that the Church of England should not be disestablished but democratised and ethicised, and saw his own Bayswater Church not as a rival sect but as a model for Anglican reform. Tribe, *op cit.*, pp.38-39; Smith, *London Heretics*, pp.126-27; Budd, *op cit.*, pp.228-29.

[24] See D. Nash, Reconnecting Religion with Social and Cultural History: Secularization's Failure as a Master Narrative, *Cultural and Social History*, 1:3, 2004, 302-235, pp.310-13 for discussion.

[25] For example, Cruickshank, *op cit.*, pp.xiii-112; Daglish, *op cit.* Stephen Platten is undoubtedly correct to emphasise the decline in the influence of the Anglican church in elementary education by the turn of the twentieth century. Platten, *op cit.*, pp.297-98. However, the established church and other denominations continued to exert considerable influence over the decision-making apparatus and educational debates of the period.

[26] McLeod, *Religion and the Working Class*, pp.15-16. See also Gunn, *op cit.*, pp.32-33.

[27] J. Springhall, *Coming of Age: Adolescence in Britain 1860-1960*, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1986, p.46.

attributed to the work of the American psychologist Granville Stanley Hall).[28] There was also the increased visibility of the problems of youth in this period described above. An increased awareness of the condition of the young fed fears about their condition and future prospects and encouraged a range of punitive responses to the 'youth problem'.[29] There was, Springhall and Hendrick suggest, a class element to these fears. Working-class youths were free from adult supervision once they left elementary school, at an age when their middle-class peers were still being educated (and supervised). These fears led to the labeling of working-class youth as delinquent,[30] and also stimulated demand for continuation and evening schools and a higher school leaving age.[31]

Moralising the population: the social, political and philosophical context

Moral education in elementary schools was, arguably, part of what Jose Harris describes as a "movement for the revival of public spirit, patriotism, and civic virtue" in the late Victorian and Edwardian period.[32] I argue that moral education should be considered alongside the range of initiatives – both voluntary and state-led – which sought to improve the moral condition of the population. However, educational reform and welfare reform, and educational theory and political and social thought, have often been treated separately in the historiography of the period. This connection has therefore frequently been neglected.[33]

An abundance of voluntary agencies emerged in the nineteenth century which aimed to provide a materially and morally better life for the country's citizens, particularly in large urban areas. Charitable aid was offered alongside educational provision, or attempts to

---

[28] Springhall, *Coming of Age*, pp.9, 28-37; H. Hendrick, *Images of Youth. Age, Class and the Male Youth Problem, 1880-1920*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, pp.9-10, 83-85. Reeder sees these changes underpinned by demographic and social changes, with a move to a more prolonged and institutionalised period of dependency for young people. Reeder, *op cit.*, p.89.

[29] Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.88-89; Springhall, *Coming of Age*, p.46; J. Gillis, The Evolution of Juvenile Delinquency in England 1890-1914, *Past and Present*, 67, 1975, 96-126; and V. Bailey, *Delinquency and Citizenship. Reclaiming the Young Offender 1914-1948*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, pp.8-12.

[30] Springhall, *Coming of Age*, pp.48, 52-56. Hendrick notes that delinquency was often used not just to refer to potential criminality but in a looser sense to refer to a variety of behaviour patterns likely to offend adult sensibilities. Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.140-41.

[31] Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.213-49.

[32] J. Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870-1914*, London: Penguin Books, 1993, p.249.

[33] See e.g. Reeder, *op cit.* and K.J. Brehony, A 'Socially Civilising Influence'? Play and the Urban 'Degenerate', *Paedagogica Historica*, 39:1/2, 2003, 87-106 for exceptions which connect educational efforts with the wider context of welfare reform.

encourage the productive and morally healthy use of leisure.[34] Prochaska, for instance, notes that philanthropic institutions whose objects were chiefly educational or recreational had underlying moral or spiritual purposes.[35] Moral purposes were also explicit in the work of the Charity Organisation Society, who argued that charitable aid should be employed in a way that strengthened the moral nature of the person in distress.[36] Evangelistic agencies of churches and organised freethought, individuals and organisations of socialist and conservative complexions, and elements of the middle and working-classes were alike engaged in such activity.[37]

By the turn of the twentieth century this voluntary effort was supplemented by state welfare reform and professionalised responses to social problems. There was much continuity between these later responses and 'amateur' philanthropic effort, with a moralising intent evident in both.[38] Moreover, earlier intervention on the part of the state as exemplified by, for instance, the administration of the poor law in the mid nineteenth century was explicitly moral in nature (for instance in its judgements over whether applicants for relief were deserving or not) and aimed at improving the moral condition of the population.[39]

---

[34] Many authors have written about such voluntary initiatives. See, for example, Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.81-84, 87-89; F. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, *passim*; Bartley, *Preventing Prostitution*; Bartley, *Prostitution: Prevention and Reform*, pp.73-115; C. Waters, *British Socialists and the Politics of Popular Culture 1884-1914*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990, pp.65-96; and J. Springhall, Lord Meath, Youth and Empire, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 5:4, 1970, 97-111 for examples from different political backgrounds. Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, pp.37-60; Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, pp.10-11; Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.109-24; and M. Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor. Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London*, Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1999 address the philanthropic endeavours of different religious groups and organised freethought.

[35] F. Prochaska, *The Voluntary Impulse. Philanthropy in Modern Britain*, London: Faber & Faber, 1988, p.xiii.

[36] C.L. Mowat, *The Charity Organisation Society 1869-1913. Its Ideas and Work*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1961, pp.2, 25-27.

[37] Prochaska and Rozin discuss working-class contributions to charities. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*, pp.42-44, 100, 109; Prochaska, *Voluntary Impulse*, pp.27-31; Rozin, *op cit.*, pp.199-201. However note Waters' distinction between philanthropic efforts which sought to elevate the working-class to middle-class standards of culture such as settlement houses and philanthropic efforts which encouraged workers to advance by their own efforts, and involved the needy in their helping themselves such as Stanton Coit's neighbourhood guilds. Waters, *op cit.*, pp.95-96.

[38] One example of a professionalised response is the 'social hygiene movement' of the early twentieth century which blended medical assistance and improving morality. L. Bland, 'Cleansing the Portals of Life': the Venereal Disease Campaign in the early Twentieth Century, in M. Langan and B. Schwarz (eds.), *Crises in the British State 1880-1930*, London: Hutchinson, 1985, 192-208, pp.200-01.

[39] B. Harris, *The Origins of the British Welfare State. Social Welfare in England and Wales, 1880-1945*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, pp.40-58 stresses the distinction between poverty and indigence under the 1834 New Poor Law. See also, A. Brundage, *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002, pp.65-67, 75-81, 112-20.

Indeed, Jose Harris argues that judgement of character was even more central in the social discourse of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than it had been in the mid-Victorian era.[40] 'Character' was not rejected by the state or professional agencies, but was instead utilised as a powerful analytical category in the deployment of resources and aid, and intervention was directed at improving attitudes and behaviour as well as alleviating poverty and physical weakness.[41]

Thus state intervention and professional agencies did not replace the voluntary activity of an earlier period, but rather combined with philanthropic effort to tackle the same social problems.[42] Yet by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, understandings of these social problems had shifted, in line with developments in psychology. Explanations focused on the notion of individuals' pathologies now co-existed with the older structural understandings.[43] Much of this activity was directed at adults. However, voluntary and state initiatives increasingly targeted children and adolescents. There were youth organisations of different kinds – including the YMCA, the Girls Friendly Society, and the Boys Brigade[44] – and for younger children the Guild of Play.[45]

The historiography of the period deals with issues of voluntary agency and state power, the shifting boundaries of civil society[46] and the state, and individualist and collectivist modes of thought and processes of welfare provision. Generalisations of a shift from voluntary provision to a welfare state, and from individualism to collectivism have been questioned by recent research which emphasises the collectivist strain in early and mid Victorian welfare provision and the survival of various types of voluntarism and individualism into the early

---

[40] Harris, *Private Lives*, pp.248-49.
[41] Harris, *Private Lives*, pp.248-50; Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.28-29, 58.
[42] P. Hollis, *Ladies Elect. Women in English Local Government 1865-1914*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, p.20; J. Harris, Political Thought and the Welfare State 1870-1940: An Intellectual Framework for British Social Policy, *Past and Present*, 1992, 135, 116-41, pp.120-22. Hollis and Harris note that individuals who became involved in local government and professional administration and social science continued to be involved in charities and social reform organisations.
[43] For an overview of psychology in this period see N. Rose, *The Psychological Complex. Psychology, Politics and Society in England 1869-1939*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
[44] Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.88-90; J. Springhall, *Youth, Empire and Society*; P. Wilkinson, English Youth Movements, 1908-1930, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 4:2, 1969, 3-23; Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.157-80; J. Mackenzie, *Propaganda and Empire. The Manipulation of British Public Opinion 1880-1960*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984, pp.240-49; J. Gillis, *Youth and History. Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770-Present*, London: Academic Press, 1974, pp.142-48.
[45] Brehony, *op cit.*, passim; Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.87-88.
[46] On the complex understandings of civil society see J. Harris (ed.) *Civil Society in British History. Ideas, Identities, Institutions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

twentieth century.[47] As a broad pattern, however, a shift in opinion in favour of state intervention holds true. Stedman Jones sees the economic crisis of the 1880s as a key point of transition that undermined older views of individual degeneracy as a cause of poverty, and led to a perception that poverty was a cause of demoralisation. This change in views, he argues, lay behind demands for state intervention to remedy poverty.[48] The timing of the emergence of political ideologies (notably new liberalism and socialism) espousing state intervention, and the 'Nonconformist conscience' (with many Nonconformists calling for the state to promote the moral welfare of its citizens) lends credence to this analysis.[49]

This broad shift did not translate into a consensus on the degree of state action that was desirable or what form such action should take, and some remained committed to voluntarist methods.[50] Within the Charity Organisation Society, for instance, Helen and Bernard Bosanquet and others recognised by the 1890s that a simple dichotomy between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor was inadequate, and that poverty could have serious effects on behaviour. Nonetheless, individuals continued to be held responsible for their own actions and the COS continued to fight what Mowat calls a "rearguard action" against state intervention in the relief of poverty.[51] Moreover, as noted already, there was a 'mixed economy of welfare' with voluntarism and philanthropy remaining buoyant even as the functions of the state grew.

The links between classroom teaching and other aspects of welfare policy which aimed not only physically to assist but also to form and reform the character of the rising generation have unfortunately been neglected in much of the literature on changing political thought and social policy.[52] Still, a tradition of welfare provision in which the boundaries between

---

[47] See Harris, *Origins*, pp.1-14 for a useful summary of the historiography. Also see Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.118, 120-22.
[48] Stedman Jones, *op cit.*, pp. 281-314. See also Mowat, *op cit.*, pp.114-144 on changes in views on poverty, its causes, and desirable remedies during the 1880s and 1890s.
[49] Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, pp.11-13. Changing political doctrines will be discussed further below.
[50] W.H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition. Volume One: The Rise of Collectivism*, London: Methuen, 1983, *passim* and J. Cronin, *The Politics of State Expansion. War, State and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain*, London: Routledge, 1991, pp.3-6. Cronin notes that, despite appearances of steady growth, state expansion in the twentieth century has been fitful and uneven.
[51] Mowat, *op cit.*, p.117; A.M. McBriar, *An Edwardian Mixed Doubles. The Bosanquets versus the Webbs. A Study in British Social Policy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987, pp.369-70; Harris, *Private Lives*, p.231.
[52] Nevertheless, Bernard Harris sees a range of child welfare activities in the school, particularly school meals and the school medical service (though not classroom teaching or the curriculum) as aspects of the

material assistance and moral reform were blurred, and the proper boundaries of state and civil society were questioned, is part of the context which informed moral education in elementary schools.

These various attempts to improve the condition of the population drew on different social and political doctrines but were united by common threads, namely developing and reforming the character of individuals, and integrating the population in an organic community.

The idea of community was invoked by groups and individuals aiming to build consensus, or what Robert Bérard labels "social unity", at a time of social and demographic change and challenge to earlier ideological certainties.[53] This concept underpinned a range of different and sometimes conflicting philosophical and religious ideas, social and political theories, and social policies in the late nineteenth century. On the political left and the political right it was felt that a new or a renewed social consensus was needed for the well-being of the national community. Ideas differed over what a healthy national community should look like and how this should be achieved.[54] The common thread was that individuals were seen, in something of a break with earlier traditions, as "constituent parts of a wider social whole."[55]

Character – as noted by Jose Harris, Alan McBriar and Stephan Collini among others – was deemed essential for social and national vitality in this period.[56] It was, as Harris puts it, more than a "moral means test", a powerful explanatory variable in late nineteenth century social science that could be employed as "a stimulus to ... political emancipation." It was also seen as the glue which held society together: unless individual citizens were motivated by unifying

---

development of the welfare state. See B. Harris, *The Health of the Schoolchild. A History of the School Medical Service in England and Wales*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995, *passim* and Harris, *Origins*, esp. pp.136-49, 157-59, 262-82.

[53] Bérard, *Movement*, pp.55-56. Jan Romein argues that there was ideological uncertainty and cultural confusion across Western Europe at the turn of the century. J. Romein, *The Watershed of Two Eras. Europe in 1900*. Trans. by A.J. Pomerans, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1978, pp.651-58. According to Reeder the notion of community was invoked as a response to urbanism in the late nineteenth century as a way of counteracting the perceived dangers of an urban society. Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.76-79.

[54] For example, Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.31-32, 233-34, 244; McBriar, *op cit.*, p.372; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, p.111; M. Freeden (ed.) *Minutes of the Rainbow Circle, 1894-1924*, London: Royal Historical Society, 1989, pp.1-15.

[55] Harris, *Private Lives*, pp.245-46.

[56] Harris, *Private lives*, pp.248-50; McBriar, *op cit.*, pp.121-28, 132-34, 369-70; S. Collini, *Public Moralists. Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991, pp.91-118.

moral purposes it was feared that the community would fall apart.[57] By the turn of the twentieth century the concept of character was being invoked in debates over a range of issues from the youth labour 'problem' to 'social purity'[58]. More than an ideological device for imposing middle-class values on a potentially disruptive working-class,[59] like the notion of community it crossed political party and religious lines. Character was invoked by classical economists such as Alfred Marshall, and socialists such as Sidney Ball, to justify their preferred economic arrangements and theories of social action.[60] As Collini argues, "The very fact that ... politically and theoretically diverse declarations should take this common form points to the extraordinary status and centrality of the cluster of assumptions which the term denoted... it represented a prize worth fighting for."[61]

It would be impossible within the confines of this chapter adequately to trace all the intellectual and political currents through which notions of character and community were invoked by the late nineteenth century. Idealism, national efficiency, social Darwinism and ethical socialism were among the ideological frameworks used to navigate and understand the social and political landscape of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[62] The focus here will be on idealism. Idealism had a significant influence on social philosophy and social policy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which, according to Selleck, was indicative of the level of concern aroused by moral issues at this time.[63] Though committed philosophical idealists were few, there is evidence that more diffuse forms of idealism permeated much political and social thought and policy in this period.[64] Moreover, idealism is particularly pertinent to this study. Idealist thought influenced a number of

---

[57] Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.140-41; Harris, *Private Lives*, pp.249-50. See also Roberts, *Character*, pp.180-85 on character as an explanatory variable in the emerging discipline of psychology.
[58] Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.51-82, 119-54; Reeder, *op cit.*, p.79, 93.
[59] See Stedman Jones, *op cit.*, pp.281-314 for the idea that calls for moral reform of individuals were spurred by fears of unrest among the poor residuum.
[60] Collini, *Public Moralists*, pp.92-94; S. Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology. L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, pp.28-32; Hendrick, *op cit.*, especially p.254; W.H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition. Volume Two: The Ideological Heritage*, London: Methuen, 1983, p.413.
[61] Collini, *Public Moralists*, p.94.
[62] See Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.79-81, 85-86 and Harris, *Political Thought*, p.139 for discussions of other relevant ideological frameworks. For more on national efficiency see G.R. Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
[63] Selleck, *op cit.*, p.259.
[64] Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.125-26, 138-39. For the influence of philosophical idealism on Anglican theology see T. M. Gouldstone, *The Rise and Decline of Anglican Idealism in the Nineteenth Century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.

prominent educational reformers and administrators at the Board of Education[65] and there was a strong idealist element in the ideas of the ethical movement which was, as already noted, central in the campaign for secular moral instruction.[66]

Idealist thought originally appeared in England in the mid-nineteenth century, in a scattered form through the literary, religious and socio-political works of, for instance, Thomas Carlyle, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Arnold and FD Maurice. However, according to Gordon and White, it was through the construction of a coherent philosophical system by Benjamin Jowett and his tutee TH Green of Balliol College, Oxford, that idealism was able to permeate the English intellectual world.[67]

The idealist notion of reality as an organic, interconnected whole with every part dependent on the rest predicates an emphasis on community.[68] Following and expanding Hegel's emphasis on social morality, TH Green argued that the supreme principle that should guide the individual in his or her conduct and in deciding between right and wrong should be the 'common good'. The community was to provide the locus for the individual's moral strivings. The community Green emphasised was the modern nation state. The function of the state was to "promote the common good", and to enable the individual to "realise his capacity for contributing to a social good which is the foundation of his right to free life."[69]

In idealism the well-being and duties of the individual and the state are inextricably bound together. Individuals should, in Green's vision, serve the state of which they are an organic part. Hence the prominence of an individual's moral obligation to the state in idealist social and political thought. On the other hand, the state had a duty to promote the moral

---

[65] P. Gordon and J. White, *Philosophers as Educational Reformers. The Influence of Idealism on British Educational Thought and Practice*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, p.xi.
[66] This will be explored further later in this chapter. Green's redefinition of religion as morality is a key link between his idealism and ethicist thought. Budd, *op cit.*, pp.200-01.
[67] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.3-8. See M. Richter, *The Politics of Conscience. T.H. Green and his Age*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964, pp.52-96 for a detailed discussion of Green and Jowett at Balliol College.
[68] See Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.13-63 and Richter, *op cit.*, *passim* for a more detailed outline of idealist thought.
[69] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.25-30, 42-46; Richter, *op cit.*, pp.215, 248-49.

improvement of its citizens by removing obstacles to the individual's full development.[70] There are aspects of both the remoralisation of individuals and systemic reform in Green's philosophy. Green's idealism provided a language which could on the one hand justify a range of new responsibilities for the state, but on the other emphasise the duties of the individual citizen.[71]

This flexibility is one of the reasons why idealism – broadly defined – was so popular. Idealism as formulated by TH Green was not prescriptive in terms of the individual or organisational action demanded. Green's goal of developing the spiritual capacities of all the members of the national community (and indeed the community of humanity as a whole) could be achieved in several ways, through a career in the church, or different forms of social service.[72] Green did not specify how in political terms the goal of a moralised state was to be achieved. Moreover, Socialists and conservatives alike could buy into the goal of a moralised state. Anomic individualism was seen as a threat on the political left and the political right which the idealist organic community could potentially dispel.

It is unsurprising therefore to find broadly idealist positions adopted by those in favour of, and against, state intervention to alleviate poverty, famously the Bosanquets and the Webbs.[73] Idealist principles also bolstered calls for state action to remove the causes of ill health, low wages, unemployment, and politically conservative arguments about the 'boy labour' problem and continuation schools.[74] Idealism was used in these ways to justify very different programmes of reform.

The prominence of idealist thought was also achieved through individual idealists attaining important positions in social policy and administration. Graduates of Oxford and Glasgow Universities, influenced by TH Green and Edward Caird, came to London and put the idealist philosophy they had learned at university into practice in different ways, through the settlement movement, the Fabian Society, the Charity Organisation Society, and the ethical

---

[70] Gouldstone, *op cit.*, pp.60-61; Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.45-46. See Richter, *op cit.*, pp.222-91 for a detailed discussion of Green's theory of political obligation and his views on state intervention and the goals of social policy.
[71] P. Clarke, *Liberals and Social Democrats*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978, pp.14-15.
[72] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.31-33.
[73] McBriar, *op cit.*, passim. See also Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.131-34; Richter, *op cit.*, pp.330-336.
[74] Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.133-34; Hendrick, *op cit.*, pp.235-38.

movement.[75] Gordon and White argue that idealism influenced a number of prominent educational reformers between the 1870s and 1920s – Michael Sadler, Robert Morant, Arthur Acland, Henry Jones, Edmond Holmes – and in a later generation RH Tawney, AD Lindsay and Fred Clarke, all but one of whom were Oxford or Glasgow graduates. They see much of the impetus for liberalising the elementary school curriculum in the 1890s, and state secondary education, coming from these individuals. Graduates of Balliol College, Oxford, in particular were prominent in the higher branches of educational administration in the period covered by this thesis: on the Board of Education, in central and local inspectorships, and through representation on royal commissions and consultative committees.[76]

Why this link between idealism and involvement in educational administration and reform? Gordon and White argue that philosophical idealism led naturally to educational implementation, as it was concerned with teaching the individual what it was to realise his or herself and how that self-realisation was to come about. Education was deemed necessary for the self-realisation of each individual and for the attainment of the common good (which was bound up in individuals' self-realisation). Hence Green's advocacy of universal elementary education and compulsory attendance: education was for him a moral duty and a public duty, and all must be able to benefit from elementary schooling.[77]

Commentators in the Edwardian period and since have observed a close relationship, and some have even argued for a causal relationship, between philosophical idealism and the changes in the political doctrine of liberalism around the turn of the century which have been labelled new liberalism.[78] However, as Richter notes, there were differences between Green's own politics, which were close to the older liberal tradition of the Manchester school and John Bright, and the later use made of his thinking by new liberals like LT Hobhouse and JA Hobson who considered him their teacher and guide.[79] In new liberalism, as in idealism, there was an organic conception of society: the character of the individual and character of

---

[75] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.9-11; Budd, *op cit.*, p.201.
[76] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.xi, 86-88. Morant studied at New College, Oxford rather than Balliol and was influenced by Green's ideas at second hand through working with Michael Sadler at Toynbee Hall.
[77] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.46, 52-53, 77-79; Richter, *op cit.*, pp.355-59.
[78] Richter, *op cit.*, pp.13, 267. Freeden argues instead that Liberalism would have changed in any case, and idealism was merely a compatible argument which offered intellectual support. M. Freeden, *The New Liberalism, An Ideology of Social Reform*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, pp.16-18, 55-60.
[79] Richter, *op cit.*, pp.268-76, 280-81.

society were thought interdependent.[80] Yet new liberals went beyond Green's own arguments, using his concept of the common good to support a programme of positive state intervention, with LT Hobhouse for instance arguing that the state should supply all with the economic basis required for the full employment of personal powers.[81] The new liberal debt to idealism is evident also in the notion of the state having a moral function. State intervention was required in order to guarantee and preserve the conditions of liberty which were needed for the self-realisation of individual citizens, in other words the development of their characters.[82]

Links between idealism and socialism have also been identified, though not to the same degree.[83] However, the moral condition of the people – interpreted as both the character of individuals and the well-being of the community – was as important to socialists as other parties of the period. Kevin Manton, for instance, argues that moral and material reforms were combined and indeed were inseparable in the socialist programme of the late nineteenth century.[84] We can see this emphasis on both individual moral reform and economic change in the Labour Party's early child welfare policies,[85] and the socialist critique of aspects of popular culture which were seen to undermine the advance of socialism.[86]

Socialist versions of morality emphasised the values of collectivism, cooperation, and mutual help in the pursuit of social justice. These values were central to working-class movements of

---

[80] Freeden, *New Liberalism*, pp.176-77.
[81] Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology*, pp.144-45.
[82] D. Sutton, Liberalism, State Collectivism and the Social Relations of Citizenship, in M. Langan and B. Schwarz (eds.), *Crises in the British State 1880-1930*, London: Hutchinson, 1985, 63-79, pp.77-78; Freeden, *New Liberalism*, pp.170-77. Collini argues that as the self-reliance promoted by Samuel Smiles and others in an earlier period became self-realisation or self-development, the potential for collectivist interpretations of the action needed for individuals to develop character increased. Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology*, pp.28-29.
[83] Greenleaf notes that the ideas of Green and his disciples influenced early English socialists, while Harris points to idealist thought among early members of the Labour Party. Greenleaf, *Political Tradition, Volume Two*, p.139; Harris, *Political Thought*, pp.133-34.
[84] Manton, *Socialism and Education*, passim. See also J. Stewart, Ramsay MacDonald, the Labour Party, and Child Welfare, 1900-1914, *Twentieth Century British History*, 4:2, 1993, 105-25 for the combination of moral and economic arguments in Ramsay MacDonald's rationale for child welfare. This argument seems more convincing than the division of socialists into moralists and materialists (for example, Greenleaf, *Political Tradition, Volume Two*, pp.350-52, 412-17) or an emphasis primarily on the ethical aspects of socialism (for example, P. Joyce, *Visions of the People. Industrial England and the Question of Class 1848-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p.300).
[85] John Stewart outlines Ramsay MacDonald's view of the role of the family in the achievement of socialist society, and the notion of an organic relationship between state, individual and community which, Stewart argues, formed the basis of MacDonald's arguments for child welfare reforms, particularly school meals. Stewart, *Ramsay MacDonald*.
[86] Waters, *op cit.*, p.187.

the mid nineteenth century like Chartism and Owenism.[87] Socialists of the 1880s and 1890s took from these earlier movements the rationalist element in socialist morality, and also the notion of moral training at an early age, and the idea of creating the community ethos and emotional conditions in which socialist values would flourish.[88] The right sort of education, promoting children's physical and moral welfare, was thus a moral imperative for socialists of the late nineteenth century. Harry Quelch and others argued that the community should oversee the training of character in the young, in order that the right collective values were promoted, and in order to ensure that children received the knowledge about social conditions that would lead them to accept the rightness of socialist conclusions.[89] Socialists established both day and Sunday schools to provide such an education. However, they disagreed on whether the primary emphasis should lie in imparting knowledge about society and economics, or in encouraging ethical endeavour.[90]

Christian versions of morality on the other hand – glossing over important doctrinal differences within and between denominations – were centred on the notion of duty to God: doing God's will and obedience to his demands. Duty to God was seen to involve personal religious commitment. The various denominations came to see themselves as guarantors and promoters of morality.[91] This, along with gaining young recruits, particularly among the poor, was a key impulse behind church involvement in elementary schooling, as it was believed that an appropriately religious education would develop the individual piety and the highest form of 'character'.[92]

Christian morality also had a social aspect, as Christian duty was defined increasingly as social action as the nineteenth century progressed. This is testified by the ideologies of, for instance, Christian socialism and the civic gospel, and the 'outreach' activity and the range of charitable and philanthropic endeavours on the part of different denominations alluded to

---

[87] Manton, *Socialism and Education*, pp.92-93, 101-04; Waters, *op cit.*, p.190.
[88] B. Simon, *The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974, pp.260-61; Castle, *op cit.*, pp.267-70; Budd, *op cit.*, pp.22-24; Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, pp.54-55.
[89] Manton, *Socialism and Education*, pp.92-93.
[90] Manton, *Socialism and Education*, pp.84-115; Budd, *op cit.*, pp.75-76; F. Reid, Socialist Sunday Schools in Britain, 1892-1939, *International Review of Social History*, 11:1, 1966, 18-47.
[91] E. Norman, *Church and State since 1800*, in S. Gilley and W.J. Sheils (eds.) *A History of Religion in Britain*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994, 277-90, p.285.
[92] Harris, *Private Lives*, p.155.

above. Thomas Chalmers was a crucial figure. According to his biographer Stewart Brown, his programmes for parish ministry to the poor – programmes of poor relief, popular education, and household visits – encouraged others "to strive for social improvement with a sustained and unselfish commitment to God and the future good of mankind."[93] These developments were not without difficulties. Chalmers himself perceived a tension between the duty of charitable relief for those in need and the danger that charity could encourage greed and laziness among the poor.[94] Evangelicals were, however, inspired by the notion of salvation by good works to engage in community work and lay activity.[95] This view of Christian duty also led to clergy and laity becoming involved in municipal politics (as in the 'civic gospel' preached in Birmingham), and in lobbying on the national political stage (over slavery, alcohol, prostitution, and elementary education among other issues).[96] Christian duty was thus understood as requiring activism both to help those in need and to combat vice and sin, through voluntary provision or municipal or state-led programmes.

There was little place for God in secularist morality. Rooted in the deism of, for instance, Thomas Paine and Robert Owen, secularists deemed individuals responsible for the world and its well-being. Aspects of utilitarianism and Owenite rationalism were weaved through the secularist ethical code, which was to be independent of religion and instead based on the needs of society, with those needs determined and analysed by observation and reason. For example, George Jacob Holyoake proposed a secularist code of conduct relating exclusively, unlike Christian morality, to the here and now, with all human energies invested in the improvement of the present life.[97] Secularists also argued that ethics should be modified in the light of new knowledge, in contrast with what they saw as the immutable nature of Christian morality.[98]

---

[93] S.J. Brown, *Thomas Chalmers and the Godly Commonwealth in Scotland*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, pp.378-79.
[94] Brown, *op cit.*, pp.67-68, 117-29.
[95] See Stewart, *Christ's Kingdom*, pp.3-4, 14-16 for a discussion of attempts to revive and build on Chalmers' work in Edwardian Scotland. Also see Brown, *op cit.*, pp.376-77 and Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, pp.10-11, 120-23 for Chalmer's influence on the Charity Organisation Society and evangelicalism generally.
[96] See Chapter Four on the civic gospel in Birmingham. On the political campaigns of the various churches see Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, passim and G.I.T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, pp.3-23.
[97] Budd, *op cit.*, pp.26-27.
[98] C. Gorham, Agnostic and Theistic Views of Morality, *Agnostic Annual*, 1902, 48-55, p.55.

Hence there was a rational and intellectual strain in secularist morality. As Charles Gorham put it "the basis of morals is the rational nature of man ... the sanction of morals is the authority of right as known by experience." For Gorham the stress on the intellect of the "rational morality" of the agnostic distinguished it from religious morality, which relied on supernatural authority and emphasised the "emotional feeling".[99] Yet feelings were also important in Secularist morality. As George Foote argued in 1894, "Reason shows us how to reach our object, but feeling decides what object we try to reach."[100] Secularist morality had both individual and social aspects. In keeping with the strain of individualism in Secularist culture, individuals were expected to ascertain their moral code and to decide on how to behave through rational enquiry.[101] Still, as already noted, secularist morality was derived from social requirements, and aimed to benefit the community.[102]

Morality was also of prime importance to the small group of English positivists. In this they followed Auguste Comte, who deemed teaching in positivist morality as essential for progress towards the ideal positivist society. Positivist morality consisted of a balance of intellectual and emotional elements. Moreover, in keeping with an emphasis on social unity, positivist ethics placed social needs and service above the needs and freedom of the individual.[103] And in keeping with the notion of the evolution of humanity, morality was deemed relative and context sensitive, altering as situations changed and the race developed.[104]

The title of the ethical movement indicates how crucial morality was to its thought and its activities. The promotion of the study of morality, the pursuit of the "moral life" and emphasis on the ethical elements of every day existence are common threads in various

---

[99] Gorham, *op cit.*, pp.48, 50-51.
[100] G.W. Foote, Why live a moral life?, *Agnostic Annual*, 1894, cited in J. Herrick, *Vision and Realism. A Hundred Years of the Freethinker*, London: G.W. Foote & Co., 1982, p.32.
[101] Budd argues that many rejected orthodox beliefs on intellectual grounds and because of an ethic based on personal autonomy and liberty, Budd, *op cit.*, pp.189, 240-41. Autodidact traditions of learning were strong among secularists. Budd, *op cit.*, pp.12-13; Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.81-83, 117-18; Royle, *op cit.*, pp.316-17. For an autobiographical account of autodidact learning see T. Barclay, *Memoirs and Medleys. The Autobiography of a Bottle-Washer*, Leicester: Edgar Backus, 1934.
[102] Gorham, *op cit.*, p.48.
[103] Simon, *European Positivism*, pp.44, 125; F.J.Gould, *Childrens' Book of Moral Lessons. First Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1899, p.xvi.
[104] F.J. Gould, *The Religion of Humanity*, London: Watts & Co., 1916, pp.9-10; F.J. Gould, *British Education after the War*, London: Watts & Co., 1917, p.23.

statements of aims produced by the movement.[105] Like Secularists and positivists they envisaged a purely human morality "apart from theological and metaphysical considerations". But unlike the Secularist notion of a code of ethics in opposition to the Christian version, ethicists saw morality as the core around which individuals of all or no religion could combine and cooperate. They envisaged a universal and synoptic morality which was sufficient for a rule of life and would form the basis for union of individuals of different creeds. Such a vision depended on the philosophical premise that ethics could be deemed somehow independent of their political or religious contexts.[106] This could explain why other than requiring a certain economic standard to ensure the full moral development of citizens, the ethical movement failed to come up with a coherent political programme for action or position on social reform.[107] Views varied within the ethical movement on how morality should be developed. Stanton Coit for instance was among those who emphasised the social aspects of ethics, arguing that good was only attained through contact with society.[108] Others, for instance Professor Muirhead, prominent among the idealists of the London Ethical Society, saw the working out of moral values as an individual intellectual act and stressed the need to focus on the inward and individual side of the ethical experience.[109]

The various branches of organised freethought had different educational priorities in relation to both state education and provision for their members. The main focus of Secularist educational campaigns was keeping state funded education on a purely secular basis.[110] Explicitly moral ends were clearer in positivist modes of education. FJ Gould, for instance, saw educating the young in moral considerations as a way of infusing them with a sense of their membership of humanity and thus of promoting social unity and the moral advance of society. Rather than "[standing] aloof from the course of so-called National Education" because it fell short of Comte's proposals, as he felt some his fellow positivists did, he recommended "[developing] progress from the present order of the primary schools, using

---

[105] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.1-8, 99-107. See also Budd, *op cit.*, p.189.
[106] Budd, *op cit.* pp.226-27, 247-48; Tribe, *op cit.*, pp.39-40.
[107] MacKillop, *op cit.*, pp.143-45.
[108] S. Coit, The Ethical use of the Bible in Schools, in G. Spiller (ed.) *Papers on Moral Education Communicated to the First International Moral Education Congress*, 2nd edition, London: David Nutt, 1909, 157-59; Budd, *op cit.*, pp.226-27.
[109] Professor Muirhead emphasised the "inward side of moral life" in his response to papers presented in the fifth session – the relation of religious education to moral education – of the First International Moral Education Congress. *Record of the Proceedings of the First International Moral Education Congress*, London: David Nutt, 1908, p.47.
[110] Royle, *op cit.*, pp.309-16; Tribe, *op cit.*, pp.175-80.

Comte's directions as a test in the daily administration, and as a goal of reform."[111] Moral education was, unsurprisingly, central to the educational programmes of the ethical movement, from the discussions of ethics and philosophy for adults run by the London Ethical Society, to the Sunday school of the East London Ethical Society. It was also central to the movement's attempts to influence state education, primarily through the Moral Instruction League.[112]

Moralising the population: the educational context

It is now time to focus in on the educational context. An important aspect of this context was what could be described as the public school tradition of moral training. One of the distinctive features of the English public school system was the idea that a school was a place to train character,[113] though the sector was by no means homogenous. The reforms introduced by Thomas Arnold in the 1820s-40s at Rugby and by Edward Thring in the 1850s at Uppingham are particularly well-known and pertinent to this study.

Despite Arnold's own uncertainties in his faith in his early life,[114] he promoted the ideal of a 'Christian gentleman': cultured, kindly, a leader who would civilise others through force of moral example and *character*. The desired character was to be developed through some formal mechanisms – such as sermons in the chapel – but mainly through informal mechanisms of a cultured and refined atmosphere, and healthy and positive relationships between staff and pupils. Thring in particular recognised the impact which the organisation of the school and school surroundings could have on moral tone and discipline, and realised the importance of improvements in the physical surroundings and provision for a variety of leisure activities.[115] Both Arnold and Thring acknowledged the importance of the corporate identity of the school. Arnold envisaged a community of shared values and disciplined behaviour

---

[111] F.J. Gould, Positivism and the Elementary School System, *Positivist Review*, August 1905, 173-77, p.174; Wright, *Morality without Theology*, pp.11-13; McGee, *op cit.*, p.60. Comte insisted on complete separation between school and state: recommending education at home till age 14 under the mother then training at school under positivist teachers. Simon, *European Positivism*, p.83. For more on the influence of positivism on Gould's ideas on moral education see Bérard, *Frederick James Gould*, pp.239-40 and Wright, *Morality without Theology*, pp.18-34.

[112] Budd, *op cit.*, pp.201-03; F.J. Gould, *The Life Story of a Humanist*, London: Watts & Co., 1923, pp.76-78. See Chapter Two for more detail on the Moral Instruction League's roots in the ethical movement.

[113] Gathorne-Hardy, *op cit.*, pp.75-76; J. Tosh, *A Man's Place. Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*, London: Yale University Press, 1999, 117-19.

[114] See T. Copley, *Black Tom: Arnold of Rugby, the Myth and the Man*, London: Continuum, 2002, pp.39-42.

[115] Barnard, *op cit.*, p.179; Castle, *op cit.*, pp.312-19; Copley, *op cit.*, pp.156-51, 164-70.

"disciplined to a uniformly Christian spirit" while Thring worked for a "similarity ... of social sympathies" among his pupils.[116] Thring and Arnold's visions were of a hierarchical community. More egalitarian and democratic models of the school community were developed elsewhere by, for instance, the Hill family at Hazelwood School in Birmingham in the first half of the nineteenth century and later by Cecil Reddie at Abbotsholme School.[117]

In the years following the Public Schools Commission of 1864 there developed a public school tradition of moral education centred on the playing field, namely athleticism or "the cult of organised games". Mangan describes it this way: "The character of the future gentleman was largely shaped by the allegedly moral lessons learnt on the games field".[118] It was argued that individuals would learn psychological and physical stamina, allegiance to the team (and by extension to the house and school), and to subordinate their own comfort and interests for the good of the team as a whole. A perceived link between the qualities developed on the playing field and the needs of empire permeated public school magazines and songs and wider educational debates of the period. Building on the tenets of transfer psychology, it was argued that the qualities learned on the playing fields would transfer automatically to other settings, in other words that those who learned to "play the game" at school would also do so in other areas of life.[119] Educational reformers and administrators, many of whom had been to public schools themselves, wished to see elements of the public school traditions of moral training reproduced in state-funded elementary schools and extended to the lower classes through youth organisations such as the Boys' Brigade and Boy Scouts.[120]

---

[116] Mangan, *Athleticism*, pp.14-16; Castle, *op cit.*, pp.285-90; Copley, *op cit.*, pp.156-61; Gathorne-Hardy, *op cit.*, pp.70-78; Honey, *op cit.*, pp.1-26.
[117] P. Bartrip, 'A Thoroughly Good School': An Examination of the Hazelwood Experiment in Progressive Education, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 28:1, 1980, 46-59; Castle, *op cit.*, pp.245-49; Marsh, *Back to the Land*, pp.212-13; R. Skidelsky, *English Progressive Schools*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969, pp.91-114; Gathorne-Hardy, *op cit.*, pp.276-83.
[118] Mangan, *Athleticism*, p.136.
[119] Mangan, *Athleticism*, pp.138, 179-206; Collini, *Public Moralists*, pp.114-17; Gathorne-Hardy, *op cit.*, pp.146-48; Honey, *op cit.*, pp.115-17.
[120] Chapters Two and Six of this thesis discuss the extension of the games ethic to elementary schools. See Springhall, *Youth, Empire and Society*; Orr, *op cit.*; Rosenthal, pp.88-130, 161-90 on the idea of character formation through youth movements.

There was also a 'voluntary school tradition' of moral education.[121] "Religious and moral education" was deemed a central purpose of voluntary school teaching, in addition to a basic education centred on reading, writing and arithmetic. In the schools of the National Society (founded in 1811) a disciplinary religious instruction on a confessional basis, based around the catechism and the Bible, was seen as the mechanism through which moral education would be achieved. A telling phrase in the National Society's management clauses of 1847 – "The Minister is to have the superintendence of the moral and religious instruction of the scholars" – indicates how closely religion and morality were elided in this view, and also reveals how central the local vicar was to this aspect of schooling.[122] Moreover, part of the objection to the 1862 Revised Code on the part of Anglicans was that it took no account of, and would therefore discourage, "training the children in habits of order, discipline and cleanliness" or "instruction in the Holy Scripture".[123] Voluntary schools – whether Anglican or Roman Catholic – continued to promote this type of confessional moral education after the passage of the 1870 Act. Church authorities were determined to resist the incursions of board schools, and resolved to retain a degree of independence from state control, partly to ensure that their schools remained able to conduct moral teaching in the only way they considered effective.[124]

In contrast, the Nonconformist dominated British and Foreign School Society posited a non-denominational form of religious instruction for their schools, with simple Bible reading with limited or no explanation. However, this as much as the confessional instruction in national schools was felt to create a desirable religious influence in the school and was therefore

---

[121] Voluntary schools were established by voluntary agency, often churches of different denominations. Through the nineteenth century they received only partial public funding and were subject to only partial public control. Board schools were set up by School Boards (established where voluntary school provision was deemed inadequate under the 1870 Education Act) and subject to full public control and funding. When School Boards were replaced by Education Committees under the 1902 Education Act board schools became council schools.

[122] H.J. Burgess, *Enterprise in Education. The Story of the Work of the Established Church in the Education of the People Prior to 1870*, London: National Society/SPCK, 1958, p.219. See also Silver, *op cit.*, particularly pp.29-34 and A. Digby and P. Searby, *Children, School and Society in Nineteenth-Century England*, London: Macmillan, 1981, pp.81-83 on the National Society and moral education on a Christian basis in the mid-nineteenth century.

[123] Burgess, *op cit.*, p.178.

[124] See Sacks, *op cit.*, pp.114-23 for a useful discussion of these issues which highlights differences of opinion within the Anglican and Roman Catholic camps.

deemed central to moral training.[125] It appears that the majority of School Boards after 1870 followed this basic model.[126]

From the time of its first interventions into elementary education in the 1830s, the state placed moral education in elementary schools on a firmly religious basis.[127] James Kay Shuttleworth's instructions in 1840 on behalf of the newly formed Committee of the Privy Council on Education to the first two members of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools are telling: "no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which the intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion."[128] Thirty years later, during the debates on the Education Bill in 1870, Cowper-Temple stated that if there was moral training in schools founded by the state it should be based "upon the sanction of the Divine Law."[129] The link between religion and morality was also reinforced many times in the evidence presented to the Cross Commission from within the inspectorate and others involved in educational administration between 1886 and 1888.[130] The notion that moral education was rooted in religion was thus deeply embedded in the culture of educational administration and proved impossible for the Moral Instruction League and others to uproot.

Within this broad ethos of moral education on a Christian basis, there is evidence of moral instruction which was not directly related to God and religion. Log book entries for voluntary schools before 1870 reveal that teachers seized on opportunities to speak to their

---

[125] See for example Sacks, *op cit.*, pp.123-27.
[126] See evidence of J. Hanson, Bradford School Board in the *Second Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Elementary Education Acts*, 1887, cited in Digby and Searby, *op cit.*, pp.90-94; Bebbington, *Nonconformist Conscience*, p.132; Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, p.125. However, Cruickshank points out that some Nonconformists objected to any form of religious instruction in schools paid for out of state funds, arguing that it should be given in church or if in schools out of normal school hours by voluntary agency. R.W. Dale of Birmingham School Board was prominent in this agitation. Cruickshank, *op cit.*, pp.44-47, 59. See also Chapter Five below for debates on Birmingham School Board over this issue.
[127] This was in keeping with the wider discourse on the moral purpose of schooling in mid-nineteenth century England and Upper Canada. M. Larsen, *A Comparative Study of the Socio-historical Construction of the Teacher in Mid-Victorian England and Upper Canada*, Unpublished PhD thesis: Institute of Education, University of London, 2004, pp.177-83.
[128] Minutes of the Committee of Council 1840-41, cited in R. Aldrich, A Curriculum for the Nation, R. Aldrich, *Lessons from History of Education. The Selected Works of Richard Aldrich*, London: Routledge, 2006, 129-42, p.134. See also report of Her Majesty's Inspector (HMI) Joseph Fletcher in the *Minutes of the Committee of Council*, 1846, cited in Digby and Searby, *op cit.*, pp.77-79.
[129] Cited in Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, p.99.
[130] Platten, *op cit.*, pp.288-90. Some witnesses, however, suggested that morality could be taught in schools without reference to Christianity.

pupils about, for instance, the value of saving at times of distress, and the importance of cleanliness.[131] In some respects this anticipates the explicitly secular moral instruction promoted later in the nineteenth century.

Moral training was also developed outside the formal school system, for instance in Sunday schools. Christian denominations, branches of organised freethought, and socialists alike recognised the importance of reaching the young in this way. Sunday schools were not only a means of missionary activity, but also provided a rudimentary elementary education and moral training. The extension of state elementary education led to a decline in the elementary education element in Sunday schools, which increasingly stressed the moral instruction they were providing.

Denominational Sunday schools of the early and mid-Victorian periods taught not only Christian doctrine and traditional Christian virtues of piety, honesty and charity but also broader social values of the time. These Sunday schools aimed to form habits of work and play. As well as Christian piety, virtues of hard work, honesty, thrift, perseverance were promoted in the morality tales in the tracts and reward books distributed to attendees and the textbooks used during Sunday school hours. At the same time, systems of reward and punishment encouraged cleanliness and regular and prompt attendance, and sermons promoted the civilised and rational use of leisure.[132]

The potential moral benefits of the Sunday school were similarly recognised within organised freethought.[133] Secular Sunday schools, like many Secularist institutions, were derived from Owenism. They combined the development of useful knowledge – hence the scientific veneer of the curriculum – with an appreciation of the need for moral education.[134] According to Charles Watts, these institutions provided "useful and entertaining instruction

---

[131] N. Ball, *Educating the People. A Documentary History of Elementary Schooling in England, 1840-1870*, London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1983, pp.168-70.
[132] T.W. Laqueur, *Religion and Respectability. Sunday Schools and Working Class Culture 1780-1850*, London: Yale University Press, 1976, pp.187-240. For more on the moral content of Sunday school books and magazines see Tholfsen, *op cit.* This research relates mainly to Sunday schools of the early to mid-Victorian period.
[133] Positivists do not appear to have organised their own Sunday schools, although an elementary school was opened at Chapel Street, London, in 1872 which lasted 5 years. McGee, *op cit.*, p.60; Smith, *London Heretics*, p.92. However, the positivists in Leicester Secular Society, including F.J. Gould, were active in the Society's Sunday school. Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.112-14.
[134] Royle, *op cit.*, pp.320-24; Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.112-13.

for an hour and a half" while "[impressing] upon them the advantages of a moral and virtuous life."[135] Prominent Secularists produced materials for such moral teaching. Charles Watts and Austin Holyoake edited a secular hymn book designed for freethought 'rites' and for meetings in halls of science and secular Sunday schools in 1871, which contained hymns on moral qualities and reformers. Annie Besant and Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner produced collections of moral tales.[136]

The Sunday schools of the ethical movement provided an immediate precedent for the work of the Moral Instruction League. Not all ethical societies established Sunday schools. As noted above the idealists of the London Ethical Society preferred philosophical discussion groups for adults. Nevertheless, Sunday schools were a prominent part of the "missionary activity" of other groups like the East London Ethical Society.[137] Influenced by the provision for the moral education of children on the part of the ethical culture movement in the USA, moral instruction formed a central part of the ethical Sunday school curriculum.[138] The Moral Instruction League drew on this model in developing their educational programme for elementary schools.[139]

Educational theorists and moral education

In addition, contemporaries could draw on a range of theoretical perspectives which emphasised moral education to inform their practice. Like the 'traditions' developed in public and elementary schools and among policy-makers at the Board of Education, more often than not these theoretical perspectives favoured religious rather than secular, and indirect rather than direct, approaches to moral education.

Pestalozzi and Herbart will be considered here because of their emphasis on moral education, and also because of their influence on the English educational world of the late nineteenth century. Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827) defined three categories of

---

[135] Charles Watts, *National Reformer*, 6 December 1868, cited in Tribe, *op cit.*, p.194.
[136] Tribe, *op cit.*, p.197; Royle, *op cit.*, p.321.
[137] MacKillop, *op cit.*, pp.81-98, 138-39; Budd, *op cit.*, p.203.
[138] As early as 1883 Felix Adler argued that ethical societies should provide for the moral training of children as an alternative to church Sunday schools. F. Adler, A Secular View of Moral Training, *North American Review*, May 1883, 446-54, p.452. On ethical Sunday schools in England see Budd, *op cit.*, p.246.
[139] MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, p.4. See also Gould, *Life Story*, pp.77-78.

educational knowledge – intellectual, moral, and physical – giving primacy to the moral as the most important kind of knowledge. He applied the idea of *Anschauung* (variously translated as observation and sense impression, or concreteness) to the field of morals. Ethical teaching, he argued, should not be based on precepts and codes, but the child should learn the goodness of God and rightness from actual experience. The moral life of the child should be built up not through direct instruction but instead through the teacher guiding and directing the child so he or she can obtain the experience which will make them aware of themselves and others. It is not surprising to find that Pestalozzi acknowledged the influence of Rousseau here.[140] Pestalozzi's ideas lent weight to arguments for indirect methods of moral education – guidance and creating the right environment for the child to learn by experience – and to arguments for the centrality of God in the moral world.

Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1834) also gave priority to moral education, but his views on how it should be carried out differed from Pestalozzi's recommendations. Herbart adopted the idealist aim of education as moral improvement: "The one and the whole work of education ... may be summed up in the concept – Morality."[141] Society, for Herbart, was imperfect, and the purpose of education was to improve society through 'making good men' (i.e. improving the individuals in society). In contrast to Pestalozzi, instruction was central to Herbart's model of moral education. Like Kant, Herbart located morality in the will. Instruction and the will were central to character formation as formulated in his idea of the 'circle of thought'.[142] Goodness in Herbart's view required the cultivation of the right knowledge or ideas, and an interest in the right things (hence his emphasis on "many sided interest" cultivated through skilful teaching and a broad curriculum).[143] Herbart's theories, with their emphasis on instruction and intellectual knowledge, gave primacy to the role of the teacher, who he thought responsible for developing the child's circle of thought and many-sided interest. Intuitive and imitative aspects of moral training are downplayed.[144]

---

[140] Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, pp.59-60; Castle, *op cit.*, p.158-63; Barnard, *op cit.*, pp.45-46.
[141] Herbart 's *The Aesthetic Revelation of the World* cited in Selleck, *op cit.*, p.227. Gordon and White note that despite the similarity of aim, Herbart's emphasis on instruction contrasted with the idealist emphasis on the indirect educative emphasis on social institutions. Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.178-79.
[142] Rawnsley explains this complex idea. Rawnsley, *op cit.*, pp.60-72.
[143] Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, pp.64-65; Castle, *op cit.*, pp.214-15; Selleck, *op cit.*, p. 235.
[144] Selleck, *op cit.*, pp.263-64; Castle *op cit.*, pp.218-19.

Thus Pestalozzi and Herbart, despite a similar emphasis on moral education, had different visions of the content and structure of the curriculum, the role of the teacher, pedagogical approaches, and indeed the organisation of the school.[145] Perhaps this is part of the reason why battles over different approaches to moral education were so keenly fought: more than just teaching methods were at stake.

What impact did these theories have on educational practice? Birchenough saw reforms to methods of instruction during the nineteenth century – including an emphasis on object lessons and the grading of all instruction from its logically simplest elements – as influenced by Pestalozzian ideas. Pestalozzi's theories of moral development, however, are absent from Birchenough's description of Pestalozzian influence.[146] Selleck claims that Herbartians were influential in training colleges and the education press in the 1890s, and that this influence was a result of Herbart's emphasis on moral education. "Herbartians," Selleck contends, "gave voice in the educational world to the demand for moral instruction but the demand itself (which gave urgency to their arguments and assured them of their hearing) was not primarily of their creation."[147] However, the chief Herbartian influence on teaching practice was not his theories of moral instruction but his method of five stages which was widely adopted as a model for curriculum planning.[148] Also, Frank Hayward's attempts to promote a Herbartian model of moral education through his educational texts and after 1910 through his programme of school celebrations met with limited success.[149] We should not assume that just because these theories of moral education existed and were known among educationalists that they had a widespread influence on classroom practice.

Character was also an important analytical category in the emergent discipline of psychology by the end of the nineteenth century.[150] Nathan Roberts discusses academic inquiry into character and how it could be effectively cultivated, and the ways in which such inquiry came to influence the educational world. By 1914, Roberts argues, English theorists located in a

---

[145] Selleck argues further that the differing views of moral educators were underpinned by different models (collectivist or individual) of social change. Selleck, *op cit.*, pp.315-22.
[146] Birchenough, *op cit.*, pp.328-29.
[147] Selleck, *op cit.*, pp.244, 249-50.
[148] Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, pp.64-65; Castle, *op cit.*, p.216; Selleck, *op cit.*, pp.244-45.
[149] For more on Hayward's Herbartian ideas see Rawnsley, *op cit.* and Leinster-Mackay, *op cit.*
[150] For a useful overview of the development of educational psychology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries see A. Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind. Education and Psychology in England, c.1860-1990*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, especially pp.49-72.

psychological tradition that can be traced back to JS Mill and his intellectual successors including Alexander Shand and William McDougall had developed a sophisticated theory of character as an interplay of the will and intelligence which could be grounded in explicable mental processes.[151] Educationalists adopted such psychological theories of character to support arguments for moral education through the system of discipline, the influence of the teacher, and the construction of an environment in which children were guided towards the achievement of character through pervasive disciplinary influences. These methods, rather than the child passively absorbing moral lessons, were deemed the best approach to character formation. Psychologists such as G Stanley Hall also lent the weight of knowledge acquired through scientific investigation to the idea that religious instruction was an important aspect of character development.[152] Advocates of secular moral instruction thus had to contend with not only the weight of tradition but also with new academic knowledge.

Conclusion

The late nineteenth century was clearly a time of concern about the moral condition of the population. Voluntary and state agencies attempted to cure perceived moral ills in many different ways. This influenced the way people involved in elementary education thought about their task, and attempts to improve the moral element of elementary schooling should be seen as linked with this effort. Nevertheless, what is striking from the foregoing analysis is that despite having similar aims, individuals and organisations differed in their methods and also over what sort of future they wanted to moralise the population for. In the educational world too different approaches to moral education developed. Despite common sets of social concerns, and a common aim of improving the moral condition of the young, efforts were somewhat unfocussed.

Yet within this general lack of focus, moral education through indirect methods, and on a religious basis, was favoured by both entrenched traditions in elementary and public schools and the higher echelons of educational administration, and the sophisticated analyses of the

---

[151] Roberts, *Character*, pp.180-85. Galton and others offered an alternative explanatory framework based on the premise of biological inheritance which argued that character was innate rather than acquired.
[152] Roberts, *Character*, pp.188-96; G.S. Hall, *Educational Problems. Volume I*, London: Appleton and Company, 1911, p.207.

vanguard of educational psychologists. This combination, as we shall see in the next chapter, proved too much for advocates of secular moral instruction to overcome.

CHAPTER TWO:
PRESSURE GROUP PROPAGANDA AND GOVERNMENT POLICY

Having evaluated the broader context of moral concerns and efforts to improve the moral condition of the population inside and outside of formal schooling, this thesis now turns to review efforts to promote moral education in elementary schools 1879-1918 and analyses the relationship between pressure group propaganda and government policy. As the previous chapter indicated, the central education department[1] emphasised in various ways the importance of morality in elementary schools and, more generally, the idea of education as character formation. Yet it came up with little in the way of definite guidance on methods. The main impetus for action came instead from the efforts of School Boards at the local level, and from voluntary organisations and pressure groups, most notably the Moral Instruction League.

The League aimed to 'educate' the general public and influence national and local educational policy, as well as the work of teachers on the ground. For an organisation of its size, its output, the scale of activities, and the debate it stimulated were remarkable. The League's efforts helped to stimulate demand for character-training, yet it failed to achieve its specific goal of getting compulsory moral instruction lessons on the elementary school curriculum. This chapter will evaluate the League's educational ideas and programme, its activities, and its propaganda strategies in some detail, and assess its success in influencing educational policy, and practice in schools, alongside wider public opinion. First, it will outline developments in moral education prior to 1897 when the League was founded, examining the respective attitudes and roles of the education department, School Boards, and individual educationalists.

[1] Committee of Council on Education to 1899, then it was the Board of Education till 1944.

Moral education in elementary schools before 1897

As noted in the previous chapter, from the time it became involved in elementary educational provision, central government recognised the potential of the elementary school as a moralising agent. Politicians and civil servants at the education department recognised the importance of morality in education as a general principle, and saw moral education as an issue worthy of thought and discussion. Statements from government spokesmen emphasised that this moral training should be on a religious basis and a conflation of morality and religion seems to have been a majority view. Moreover, both voluntary schools and the schemes of instruction of most School Boards envisaged a link between religion and morality, and viewed religious instruction as a key mechanism for moral education.[2]

Despite these clear views, central government evidently felt unable to commit to any particular form or programme of moral education. As we shall see, it was left to individuals and School Boards to develop and promote relevant programmes.

After 1870 the importance of moral training as an aspect of elementary schooling was enshrined in a range of government documents and regulations. For many years the Board of Education sought to encourage schools to provide adequate and appropriate moral training for pupils through rewarding or withholding the higher level of grant. Article 19A of Codes from 1875 stipulated that

> all reasonable care is taken, in the ordinary management of the school, to bring up the children in habits of punctuality, of good manners and language, of cleanliness and neatness, and also to impress upon the children the importance of cheerful obedience to duty, of consideration and respect for others, and of honour and truthfulness in word and act.

In a circular issued 16 January 1878 expanding on this stipulation, Her Majesty's Inspectors were urged to ensure, through school managers, "that the teachers maintain a high standard of honesty, truth, and honour in their schools, and that they not only inculcate upon the

---

[2] See Chapter One. See also G Taylor, *The Developing Elementary School Curriculum under School Board and Local Education Authority: A Study of the Educational Debate, Personalities and Policy in Birmingham, Nottingham and Derby, 1870-1933*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leicester, 1992, p.80 for the Nottingham scheme (which followed closely the London School Board formula).

children the general duty of consideration and respect for others, but also the special duty of obedience to and reverence for their parents."[3]

Regulations aimed at teachers also highlighted moral aspects of schooling. It was deemed necessary that teachers were of good character. School managers were required to produce a certificate of good "moral character of the candidates and of their homes" for intending pupil teachers, and teachers could be dismissed for "idleness, disobedience, or immoral conduct of a gross kind." Teachers' character and behaviour, both inside and outside the school, were deemed as crucial because they provided a vital example for the moral development of pupils. "Good habits on the part of the teacher", the Board of Education argued in its revised instructions of 1901, "[are the] foundation of good habits in the scholars."[4] Moreover, teachers were expected to learn about pupils' moral development as part of their training. From 1882 "formation of habits and character", and from 1897 "elements of ethics with special reference to the government and discipline of children", were covered in the syllabus for the certificate examination.[5]

School management manuals (which took government regulations into account) reinforced these messages. Henry Major in 1883, for instance, argued that a good 'tone' in the school was secured primarily through "the example of the teachers." PW Joyce urged teachers to set

---

[3] Education Department, *New Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools 1875*, London: HMSO, 1875, p.6 (Article 19A); Circular of General Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors 16 January 1878, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1877-78*, London: HMSO, 1878, 331-33, p.333. These conditions were to be satisfied for the award of the higher grant for discipline and organisation from 1875, for the award of the merit grant when the funding system changed in 1881, and for the award of the higher discipline and organisation grant (on top of the principal grant) when the system changed again in 1890. Education Department, *New Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools 1881*, London: HMSO, 1881, p.7 (Article 19A); Education Department, *New Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools 1890*, London: HMSO, 1890, p.132 (Article 101b). This clause was retained in codes till the changes of 1906.

[4] New Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools 1879. First Schedule. Qualifications and Certificates of Pupil-Teacher at Admission and During their Engagement, *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1878-79*, London: HMSO, 1879, pp.386-87; Revised Instructions Applicable to the Code of 1901, in *Report of the Board of Education, 1900-01. Appendix to Report*, London: HMSO, 1901, 210-16, pp.214-15.

[5] Syllabus for Candidates, December 1882, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales 1881-82*, London: HMSO, 1882, 479-90, pp.480, 486; Syllabus for Men 1897, Syllabus for Women 1897, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, 1896-97*, London: HMSO, 1897, 339-62, pp.342, 355.

a good example – by being quiet and punctual – as pupils acquired good habits by imitating the teacher.[6]

The education department's statements on moral training emphasised the character of the teacher and the "ordinary management of the school", and encouraged schools to introduce savings banks and organised games. However, the methods by which moral training was to be imparted were not prescribed.[7] In the absence of central government direction, much of the impetus for formulating specific programmes of moral education in these years came from individuals, voluntary organisations, and School Boards. Burton-on-Trent, Birmingham and Huddersfield School Boards introduced moral lessons in 1878, 1879 and 1889 respectively. Although School Boards exchanged information and ideas through mechanisms such as the *School Board Chronicle* and the Association of School Boards, and communicated with each other and co-operated on a number of other issues,[8] these Boards appear not to have communicated over this matter. Birmingham makes no mention of Burton-on-Trent, and Huddersfield makes no explicit mention of Birmingham.[9]

Burton-on-Trent School Board issued a syllabus of "lessons on principles of morality, virtue and good behaviour" in "about 1878". There was to be one lesson a week in the time devoted to religious instruction, illustrated as far as possible from the portions of scripture in the syllabus for repetition and study, but also from other secular and scriptural sources. In

---

[6] H. Major, *How to Earn the Merit Grant. Part II. Girls', Boys & Mixed Schools*, London: George Bell and Sons, 1883, p.327; P.W. Joyce, *A Handbook of School Management and Methods of Teaching*, 12th edition, Dublin: Gill & Son, 1887, pp.68, 81-84. See also G. Collar and C.W. Crook, *School Management and Methods of Instruction*, London: Macmillan & Co. Limited, 1900, pp.55, 63.

[7] See Circular Respecting School Savings Banks, Circular No. 196, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1880-81*, London: HMSO, 1881, pp.146-49; Circular to School Managers, Circular No. 308, 12 October 1891, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1891-92*, London: HMSO, 1892, pp.250-53; Revised Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors, and Applicable to the Code of 1895, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1894-95*, London: HMSO, 1895, 405-32, p.426. The closest the Board came to 'compulsion' was in ruling that provision for drill or "suitable physical exercises" was a condition of the higher grant for discipline and organisation after 31 August 1895. Revised Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors, and Applicable to the Code of 1894, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1893-94*, London: HMSO, 1894, 410-30, p.424.

[8] For instance see Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.158-59, 234-36 and P Gordon, Commitments and Developments in the Elementary School Curriculum 1870-1907, *History of Education*, 6:1, 1977, 43-52, pp.47-48.

[9] See Chapter Five. Hackwood's *Notes of Lessons on Moral Subjects*, originally produced for used in Birmingham schools, was a designated text in Huddersfield along with Mrs. Charles Bray's *Elements of Morality*. F.W. Hackwood, *Notes of Lessons on Moral Subjects*, London: T. Nelson & Sons, 1883; Mrs. Charles Bray, *Elements of Morality*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882.

1879 Birmingham School Board made provision for two thirty-minute moral lessons a week, in the "ordinary school hours." These lessons were to be "of a conversational character" and "largely enforced by illustrations drawn from daily life." Huddersfield followed in 1889 with the introduction of one half-hour lesson a week by the head teacher to all scholars.[10]

Birmingham's actions were reported in educational periodicals and the national press, and mentioned in a parliamentary question to Lord George Hamilton, president of the Committee of Council on Education. Lord Hamilton's response – "the Education Act of 1870 did not contemplate the contingency of any School Board substituting moral for the religious instruction generally received" – suggests that this initiative took the education department by surprise.[11] The introduction of moral lessons by Burton-on-Trent and Huddersfield School Boards was reported in the *School Board Chronicle* and the local press in each town, but did not receive the national attention that Birmingham did.[12] It is likely that the size and importance of Birmingham School Board and the city's tradition of influencing national educational debate ensured that their initiative was more widely acknowledged.[13]

A number of individuals also worked on their own initiative, apparently with the minimum of coordination. William Jolly produced a pamphlet on moral education in 1874. Dr Alex Bikkers and Joseph Hatton (editor of the *School Board Chronicle*) translated and wrote an introduction for Professor Wilhelm Fricke's *Ethics for Undenominational Schools* for an English audience in 1872. J Allanson Picton campaigned unsuccessfully for London School Board to consider the question of systematic moral teaching in board schools. These individuals do not appear to have combined resources or to have acknowledged one another's work.[14] Yet

---

[10] The moral lesson formed part of the 'secular' curriculum in Birmingham and Huddersfield, while in Burton-on-Trent the moral lesson was to take place once a week during the time allotted for religious instruction. H. Johnson, *Moral Instruction in Elementary Schools in England and Wales. A Return Compiled from Official Documents*, London: David Nutt, 1908, pp.10-11, 26. See also Chapter Five and Dewsbury, *op cit.*, pp.25-27, for more on moral instruction in Birmingham and Huddersfield respectively.

[11] *The Times*, 5 May 1879, p.11, 13 May 1879, p.9, 4 July 1879, p.9; *The Schoolmaster*, 17 May 1879, p.541; 2 August 1879, pp.115-16; *The National Schoolmaster* June 1879, pp.121-22, 137-38, August 1879, pp.184-87; Hansard, 3, CCXLVI, 12 May 1879, cols.125-27.

[12] *School Board Chronicle*, 19 January 1889, pp.59-60. According to Dewsbury, *op cit.*, pp.25-27 there were reports in the *Huddersfield Daily Chronicle*, 8 January 1889 and *Huddersfield Weekly Examiner*, 28 July 1888.

[13] See Chapters Four and Five for a discussion of Birmingham School Board.

[14] *Moral Instruction League Quarterly* (henceforward *MILQ*), 11, 1 October 1907, pp.2-3; F.H. Hayward, *The Reform of Moral and Biblical Education on the Lines of Herbartianism, Critical Thought, and the Ethical Needs of the Present Day*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1902, p.106; F.H. Hayward, *An Educational Failure. A School Inspector's Story*. London: Duckworth, 1938, pp.66-70; A.V. Bikkers and J. Hatton, *Ethics*

despite the lack of combined activity, these individuals were united by a common view that secular moral training was an essential part of a secular state education system. In this they were in a tradition of "advanced educationists" who, according to Brian Simon, had since the late eighteenth century recognised that secular moral teaching was part of an all-round education.[15]

Other campaigners of the period promoted somewhat different approaches to moral education. The Earl of Meath, later champion of the Empire Day and Duty and Discipline Movements, is a good example of the group identified in the previous chapter who looked to their own public school background, and particularly the development of moral qualities and a sense of *esprit de corps* on the playing fields, as a model for moral training in elementary schools. He moved a resolution in the House of Lords in 1889 calling for the Code to provide for the physical education of elementary school children on the grounds that it not only improved health and fitness, but also improved their character.[16] Similarly, Nottingham educationalist and Congregationalist minister JB Paton urged that games in public schools did much to maintain morale, and enabled the masters to influence the pupils' characters. He argued that similar benefits would be obtained if organised games (involving teachers as well as pupils) became commonplace in elementary schools.[17] Such arguments, it will be suggested below, influenced the Board of Education's provision for organised games in the 1906 Code. The unwillingness of the education department to commit to a particular method of moral education clearly gave individuals and School Boards the space to develop and promote programmes of moral education. This was done in a somewhat piecemeal manner, with no real central organising force. In 1897 this role was taken up by the Moral Instruction League,

---

for Undenominational Schools, London: Grant & Co., 1872; J. Allanson Picton, *The Bible in School. A Question of Ethics*, London: Watts & Co., 1901, pp.74-75. Picton was member of London School Board 1870-79 and Liberal MP for Leicester 1884-1894. S.C. Orchard, Picton, James Allanson (1832-1910), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35527], accessed 9 October 2006.

[15] Simon, *Education and the Labour Movement*, p.144.

[16] Reginald, 12th Earl of Meath, *Memories of the Nineteenth Century*, London: John Murray, 1923, pp.258-60; Hansard, 3, CCCXXXV, 13 May 1889, cols.1815-23, 1829.

[17] J.B. Paton to R. Morant, 6 February 1906, ED/24/409, National Archives (henceforward NA). His suggestion that elementary schools should form old scholars' associations was clearly based on the same public school model. For more on J.B. Paton see A. Gordon, Paton, John Brown (1830-1911), rev. R. Tudur Jones, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35410], accessed 14 March 2006. Paton was a close friend of fellow Congregationalist R.W. Dale, and like Dale sought to embody Christian principles in practical schemes for social improvement.

who coordinated efforts to promote moral instruction to an unprecedented degree. This chapter will now turn to the work of this key pressure group in moral education.

Moral Instruction League

A number of organisations campaigned for moral education – in some form – in elementary schools in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. There were various small, localised organisations including the Civic Education League in Leicester. There were organisations which promoted direct moral teaching focused on one particular issue. Some focused on sex education, including the Manchester-based Moral Education Society,[18] and the Eugenics Education Society which promoted systematic sex education along eugenicist lines.[19] The Band of Hope and other similar organisations promoted temperance teaching in schools. Organisations which sought to instil patriotic and imperialist sentiments in the young similarly worked through the elementary school: Chapter Six highlights some of the activities encouraged by the Empire Day Movement and the Navy League.[20] Finally, there were organisations which were broadly educational in their remit but which operated at least partly outside the elementary school. Baden-Powell promoted his Boy Scouts as offering an alternative pedagogy which would be effective in character formation.[21] The Duty and Discipline Movement targeted parents and teachers as part of its general strategy of influencing public opinion in order to "counteract the lack of adequate moral training and discipline."[22]

---

[18] MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6,* 30 June 1915, p.3, Moral Education League Circulars and Pamphlets 1915-21, 8289 cc.28, British Library.

[19] Some of the founding members of the Eugenics Education Society were in the Moral Instruction League. See P. Mazumdar, *Eugenics, Human Genetics and Human Failings. The Eugenics Society, its Sources and its Critics in Britain*, London: Routledge, 1992, pp.7, 24-29.

[20] See Chapter Six. For more on the Empire Day Movement see A. Bloomfield, Drill and Dance as Symbols of Imperialism, in J.A. Mangan (ed.) *Making Imperial Mentalities. Socialisation and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990, 74-95; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.105-10; P. Horn, English Elementary Education and the Growth of the Imperial Ideal: 1880-1914, in J.A. Mangan (ed.) *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988, 39-55, pp.48-51; Mackenzie, *op cit.*, pp.231-36.

[21] Orr, *op cit.*, especially pp.297-309; Rosenthal, *op cit.*, *passim*. Baden Powell promoted scouting as an alternative pedagogy which could complement and, if some of its principles were taken on by teachers, improve the teaching in elementary schools, see his paper to the Conference of Educational Associations in *Teachers World*, 7 January 1914, p.342.

[22] *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, p.vii; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.103-05.

The Moral Instruction League was probably the most significant, and was certainly the most vociferous, pressure group promoting the secular moral instruction which is the focus of much of this thesis. Founded in December 1897, the Moral Instruction League initially arose out of a localised and immediate need (that of canvassing candidates for the London School Board election) and evolved into "a strictly non-sectarian and non-party Association"[23] aiming to promote moral instruction throughout England and Wales. The League has been described as "an odd collectivity of teachers, writers, politicians, and free-lance intellectuals," or, more positively, as "the socially responsible, advanced thinkers of their day, progressives who actively worked for the programmes in which they believed".[24] The League was the first organisation to make a significant attempt to coordinate efforts to promote moral education.

Though the League failed to achieve all of its stated objects, its work helped raise the public profile of moral education over a number of years, and gained the sympathy of some – though not all – prominent politicians and educationalists. It was well-organised, and staffed by energetic and capable individuals. The League attained a degree of fame and influence disproportionate to its membership.

Ethical movement origins

The Moral Instruction League was formed primarily on an initiative of the Union of Ethical Societies. Established in late 1895, the Union was an umbrella organisation made up of some, but not all, local ethical societies, and was the closest that the ethical movement in England came to having a national organisation.[25]

Some background on the ethical movement is illuminating. English ethicists were influenced by the ethical culture movement in the USA. In 1876, Felix Adler, a highly educated Jew from a rabbinic family, left his synagogue and set up the first ethical culture society in New York. Adler devised what he called an 'ethical religion'. Inspired by the idealist philosophy of Immanuel Kant, Ralph Waldo Emerson's transcendentalism and the ethical elements of Judaism and Christianity, Adler's ethical religion dispensed with theology and supernatural

---

[23] MIL, *To All Interested in Moral and Civic Education in Schools*, London: Moral Instruction League, c.1907, Society for Ethical Culture Publications 1876-1972, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives (WHSA), Madison.
[24] Bérard, *Movement*, p.56; Mazumdar, *op cit.*, pp.25-26.
[25] For detail on the Union of Ethical Societies see Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.99-123.

sanction but sought to include people of different beliefs in its emphasis on the moral aspects of life.[26]

Adler's ideas were transported across the Atlantic chiefly through Stanton Coit, who had first heard of the ethical culture movement in 1880 and subsequently worked with Adler.[27] Coit moved to London in 1887 and became Minister of South Place Ethical Society where he remained till 1891.[28] From then on he helped establish various ethical societies in London, and according to Spiller was instrumental in creating and leading the Union of Ethical Societies.[29]

As noted in the previous chapter, the ethical movement was part of a wider disenchantment with organised religion in the late nineteenth century, and one of several alternatives developed. There were parallels with the ethical movement's attempts to develop a moral system which built on the best of older ones within other movements like theosophy and positivism. The ideology of the ethical movement was vague and loosely-defined, but some key strands can be identified – an organic and holistic world-view, philosophical idealism, Emersonian transcendentalism, and social activism.[30]

It is unsurprising, given its belief in the need to moralise society, that the ethical movement devoted time and energy to moral education. As early as 1883 Felix Adler wrote about the need for ethical instruction of the young apart from Christianity.[31] He introduced a graduated programme of moral lessons into his ethical culture school in New York, published in *The Moral Instruction of Children* in 1892.[32] Also, by the mid-1880s, individual ethical societies in

---

[26] For more on Felix Adler see H.L. Friess, *Felix Adler and Ethical Culture. Memories and Studies*, ed. by F. Weingartner, New York: Columbia University Press, 1981; R.S. Guttchen, *Felix Adler*, New York: Twayne, 1974.

[27] Nevertheless, Adler and Coit disagreed over a number of issues, for instance Socialism (Coit was a staunch socialist, whilst Adler criticised Socialism). Budd, *op cit.*, pp.224-26.

[28] Coit had visited England for three months in 1886, working with the poor in East London from Toynbee Hall. According to Budd it was also Coit who persuaded J.H. Muirhead and J. Bonar, who he had met at Toynbee Hall, both of whom had been influenced by T.H. Green – to form London Ethical Society in 1886. See Budd, *op cit.*, pp.201-03, 224-26. For more detail on Coit's life see the prefatory memoir in H.J. Blackham, *Stanton Coit 1857-1944: Selections from his Writings*, London: Favil Press, c.1949, pp.1-28 and *Ethical World*, 16 March 1907.

[29] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.156.

[30] See Chapter One for more details.

[31] Adler, *A Secular View of Moral Training*.

[32] F. Adler, *The Moral Instruction of Children*, London: Edward Arnold, 1892. This book was published as part of Edward Arnold's International Education Series, clearly intended for distribution in England.

England were promoting "systematic Ethical Instruction" of both adults and the young.[33] According to Spiller, it was Stanton Coit who ensured that moral instruction became so prominent in the activities of the Union of Ethical Societies. The Union organised lectures on moral instruction, developed ethical classes for children, and ran a Moral Instruction Circle from 1899 to 1903 at which demonstration lessons were given, followed by discussion of the teacher's method after the children had been dismissed. Spiller wrote that the Moral Instruction Circle convinced "numerous London teachers and parents" that moral instruction could be interesting and effective.[34] It was this strand of the Union's activities which resulted in the establishment of the Moral Instruction League.

Formation of the League

Fifty five delegates from "various societies interested in the education of the working classes" (including the Social Democratic Federation, the Independent Labour Party (ILP), the Union of Ethical Societies, the National Secular Society, and other freethought organisations and trade unions) met on 19 July 1897. This meeting, with Frederic Harrison presiding, established a Moral Instruction School Board Election Conference in order to canvass candidates for the London School Board election to introduce non-theological moral instruction in place of religious instruction into the capital's schools.[35] The Conference decided that a permanent and national organisation should be set up to campaign for moral instruction, and convened the inaugural meeting of the Moral Instruction League on 8 December 1897.[36] The personnel of the League reflect its ethicist origins. Many of its executive committee and all the League's secretaries up to 1913 were also active in the ethical movement.[37] The ethical movement was also the source of the core of the League's membership, particularly in the early years. This is indicated in the pages of the *Ethical World* – the 'organ' of the ethical movement – which contained frequent reports of the League's

---

[33] London Ethical Society Leaflet, c.1886, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers, T-GED 11/3/13, Strathclyde University Archives.
[34] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.111-13. See also Hayward, *Reform*, pp.105-06.
[35] F. Low, A Plea for Moral Instruction, *Journal of Education*, August 1897, pp.481-82; Royle, *op cit.*, pp.313-14; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.124.
[36] F.J. Gould, *Moral Education. A Chapter from the Story of Schools in England and Wales, 1895-1925*, London: private printing, 1929, p.2; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.124; *Report of the Union of Ethical Societies 1897-98*, T-GED 11/3/13, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers.
[37] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.111.

activities and exhorted readers to join the League, help in its propaganda, and attend its events.[38]

It is useful at this point to introduce some of the key figures in the League. Stanton Coit was, according to Spiller, instrumental in founding the League. He served as Secretary from 1901-1903 then President till 1908. Harrold Johnson, graduate of London University, who also studied at the Sorbonne and Leipzig, acted as Secretary from 1902 to 1913.[39] FJ Gould was associated with the League from the start and engaged both in producing publications and demonstration lessons, even before his appointment as official demonstrator from 1910 to 1915. FH Hayward, "powerful champion of Herbartianism,"[40] highlighted the League's activities in his monographs, and offered a theoretical defence for systematic moral instruction in debates in the educational press. Gustav Spiller, a Hungarian Jewish émigré and founder (along with FJ Gould and Stanton Coit) of East London Ethical Society, was prominent in the League from the start and engaged particularly in international aspects of the League's activities. The Moral Instruction League, like the ethical movement as a whole, attracted diverse individuals with different ideas and different priorities. This diversity was a source of strength and of tension and division.[41]

At the League's first formal meeting on 26 January 1898 its object was defined as follows: "to substitute systematic non-theological moral instruction for the present religious teaching in all State schools, and to make character the chief aim of school life."[42] The wording highlights an important issue that the League had to address, namely its relationship to religion. This was a source of debate and division from the start which reflected wider differences between secularists (discussed in the previous chapter) over their relationship to Christianity and whether they saw themselves as a religion or not. Even before the League was constituted, delegates at the meeting of the Moral Instruction School Board Election Conference in October 1897 disagreed over whether the word 'religious' or 'theological' should be used. There was also the vexed issue of how moral instruction related to the

---

[38] For most of 1903 to 1914 the *Ethical World* had a regular moral instruction column, which reported on the League's activities.
[39] MacKillop, *op cit.*, pp.167-68.
[40] R. Aldrich and P. Gordon, *Dictionary of British Educationists*, London: Woburn Press, 1989, p.108.
[41] Bérard, *Movement*, pp.67-68.
[42] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.152-53.

religious instruction given in elementary schools, a source of internal division from the start.[43] The National Secular Society withdrew its affiliation to the League within a year over this issue. As Royle put it, "The Bible in any form was too much for Secularists to swallow."[44] In 1901 the League dropped its original demand of eliminating religious instruction from its object. These tensions over religion illustrate the challenges the League faced over finding a balance between maintaining a clearly radical position, and appealing to a broader cross-section of potential sympathisers.[45]

Educational programme

The League saw its educational ideas as derived chiefly from the ethical movement: Adler's *The Moral Instruction of Children* was described as "the pioneer work from which our modern moral education movement has sprung."[46] The League identified the moral instruction given by ethical societies in England, America, and on the Continent as a field of experiment and the model on which its methods were based.[47] By contrast, it was slow to acknowledge the efforts of School Boards or ad-hoc individual initiatives in this country.[48] The influence of positivism, as interpreted by FJ Gould, can also be detected in the League's pedagogical approach and in some of its publications which (though anonymous) are very close to Gould's style.[49]

---

[43] *The Times*, 14 October 1897, p.8. As noted above disagreements over the League's attitude to religion and the Bible led to the National Secular Society withdrawing its affiliation. Debates over the use of the terms religious and theological were still taking place within the League in 1907. *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, pp.3-4.
[44] The National Secular Society originally had four members on the League's committee. Royle, *op cit.*, p.314. Some Secularists, however, such as FJ Gould and Arthur Moss, saw benefits in using the ethical and historical elements in schools.
[45] *Ethical World*, 9 January 1904, p.11; Bérard, *Movement*, pp.59-60; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.153.
[46] *Moral Education League Quarterly* (henceforward *MELQ*), 24, 1 April 1911, p.5. See also *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, p.6.
[47] MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, p.4.
[48] George Dixon's death was noted in the *Ethical World*, which hailed his work with the National Education League and Birmingham School Board as encouragement to "our new forward policy in moral education" but made no reference to the introduction of moral lessons in Birmingham in 1879. *Ethical World*, 29 January 1898, p.67. The weekly moral lessons in Birmingham were referred to in *Ethical World*, 27 January 1900, p.58 as "a step in the right direction" but the "progressive majority" were criticised for not substituting daily moral lessons for the daily Bible reading. The dates of the introduction of moral lessons by Burton on Trent, Birmingham and Huddersfield were first noted in *MILQ*, 7, 1 October 1906, p.5 (with the Birmingham date given, incorrectly, as 1883).
[49] The Graduated Syllabus is a good example of a League publication in which we can detect Gould's ideas, if not his authorship. MIL, *A Graduated Syllabus of Moral Instruction and Training in Citizenship for Elementary Schools*, London: MIL, 1902.

The League's programme of moral instruction was outlined in its literature. Moral instruction, it argued, (defined as set lessons or conversations "definitely directed to moral subjects"), should be delivered through a thorough, systematic and graded programme, which would "extol the good ... rather than warn against evil."[50] The League advocated a narrative method, with concrete illustrations of moral subjects derived from a range of sources. Instruction was deemed necessary because truly moral conduct required use of the intellect and judgement.[51] The League never saw moral instruction lessons in themselves as adequate for a child's moral development – from the start it recognised the importance of the wider morally educative influences of the school, the family, and other agencies – but saw moral lessons as a necessary part of a full moral training.[52] The moral instruction curriculum will be analysed further in the next chapter.

Bérard detects a shift in the League's priorities over time, reflecting broader changes within moral education, from a focus on personal morality to citizenship and civic duties.[53] Nonetheless, the League was always well aware of the wider social purposes of moral instruction (as illustrated by the title of one of its early pamphlets *Our Future Citizens*). And even with its later emphasis on civic education an interest in developing the moral qualities of the individual citizen was retained.[54] This stress on the interdependence of the community and the individual, and the understanding that the good of one depends on the other, chimes with the idealist element in ethicist thought. Accordingly, the League repeatedly emphasised the interests of the nation and the needs of the state in its propaganda. "The future of a nation depends on how those invaluable opportunities [in school] are utilised for moral ends," it claimed. Religious instruction based on the Bible, it argued, was inadequate for the "exigencies and complex responsibilities of the modern state" which required systematic moral instruction.[55]

---

[50] MIL, *Moral Instruction*; MIL, *Graduated Syllabus*.
[51] F.J. Gould, *A Plan of Moral Instruction Adopted by the Moral Instruction League*, c.1897, pp.3, 14-15, Pamphlets – Special, BLPES; MIL, *Graduated Syllabus*; MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, pp.6-7.
[52] Gould, *Plan of Moral Instruction*, p.3.
[53] Bérard, *Movement*, pp.69-70.
[54] MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, passim; F.J. Gould, *A National Need. The Civic Spirit in Education*, London: Moral Education League, 1913, p.10, Pamphlet Collection – Special, BLPES. W. Wong describes the League's educational programme as "citizenship with a moral orientation". W. Wong, *Continuity and Change in Citizenship Education in England in the Twentieth Century*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Liverpool, 1991, pp.31-35.
[55] MIL, *To All Interested in Moral and Civic Education in Schools*; H. Johnson, *Moral Instruction and the Education Bill. An Address Delivered before a Meeting of the Nonconformist Committee of Members of the*

The League believed the state should take a neutral role regarding religion. Through the 1890s English ethical societies argued that the substitution of systematic moral instruction for religious teaching in schools was the only permanent settlement of the religious controversy.[56] This was the League's position in its early years and according to FH Hayward a key reason for its formation: "It was because children were being allowed to grow up "without moral ideas" that the attempt was made to construct some new educational machinery in order that, whatever might be the ultimate fate of religious instruction, the school should not neglect its pressing duty."[57] For a number of years, even after the original demand that religious instruction be abolished was dropped, the League continued to promote moral instruction as the solution to the religious difficulty. Moral instruction, it argued, could be given "framed in such a way as to prove acceptable to people of all theologies and of none", by avoiding the issue of sanctions and sticking to "strictly human reasons for right conduct."[58] The League also continued to oppose government intervention to promote religious education in schools.[59]

The League's educational proposals were backed up by teaching materials that could be used in schools.[60] The *Graduated Syllabus of Moral and Civic Instruction for Elementary Schools*, developed by a sub-committee headed by HH Quilter and involving a number of teachers, was first issued in 1902. Teachers in ethical Sunday schools were asked to test the scheme in their classes and to report on the results – this feedback was incorporated when the syllabus was revised in December 1905. In 1904 the syllabus was distributed to education authorities across England and Wales.[61] According to Johnson's *Return*, twenty authorities had adopted the League's syllabus by 1908, and the syllabus was also "widely in use in schools under many

---

House of Commons, Wednesday October 28 1908, Social Pamphlets R188675, Deansgate Library. See also Gould, *National Need*, p.3-4.

[56] West London Ethical Society Leaflet, c.1894, T-GED 11/3/13, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers. See Chapter One for more on the religious controversy, and for a more detailed discussion Sacks, *op cit.*, passim.

[57] F.H. Hayward, *Education and the Heredity Spectre*, London, Watts & Co., 1908, p.100.

[58] MIL, *The Moral Instruction League*, London: c.1904, p.1, Society for Ethical Culture Publications 1876-1972, WHSA; MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, pp.8-9.

[59] See Harrold Johnson to Augustine Birrell, 26 April 1906. Reproduced in MIL, *Committee's Ninth Annual Report, for the Year Ending December 31st*, 1906, ED/24/409, NA.

[60] For example see Stanton Coit's comments in *Ethical World*, 12 March 1898, p.172.

[61] Hayward, *Reform*, p.105; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.145. Plans to produce a new, larger, elementary school syllabus were mentioned in *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.3. No copy of this syllabus was located.

other Authorities."[62] A syllabus for secondary schools was published in 1907 and revised in 1912.[63]

By 1904 the League was collecting "illustrative information" for the graduated syllabus.[64] Teachers' handbooks designed to accompany the different standards of the syllabus were published from 1904. The League negotiated a deal for a complete series with Nelson,[65] and also recommended other works, including Gould's moral instruction books, to assist teachers in giving moral lessons.[66] Several plans to develop other curriculum material – including Harrold Johnson's proposed handbook of accounts of what teachers were doing in the way of moral education, a teachers' handbook based on Standard IV of the graduated syllabus in 1907, and FH Hayward's "encyclopaedia of teachers' material" – appear to have come to nothing.[67] Perhaps lack of manpower and (more importantly) money stopped the League from doing as much as they wished.

The League also aimed to assist teachers through rudimentary mechanisms of professional development. In 1903 it started running the Moral Instruction Circle (previously organised by the Union of Ethical Societies) which ran sporadically for the next ten or eleven years.[68] Though many of the demonstrators were experienced moral instructors from within the ethical movement (including Gustav Spiller, AJ Waldegrave and FJ Gould), it was envisaged as a forum for assessing and improving methods. A critical and developmental function was retained when the Circle was revived in 1912 as a way of finding new demonstrators and helping teachers "in need of further suggestions in their work of moral instruction".[69]

---

[62] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, p.xii.
[63] *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, p.8, Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.146.
[64] MIL, *The Moral Instruction League*, p.1.
[65] The original intention was to publish the complete set by 1909, but the series was not completed till 1913. *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, p.6; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, p.16.
[66] Recommended works were listed on the League's syllabus, propaganda leaflets, and often on the back of the *Quarterly*.
[67] *MILQ*, 8, 1 January 1907, pp.12-13; *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, p.8; *MILQ*, 25, 1 July 1911, pp.1-2. It is possible that Johnson's plan metamorphosed into the *Moral Instruction* from official documents published in 1908.
[68] Spiller wrote that after about 1904 the Union's documents made no further overt references to the moral education of the young, "because this section of the Union's activities was tacitly left to be carried out by the Moral Instruction League whose Committee included a number of the Union's experienced educational workers." Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.113.
[69] See *MELQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, p.11; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, p.3.

Many more teachers were reached through demonstration lessons, which the League valued for their power to attract sceptics. "Very few people leave unconverted after hearing one of these lessons, and they cannot be too much brought before the public".[70] In 1910, Gould, who had given demonstration lessons for the League on several occasions, was appointed full-time demonstrator.[71] Gould had by this stage developed his own distinctive narrative method of moral instruction in Sunday school classes of the East London Ethical Society and after 1899 at Leicester Secular Society, and published several moral lesson books. He travelled the country, giving lessons in chapels, lecture halls, classrooms, drawing rooms and gardens, invited by teacher training colleges, education authorities, churches and church organisations, teachers' unions and associations.[72]

Gould was convinced of the need to work directly with teachers: "Codes may come and codes may go, but the teachers are the perpetual driving-force of the school system, and without their living interest in our ideals, the enterprise of moral teaching would collapse."[73] Reports of his lessons suggest he was a very able and imaginative teacher,[74] and he undoubtedly brought moral instruction to the attention of thousands of teachers and other interested parties throughout the country.

Promoting moral instruction

The League used a variety of strategies in order to achieve its specific goal of getting moral lessons onto the elementary school curriculum, and its more general object of placing morality and character high on the educational agenda. Its propaganda targeted the Board of Education, local education authorities, school managers and teachers, parents, academic educationalists, training colleges, and the general public. The focus and nature of its propaganda changed over time. The League's activities created a range of sources – publicity

---

[70] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.15-16.
[71] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.142-43; *Ethical World*, 15 January 1910, p.13.
[72] For more on Gould see his autobiography (Gould, *Life Story*), Chapter Four for a biographical outline, and Chapter Five on his work in Leicester. Gould's demonstrator's reports can be found in many *MELQ* issues between April 1911 and October 1914 (issues 24-38), and his demonstration work is discussed in Gould, *Life Story*, pp.117-21.
[73] *MELQ*, 29, 1 July 1912, p.3. *The Schoolmaster* approved of his assessment of the League as a "stimulator of ideals already at work" rather than "a missionary to the heathen." *The Schoolmaster*, 20 January 1912, p.114.
[74] See Gilbert Murray's account of one of Gould's lessons and the comments after his death reproduced in F.H. Hayward and E.M. White, *The Last Years of a Great Educationalist: A Record of the Work and Thought of F.J. Gould from 1923 to 1938*, Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay and Company, Ltd., c.1942, pp.63-64, 281-83, 291; and also the report of Gould's lessons in *Journal of Education*, May 1911, p.307. Gould's own accounts of his American and Indian tours also emphasise the positive response to his lessons (see n.174).

fliers and leaflets, letters to the press, letters to politicians and educationalists, accounts of activities for members and sympathisers in the League's *Quarterly* and *Ethical World* – on which this chapter draws.[75]

Individual members and sympathisers were encouraged to assist in a number of ways: mainly by donating money,[76] but also in other ways. For example, they were requested to assist Alice Chesterton in preparing a book of quotations and verses to illustrate the headings of the graduated syllabus.[77] They were asked to write letters to their local papers, speak to family and friends, distribute League literature,[78] scour their local press for information, find out what schools and School Boards were doing,[79] arrange local meetings, demonstration lessons, and social events for teachers,[80] and lobby parliamentary candidates and MPs.[81]

London propaganda

Inevitably given its London origins, the League's propaganda was initially focused on the capital. Through 1898 and 1899 signatures were sought for a petition (distributed with a sample lesson by Gould on 'Courage') which was delivered to the London School Board by a deputation including Zola Valance, James Ramsay MacDonald, and Stanton Coit on 23 June 1899. In 1900 the League canvassed candidates for the London School Board election. Though several responded positively, Mrs Miall Smith was the only elected member who declared support publicly for its programme.[82] A direct action campaign in 1901, supervised

---

[75] The internet has enabled me to trace a greater range of primary material produced by the League – scattered across a number of archives – than was used by authors of previous accounts (Bérard, *Movement*, Hilliard, *op cit.* and Selleck, *op cit.*, pp.299-328) who relied heavily on Spiller's detailed and considered (yet in places slanted) analysis. A complete run of the *Quarterly* is not available. *MELQ* issues are filed in the British Library (PP.1103.cgl), while individual *MILQ* issues are scattered across several archives (Society for Ethical Culture, Publications 1876-1972, Wisconsin Historical Society Archive, University of Madison; Public Record Office (ED24/409); Sir Patrick Geddes Papers, University of Strathclyde).

[76] Requests for donations and subscriptions can be found in many issues of the League's *Quarterly* and the *Ethical World* and their publicity leaflets.

[77] For example sympathisers were requested to assist Alice Chesterton in preparing a book of quotations, verses etc to illustrate the headings of the graduated syllabus (this project appears not to have been completed). *MILQ*, 2, 1 July 1905, p.4; *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, pp.6-7.

[78] *Ethical World*, 5 February 1898 p.93; MIL, *Press Propaganda*, reproduced in *Ethical World*, 11 June 1898, p.381; MIL, *How to Organise*, reproduced in *Ethical World*, 18 June 1898, p.397; *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.1; MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, pp.1-4.

[79] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, p.8; *MELQ*, 37, 1 July 1914, p.1.

[80] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.15-16.

[81] H. Johnson, *The Education Bill and Moral Instruction*, 1 April 1908, Social Pamphlets R188541, Deansgate Library.

[82] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.124-27, *Ethical World*, 28 October 1898, p.689, 18 February 1899, pp.99-101, 2 February 1901, p.70.

by Stanton Coit, encouraged parents at five selected board schools to withdraw a total of 548 children from religious instruction lessons (under the conscience clause of the 1870 Act).[83]

Though these local campaigns aimed at the School Board ceased after 1901, the League remained active in London in an attempt to capitalise on the ferment generated by the passage of the 1902 Education Act. It organised a large public meeting connected with the Education Bill on 26 November 1902, and distributed leaflets at other related gatherings. "We may never have a more favourable opportunity than the present of making our views known," stated the *Ethical World*. The meeting was attended by over 600 people and according to the *Ethical World* enabled the League to reach new audiences and attract many new members. Two further public meetings were held during 1903. The "favouring political circumstances" of the time were in this way utilised to good effect.[84]

School Board and Education Committee propaganda

In 1900 the League started to focus its attention beyond the capital, sending literature to candidates standing for the School Board elections in Birmingham, Leicester and Plymouth who included non-theological moral instruction as part of their election programme.[85] The League took encouragement from the successes of FJ Gould in Leicester, Mr Arthur Grindley in Plymouth and two labour representatives in Huddersfield.[86] Indeed, these successes led Stanton Coit, as Secretary in 1901, to declare his intention of stepping up the League's activities outside the capital. "London," he argued, "[is] the least hopeful place for the League's operations."[87]

---

[83] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.126-27; *Ethical World*, 11 May 1901, 18 May 1901, pp.309-10, 25 May 1901, p.322, 1 June 1901. The direct action campaign generated an editorial in *The Head Teacher*, 15 May 1901, pp.18-19 condemning the League's actions and advising teachers affected on what action to take. The London School Board decided that the schools targeted should be instructed to provide alternative secular teaching "having regard to the possibilities of school organisation". *School Board Chronicle*, 4 May 1901, p.479.

[84] *Ethical World*, 25 October 1902, 29 November 1902; Annual Report for 1902 quoted in Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.132.

[85] Two socialist candidates in the 1900 Birmingham School Board election, J. Millington (ILP) and H. Griffin (Social Democratic Federation) made secular moral instruction part of their election platform. *Birmingham School Board Election Literature, 1900*, Birmingham Local Studies Library (henceforward BLSL) LF48.21.

[86] *Ethical World*, 2 February 1901, p.70-71; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.126. See Chapter Five for detail on Gould's activities in Leicester. It is worth noting the long-term history of secularism in Leicester and Huddersfield.

[87] *Ethical World*, 2 February 1901, p.70. Coit envisaged establishing provincial branches of the League, and running more candidates in School Board elections.

Under Coit's successor as Secretary, Harrold Johnson, the League targeted systematically School Boards (Education Committees after 1903) throughout England and Wales. In 1904 Johnson wrote personally to the Secretaries of 335 Education Committees and circularised over 7000 individual committee members (enclosing the *Graduated Syllabus* and a specimen lesson). In 1905, the League issued a memorial urging the introduction of moral instruction separated from theology to all education authorities in England and Wales and to 2000 individual members of Education Committees.[88] Another circular letter was sent out in 1906 to alert Education Committees to the provision for moral instruction in the 1906 Code.[89] There was also some activity in Scotland which, the League claimed, led to a number of boards introducing moral lessons.[90]

The League gave regular updates on 'progress' among Local Education Committees in a series of fliers and in its *Quarterly* and annual reports. In 1908 Harrold Johnson compiled a *Return* from official educational documents submitted by Local Education Authorities. "Of the hundred or more Authorities as to which particulars are supplied," he wrote, "about sixty have provision in their schools for more or less systematic moral instruction... of these, some forty have a time set apart for the moral instruction."[91] This sort of propaganda subsided after 1908, but never entirely disappeared, and the few local education authorities that introduced moral instruction lessons after this date were noted in the League's *Quarterly* and circulars.[92]

---

[88] This was in response to an influential memorial in favour of teaching Christian morals signed by both the archbishops and other religious leaders. *MILQ*, 2, 1 July 1905, p.2; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.128-29. Correspondence between J.B. Paton (who was partly responsible for memorial in favour of Christian morals) and Harrold Johnson was published in *The Times*, 27 May 1905, p.6, 29 May 1905, p.9.

[89] *MILQ*, 7, 1 October 1906, p.4.

[90] The adoption of moral instruction by Scottish LEAs was mentioned in *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, pp.5-6; *MILQ* 12, 1 January 1908, p.5 and *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.7.

[91] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.xi-xii.

[92] See *MELQ*, 32, 1 April 1913, p.12; MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, p.3. The Executive Committee had plans to revive Local Education Committee propaganda but this did not appear to happen (probably because of the war) *MELQ*, 37, 1 July 1914, p.1; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.151. The *Quarterly* appears to have ceased publication after October 1914, no doubt due to wartime financial shortages, and was replaced by shorter, more sporadic circulars.

Teacher training

"Without ... preliminary training ... [the teachers'] conduct of the moral lesson will strengthen the forces of reaction," the League argued in 1906.[93] The League wrote letters to training colleges, emphasising the need to train teachers to give moral instruction, in 1899 and 1905.[94] However, it was not till about 1909 that the League undertook an intensive campaign on teacher training. The recommendations of Sadler's report on moral instruction in 1908, Felix Adler's emphatic comments at the International Moral Education Conference on the dangers of moral instruction if teachers were trained inadequately, and Runciman's comments in the Commons debate on moral instruction in March 1909, all undoubtedly encouraged this focus.[95] The League wrote to and visited training colleges to try to persuade them to train future teachers in the methods of giving effective moral education.[96] It canvassed the Board of Education to amend its regulations in order to include a coherent course of training in moral instruction within the training college curriculum.[97]

This campaign met with limited success. Gould and Mrs Raw (his replacement demonstrator while he toured the US in 1913-14) reported a positive reception in a number of training colleges. However, the Board of Education never acceded to the League's demand that instruction in imparting moral education should be a compulsory part of the training college curriculum. CP Trevelyan, in his response to a deputation from the League in 1913, argued that the training college regulations already prescribed in various ways the study of moral education. The League, however, was unsatisfied with what they described as the "somewhat

---

[93] *MILQ*, 7, 1 October 1906, p.2. F.J. Gould had commented earlier on the importance of training teachers to give moral instruction: see Gould, *Plan of Moral Instruction*, p.3.
[94] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.141.
[95] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, p.1-5; F. Adler, in 'How Could the Ethical Efficiency of Education be Increased?' in M.E. Sadler (ed.), *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volume I*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908, 94-99, p.99; Hansard Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 1909 Vol. II, 16 March 1909, cols.1025-30.
[96] At the League's 11th Annual Meeting held 6 February 1909 the Executive was authorised to establish a special fund to enable visits to training colleges. *The Times*, 8 February 1909, p.7. Mrs Raw, who acted as Demonstrator while Gould was touring the USA 1913-14, used her contacts in training colleges to further the League's cause in this area. *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, p.7.
[97] For example, in its deputation to Walter Runciman in May 1909. Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.137-38; *The Times*, 12 May 1909, p.7.

scattered ... body of hints on the subject of moral discipline and development" in the training college regulations.[98]

Educational opinion

The League also sought to influence opinion in the educational world. Prominent educationalists of the time were among the executive committee and vice presidents, including JS Mackenzie, Professor of Logic and Philosophy at University College, Cardiff 1895-1915, and Alexander Farquharson, lecturer at London School of Economics.[99] Lectures on moral education and citizenship were given at universities and the College of Preceptors.[100] Educationalists were also invited to speak at the League's annual and quarterly meetings.[101]

The League was skilful in utilising the educational press to reach a wide audience. Lectures were reprinted in educational periodicals.[102] The League used these periodicals to outline its position in debates over moral education: for instance in FH Hayward's responses to the criticisms of the League's pedagogical approach by Professor Findlay, JL Paton (High Master of Manchester Grammar School and son of JB Paton) and RF Cholmesley of St Paul's School in the *Journal of Education* and *Educational Times* in 1907.[103] The educational press was also used to advertise and report on the League's events to a wider audience than would be reached through the *Quarterly* and *Ethical World*,[104] and to encourage teachers to engage with

---

[98] *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, pp.3-6, 11-12. The earliest evidence located to the League lobbying the Board of Education for a specific course on giving ethical instruction in the training college curriculum is Professor J.H. Muirhead's letter to the Board of Education, 20 July 1906, ED24/409, NA.

[99] J.S. Mackenzie was President of the League 1908-1916. J.W. Scott, Mackenzie, John Stuart (1860-1935), rev. M.J. Schofield, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34753], accessed 19 September 2006.

[100] For example, *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, p.8; *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, p.5; *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.4.

[101] For example, *MELQ*, 26, 1 October 1911, p.8; *MELQ*, 28, 1 April 1912, pp.3-5.

[102] Sir Charles Warren's address to the 1907 Annual Meeting was reprinted in the *Journal of Education*, May 1907, pp.354-56; Johnson's address to the College of Preceptors was reprinted in the *Educational Times*, 1 November 1907, pp.486-91. Sophie Bryant's address to the 1912 annual meeting was summarised in the *Journal of Education*, March 1912, p.176; F.H. Muirhead's presidential address to the League on 6 June 1918 was published in *Education*, 23 August 1918, pp.131-34.

[103] *Educational Times*, 1 April 1907, pp.167-68, 1 July 1907, p.291, 1 October 1907, p.432; *Journal of Education*, July 1907, pp.455-56, September 1907, p.597, October 1907, p.715. According to the *Quarterly* Hayward was "representing the League" in this correspondence. *MILQ*, 11, 1 October 1907, p.5. For more on J.L. Paton see J. Coatman, Paton, John Lewis Alexander (1863-1946), rev. M.C. Curthoys, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35412], accessed 14 March 2006.

[104] For example, *Education*, 21 February 1908, p.134, 21 February 1913, pp.109-10, 22 February 1918, p.59; *Educational Times*, 2 March 1908, p.117; *Journal of Education*, February 1913, p.115, July 1913, p.516, February 1918, p.121.

the League in various ways – for instance by sending in details of their experiences of delivering moral education, or through entering for their prize essay scheme in 1915.[105]

The League was involved in the international inquiry into the "methods and results of moral training in schools" of 1906-08 chaired by Michael Sadler, and the International Moral Education Congress held in London in 1908. Spiller probably overstated the role of the League when he described the international inquiry as "an outcome of the League's propaganda,"[106] but the League was prominent in the inquiry's proceedings. Harrold Johnson served on the executive committee, and he and Gustav Spiller acted as special investigators, contributing chapters to the Inquiry's report.[107] The League's position was reflected in some, though not all, of the executive committee's conclusions, particularly in the statement "that in all public elementary schools at least one lesson a week should be devoted to instruction in the principles of personal, social, and civic duty," following "a systematic plan on the teacher's part."[108] For the International Moral Education Congress, Gustav Spiller and Harrold Johnson were involved in organisation and planning, Frederick James Gould gave a demonstration lesson, and members and sympathisers of the League contributed papers and spoke in discussions.[109]

After about 1910, the League showed increasing awareness of, and willingness to cooperate with, other educational organisations and individuals with similar or compatible aims. The work of other organisations, including the National Home Reading Union, the Empire Day Movement, the Parent's National Education Union, features in the League's *Quarterly* from about 1911-12. The League's own meetings included talks about the Montessori system and

---

[105] *Education*, 21 December 1906, p.442; *Journal of Education*, January 1907, p.32; *Education*, 1 October 1915, p.161; *Journal of Education*, May 1915, p.272. The implementation of the prize essay scheme was delayed owing to lack of funds.
[106] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.153.
[107] *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, pp.4-6; *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.1-5. Other members of the committee included J.B. Paton, W.T. Stead and J.H. Yoxhall of the NUT. Johnson and Spiller contributed chapters to the report of the inquiry. H. Johnson, Moral Instruction and Training in France, in M.E. Sadler (ed.) *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volume II*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908, 1-50; G. Spiller, An Educational Democracy: Moral Instruction and Training in the Schools of Switzerland, in M.E. Sadler (ed.) *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volume II*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908, 196-206.
[108] The Committee's conclusions are reported in Sadler, *Introduction*, pp. xxxi-xlix. See also *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, p.3.
[109] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.8-9. Members of the League were also involved in the Second International Moral Education Congress at The Hague in 1912. *MILQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, pp.3-6.

the 'Little Commonwealth' in Dorset.[110] In January 1914 the League collaborated with the Historical Association to organise a conference on 'History teaching in its ethical aspect'.[111] Gould also gave a favourable report on Patrick Geddes' masque for learning held at the University of London in 1913.[112]

Indeed, correspondence within Patrick Geddes' papers offers a fascinating glimpse into the operation of the educational world in Edwardian London, and some of the mechanisms through which the League cooperated with and shared ideas and information with other organisations and educationalists. Harrold Johnson wrote to Geddes in 1906 and 1912, asking for feedback on drafts of the League's *Graduated Syllabus* for secondary schools and Gould's correlation scheme – presumably other educationalists were similarly approached for advice.[113] Letters related to Geddes' 'masque for learning' in 1913 also reveal informal contacts with individuals in the League, and the practical ways in which educationalists supported one another's efforts: writing letters of support, offering names of useful contacts, arranging meetings.[114] This sort of informal networking is invisible in most of the published sources examined, but presumably underpinned much of the League's work.

Central government propaganda

The League's most high profile activities were its attempts to influence central government educational policy in order to get moral instruction on to the curriculum of all state elementary schools. Over the years it tried to effect change through administrative and legislative routes, campaigning for modifications in codes and training college regulations and for amendments and additions to Education Bills in line with its goals. It sent deputations to the Board of Education, lobbied parliamentary candidates and MPs, and set up a debate in the House of Commons.

---

[110] *MELQ*, 28, 1 April 1912, p.8; *MELQ*, 29, 1 July 1912, pp.6, 8; *MELQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, p.10; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, pp.4-5,15; *MELQ*, 37, 1 July 1914, pp.2-3.
[111] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.152.
[112] *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, p.6.
[113] Harrold Johnson to Patrick Geddes, November 1906, 31 December 1906, T-GED 11/3/32; Harrold Johnson to Patrick Geddes, 24 April 1912, T-GED 9/1086, (see also FJ Gould to Patrick Geddes, 7 May 1912, T-GED 9/1088); Sir Patrick Geddes Papers.
[114] For example, Lucy Yates to Patrick Geddes, 12 January 1913, T-GED 9/1142; Lucy Yates to Patrick Geddes, 19 January 1913, T-GED 9-1154; Lucy Yates to Patrick Geddes, 7 March 1913, T-GED 9/1199; Harrold Johnson to Patrick Geddes, T-GED 12/3/39, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers.

Lobbying the Board of Education

The League's earliest direct approach to the Board of Education was in April 1902 when it presented a memorial to the Duke of Devonshire, then President of the Board of Education. This memorial called for "daily instruction in personal and civic duties" to be a requirement in the Day School Code. The League's original demand that moral instruction should replace religious instruction lessons had by this time been rescinded. Still, the memorial argued that the ethical element was inadequate in many religious lessons. According to the League's 1902 Annual Report this memorial was signed by "199 representative persons", including five members of the House of Lords, twelve members of the House of Commons, twenty three University Professors, and County Councillors and members of School Boards.[115] Political power, wealth and social capital, intellectual influence, and practical control of the machinery of educational provision at the local level, were called on in the attempt to sway government opinion.

The League also attempted to court support in the House of Commons. It canvassed parliamentary candidates for the 1905 general election:

> 149 replies were received. Of these, 12 were non-committal. Of the remaining 137 Candidates who replied, 117 expressed themselves definitely in favour of the introduction of systematic non-theological instruction into all State-supported schools. They further pledged themselves to use their influence, if elected, to secure the introduction into the Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools of such instruction as a compulsory subject.[116]

This indicates that some in the Commons were sympathetic to the League, enough for a Parliamentary Committee to be established. The League's key contacts in parliament must have done much work behind the scenes to facilitate the high profile campaigning of the next three to four years, though their activities are not obvious in the sources available.

Augustine Birrell, who became President of the Board of Education with the new Liberal Government, appears to have responded to the League's lobbying. On 28 May 1906 he stated during a speech in the House of Commons that he attached "considerable

---

[115] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.131.
[116] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.133. Canvass form, LP/GC/12/165, Labour Party General Correspondence, Labour Party Archives, Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

importance" to "teaching children the elements of morality" and indicated his intention to "give some encouragement to such instruction" in the Code.[117]

Legislation was another route through which the League tried to get the change it desired.[118] The League tried to persuade the Labour Party to promote moral instruction as part of its secular education programme in its campaigns in Spring 1906. Although Ramsay MacDonald had obviously expressed interest in the League's work and distributed copies of their syllabus, it appears that no firm commitment to moral instruction on the part of the Labour Party was forthcoming.[119]

The League was more successful with its Liberal parliamentary contacts, through whom it attempted in 1908 to move an amendment to Reginald McKenna's Education Bill. The original 140-word amendment, stating that moral instruction should be a grant-earning subject and given at least once a week, was later revised to a much shorter insertion in the clause of the Bill which defined the public elementary school as "a school in which the Board of Education is satisfied that Moral Instruction is given to each class according to a scheme submitted to and approved by His Majesty's Inspectors."[120] Harrold Johnson tried to garner support for the League's proposed amendment, addressing a meeting of the 'Nonconformist Committee' of members of the House of Commons, and circularising friends and members asking them to bring the League's proposals to the attention of their MP.[121] In October 1908 the League claimed to be optimistic that its amendment would be carried. However, the various MPs appointed to move the amendment – FD Acland, CP Trevelyan, GP Gooch – were unable to do so and this attempt came to nothing.[122]

---

[117] Hansard, 4, 158, 28 May 1906, col.130.
[118] The League had previously called for provision for compulsory moral instruction in legislation in November 1902 (in a resolution in a public meeting) and in April 1906 (in a letter from Harrold Johnson to Augustine Birrell). *Ethical World*, 29 November 1902; Harrold Johnson to Augustine Birrell, 26 April 1906, ED24/409, NA.
[119] Harrold Johnson to J. Ramsay MacDonald, 10 February 1906, LP/GC/1/222; Harrold Johnson to J. Ramsay MacDonald, 22 February 1906, LP/GC/1/223; Harrold Johnson to J. Ramsay MacDonald, 1 February 1906, LP/GC/12/163; Harrold Johnson to J. Ramsay MacDonald, 27 February 1907, LP/GC/12/166. Labour Party General Correspondence, Labour Party Archives.
[120] *MILQ*, 12, 1 January 1908, pp.1-2; *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.5-6; Johnson, *The Education Bill and Moral Instruction*; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.136. The reference to inspectors was removed in the final version of the amendment.
[121] Johnson, *Moral Instruction and the Education Bill*; Johnson, *The Education Bill and Moral Instruction*.
[122] *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.3-6. Acland and Trevelyan were promoted, and the Bill was withdrawn before Gooch was able to move the amendment. Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.136.

On 16 March 1909, the League tried a different approach, when GP Gooch, seconded by Sir William Collins, instigated a debate in the House of Commons, moving:

> That in the opinion of this House, provision should be made, in the Code, for Moral Instruction to be effectively given in every elementary school, and that the Regulations for the Training of Teachers should be so amended as to secure that they are adequately trained to give such instruction.

A range of views were aired in a long debate. There was support for the League's aims, and also the still-common fear that the League's proposals posed a threat to religion.[123] The movers did not press for a division, apparently on the grounds that the Unionist vote might have gone against the League. The *Quarterly* suggested that if the motion had been put to the vote it would probably have been carried by a good majority.[124] It is impossible to judge whether the League's representatives in the commons were being overcautious, or the League was being – as it undoubtedly was at times – over-optimistic. This episode highlights the way in which the League had to decide how far to negotiate and adapt (and possibly weaken or compromise) its demands in order to achieve definite results.

The "influential deputation" to Walter Runciman, then President of the Board of Education, on 11 May 1909 was carefully timed to capitalise on the attention to moral education generated by the International Moral Education Congress in London in September 1908, and the Commons debate. The deputation's proposals, which softened the League's previous demands regarding timetabled moral instruction lessons, but called for the Board to "require all Training Colleges to provide instruction in the methods of imparting direct, systematic and graduated Moral Instruction," were clearly informed by Runciman's comments during the Commons debate.[125]

There was a break in public parliamentary lobbying between 1909 and 22 April 1913, when GP Gooch and JS Mackenzie led a deputation to Trevelyan, by this time parliamentary secretary to the Board of Education. The League timed this deputation carefully, seizing on the publicity and excitement generated by Haldane's proposals for educational reform in

---

[123] Hansard Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 1909 Vol. II, 16 March 1909, cols.996-1032.
[124] Cited in Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.137.
[125] *MELQ*, 17, 1 July 1909, pp.1-7; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.137-38.

January 1913.[126] The deputation demanded two "character and conduct" lessons each week in elementary schools, and insisted, as they had in 1909, on instruction in "moral and civic teaching" as a compulsory part of the training college curriculum. In a private letter to Trevelyan Gooch asked for "some small step forward", claiming that though the deputation was asking for two lessons it would be "delighted if [it] could get *one*."[127] This letter was to no avail: Trevelyan, as his predecessors had done, argued against making moral lessons compulsory.[128]

Letter writing

These strategies – deputations to the Board of Education, lobbying of parliamentary candidates and MPs, attempts to influence legislation, a debate in the House of Commons – generated much publicity for the League, and thereby aided its more general object of raising public awareness and generating discussion about moral education.[129] Harrold Johnson tried to maximise the publicity to be gained through these activities by writing letters to the press. He capitalised on the public interest in moral education generated by the First International Moral Education Congress, by, for instance, writing letters to the national and educational press drawing attention to the League's work.[130]

Johnson also did a lot of letter writing behind the scenes, writing numerous personal letters to leading personnel at the Board of Education. An Education Department file at the National Archives, containing letters from 1906 to 1909, reveals Johnson's persistence. His frequent letters meant that the Board was made aware of the League's demands, and some response was required. He inundated the Board with requests for discussions, and demands

---

[126] The League passed a resolution at its annual meeting on 14 February 1913 hoped Haldane's proposals would lead to a "comprehensive scheme of National Education, framed on the broadest moral and civic lines and making for the good of the nation as a whole" being introduced before Parliament. *MELQ*, 32, 1 April 1913, p.11.

[127] Gooch to Trevelyan, 20 April 1913, cited in F. Eyck, *G.P. Gooch: A Study in History and Politics*, London: Macmillan, 1982, p.169. In this letter Gooch suggests that it was Pease, then President of the Board of Education, rather than Trevelyan himself who needed convincing.

[128] *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, pp.3-6; *The Times*, 23 April 1913, p.5.

[129] Press coverage included reports and comments on: the debate in the House of Commons in *The Times*, 17 March 1909, p.8, *Education*, 19 March 1909, pp.182-83, *The Schoolmaster*, 27 March 1909, p.549; the deputation to Runciman in *The Times*, 12 May 1909, p.9, *Education*, 14 May 1909, p.297, *Educational Times*, 1 June 1909, p.230, *Journal of Education*, 1 June 1909, p.378, *The Schoolmaster*, 15 May 1909, p.866; the deputation to Trevelyan in *The Times*, 23 April 1913, p.5, *Education*, 25 April 1913, p.249; *The Schoolmaster*, 26 April 1913, p.847.

[130] For example, *The Times*, 26 September 1908, p.8; *Education*, 4 October 1908, p.236; *School*, December 1908, p.168; *Educational Times*, 1 April 1909, p.162; *Journal of Education*, 1 April 1909, p.247.

for the Board to clarify their position and their reasons for resisting the introduction of compulsory moral lessons. For example, in the wake of London Education Committee's decision not to allow systematic moral instruction in London Council schools, he wrote to Robert Morant on 14, 25 and 29 October and on 7 November 1907, requesting an interview. An interview was secured for 21 November.[131] After the interview Johnson wrote letters to Reginald McKenna and Robert Morant outlining points raised in the interview and requesting clarification on a number of issues.[132]

Johnson adapted his arguments and demands in order to maximise the chances of getting some concessions. Writing to Augustine Birrell in 1906 he suggested that moral instruction should take place during the time set aside for religious lessons (at the beginning or the end of the school day). But in October 1907, he called for one moral lesson a week in the ordinary secular curriculum. He was also willing to work either through legislation or through the administrative mechanisms of Codes and Regulations.[133]

Results

What did the League achieve as a result of this high profile public lobbying, supplemented by letter writing behind the scenes? The League claimed statements in the 1904 Code, the 1905 *Handbook of Suggestions*, and a permissive article in the 1906 Code as endorsement of its proposals and the result of its propaganda, reprinting these statements in publicity and teaching material. There is, I suggest, some truth in these claims.

First, there was the prominent reference to the formation of character in the introduction of the 1904 Code: "The purpose of the public elementary school is to form and strengthen the character, and to develop the intelligence of the children entrusted to it ... And, though their opportunities are but brief, the teachers can yet do much to lay the foundations of conduct."

---

[131] Harrold Johnson to Robert Morant, 14 October 1907; Harrold Johnson to Robert Morant, 25 October 1907; Harrold Johnson to Robert Morant, 29 October 1907; G.E.P. Murray to Harrold Johnson, 7 November 1907; ED/24/409, NA.

[132] Harrold Johnson to Reginald McKenna, 22 November 1907; Harrold Johnson to Robert Morant, 25 November 1907, ED/24/409, NA. Johnson reported this correspondence and the interview in the League's *Quarterly*; *MILQ*, 12, 1 January 1908, pp.2-5.

[133] Harrold Johnson to the Augustine Birrell, 26 April 1906; Harrold Johnson to Reginald McKenna, 22 November 1907; Harrold Johnson to Robert Morant, 25 October 1907, ED/24/409, NA.

The League interpreted this passage as a "sympathetic" response to its propaganda.[134] The *Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers* issued the following year contained a section on 'the formation of character': "The good moral training which a school should give cannot be left to chance; on this side, no less than on the intellectual side, the purpose of the teacher must be clearly conceived and intelligently carried out."[135] The League was pleased with this statement, noting that it said more than the 1904 Code about how moral training should be carried out.[136] Though there was no explicit reference to systematic moral instruction lessons, the author of the weekly 'educational notes' in *The Times* detected the League's influence in this passage: "approval of the league's efforts towards the systematic moral instruction in schools is implied, if not expressed."[137]

Moral instruction lessons were included in a permissive article in the 1906 Code: "Moral Instruction should form an important part of the curriculum of every elementary school. Such instruction may either (i) be incidental, occasional and given as fitting opportunity arises in the ordinary routine of lessons, or (ii) be given systematically and as a course of graduated instruction." Where possible, the Code stated, the teaching should be "direct, systematic and graduated," but the choice of incidental or direct method was left to Local Authorities. The League was jubilant over these concessions: "The State, for the first time, takes over definitely the moral education of the children in its schools ... The pioneers of the League, though they dreamed dreams and saw visions, could hardly have expected this at so early a stage of their pilgrimage."[138] Others similarly thought the League's campaign was, in part, responsible for this provision.[139]

In some ways these statements appear, as the League maintained, to endorse its proposals. The statement in the 1904 Code was in line with the second part of the League's object (namely making the formation of character the main aim of education). The emphasis on

---

[134] Board of Education, *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools*, London: HMSO, 1904, p.viii; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.132; *MELQ*, 1 January 1914, p.3; *Ethical World*, 28 May 1904, pp.173-74.
[135] Board of Education, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*, London; HMSO, 1905, p.8.
[136] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.133.
[137] *The Times*, 2 November 1905, p.10. See also the comment in *The Times*, 7 October 1908, p.11 that the Moral Instruction League has influenced the Board of Education and LEAs "to make some provision for moral instruction".
[138] *MILQ*, 7, 1 October 1906, pp.1-2.
[139] For example, *The Head Teacher*, 15 July 1907, pp.53-54.

systematic moral instruction in the 1906 Code is even closer to the League's aims. Coming as it did merely weeks after the League lobbied Augustine Birrell, it appears to have been directly influenced, at least to some degree, by the League's propaganda. In addition, the moral qualities listed in the 1904 Code,[140] and, to a greater extent, those listed in the 1906 Code,[141] mirrored closely those in the League's graduated syllabus.[142]

Still, the Board of Education was far from accepting all the League's demands. Augustine Birrell commented in the House of Commons on 28 May 1906 that he was convinced that morality could be "taught, with spirit and with force, apart from [a religious] basis." Yet he also argued in the same speech that moral lessons were no real substitute for religious lessons, which should be given in all elementary schools.[143] Moreover, although the Code supported some form of moral education in all schools, the choice of method (incidental and occasional or systematic and graduated) was left to local education authorities, and most did not choose the systematic method advocated by the League.[144] The influence of idealist thought on employees of the Board at this time may have been conducive to recognition of the importance of moral aspects of education but did not guarantee full acceptance of what the League proposed.[145] The Board was also influenced by other strands of thinking on moral education. The emphasis on the playground as a key location for instilling school discipline, and the provision for organised games in the 1904 and 1906 Codes, harks back to the nineteenth century tradition of moral training in public schools, with its emphasis on the playing field.[146] These Codes reflect the ideas of men such as JB Paton and the Earl of Meath, products of the public school system, who believed that aspects of this system could be transported to elementary schools, as much as the ideas of the League.

---

[140] Industry, self-control, perseverance, self-sacrifice, purity, loyalty, and an instinct for fair play.
[141] Courage, truthfulness, cleanliness, temperance, kindness to animals, respect for beauty.
[142] Chapter Three similarly identifies substantial overlap in the content of different moral instruction handbooks.
[143] Hansard, 4, 158, 28 May 1906, cols.130-31.
[144] Board of Education, *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools*, London: HMSO, 1906, p.3 (Article 2).
[145] Gordon and White, *Philosophers*, pp.xi, 134-55.
[146] Board of Education, *Report of the Board of Education for the year 1905-1906*, London: HMSO, 1906, pp.24-25. See also *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, 1897-98*, London: HMSO, 1898, p.xx for an earlier example of a Board of Education document promoting moral training in elementary schools through organised games, based on the public school model.

The 1906 Code did not, ultimately, achieve what the League hoped it would. It soon became apparent that most education authorities were not changing their practices. The League expressed its dissatisfaction:

> As far as the majority of elementary schools is at present concerned the provision for Moral Instruction in the code is well-nigh a dead letter. So many Education Authorities escape through the loop-hole that is left to them of restricting their attentions to incidental Moral Instruction, which means generally that things go on without change in the same way as of old.

The League therefore called for the Board of Education to "take its courage in both hands" and compel schools to make effective provision for moral education.[147]

Yet, despite the numerous and persistent efforts outlined above, the League did not gain any major concessions from the Board of Education after 1906. The Board of Education proved unwilling to make moral instruction lessons compulsory, either through the training college curriculum or in the elementary school Code. Runciman in 1909 and Trevelyan in 1913 intimated that the Board could go no further than it had done in the 1906 Code.[148] The League was evidently frustrated with the 'hints' in training college regulations and the 'loophole' in the Code which, it believed, enabled education authorities and colleges to change nothing in practice. "Deeper issues," Harrold Johnson wrote in the *Ethical World* in 1909, are "shirked by the state."[149]

Why, then, did these later efforts to influence the education department fail? There is some truth in the claim that the Board had acceded to the League's demands as much as it could in the 1906 Code. The Board was fearful of alienating religious bodies or their representatives, or doing anything that might exacerbate interdenominational discord, in the context of the disputes in the wake of the 1902 Act. However, there was also a positive educational rationale for the Board's position. From the mid-1890s, it was a deliberate policy on the part of the education department to give schools and teachers greater freedom over teaching methods and the content of the curriculum. Departmental documents of the late 1890s contrasted the healthy and energetic atmosphere in schools under the new regime with that

---

[147] *MILQ*, 8, 1 January 1907, p.14; *MILQ*, 12, 1 January 1908, p.2.
[148] *MELQ*, 17, 1 July 1909, pp.5-6; Hansard Parliamentary Debates,Commons, 1909 Vol. II, 16 March 1909, col.1027, (See also Trevelyan's response to the League cited in *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, pp.5-6).
[149] *MILQ*, 8, 1 January 1907, p.14; *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, pp.11-12; *Ethical World*, 15 September 1909, p.141.

under the curricular and funding restrictions of payment by results. Too much compulsion was, as the Board of Education explained to a deputation in favour of compulsory temperance teaching in 1913, "contrary to the practice of the Board", and would have been seen as a regressive step.[150] For these various reasons – negative and positive – successive education departments failed, as they had done before the League was founded, to commit to any particular programme of moral education.

The League's final years: citizenship and social studies

Changes in the League's name in its later years reflect changes in priorities. In 1916 it was renamed the Civic and Moral Education League (with the object of "[promoting] systematic moral and civic education"). 'Moral' finally disappeared from the title in 1919 when it became the Civic Education League.[151] The original stress on individual morality, though never entirely lost, was superseded by an emphasis on civic education and the moral qualities required of the citizen. The League's publications, lectures and book reviews show that by 1913 citizenship and civic education were becoming more prominent in its thinking.[152] Alexander Farquharson, lecturer at London School of Economics, who replaced Harrold Johnson as Secretary in 1913, steered the League further in this direction. Civics teaching was closer to Farquharson's personal academic preferences than moral instruction, and also, he reasoned, likely to attract support from "individuals, teachers, schools, and education authorities" where the label moral instruction "would at once rouse prejudice."[153] Moreover, this move was an attempt to adjust to the political and social climate of the time and to seize on the opportunities available. The League predicted that during the war people would be alive to moral issues and there would be openings which did not exist before for "developing

---

[150] Selleck, *op cit.*, p.313; General Report for the Year 1895 of the Schools of the East Central Division, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1895-96*, London: HMSO, 1896, pp.59ff, p.75; *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1896-97*, London: HMSO, 1897, pp.vii-viii; *The Schoolmaster*, 18 January 1913, p.111.

[151] Gould is incorrect in his statement that the League "obscurely died" in 1919. Gould, *Moral Education*, p.18. Instead, the League merged with the Schools Personal Service Association in 1919 (it was partly in response to this association's wishes that 'moral' was dropped from the title). See Civic and Moral Education League (CMEL), *The Future of the Civic and Moral Education League*, c.1919, T-GED 2/2/30, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers. By 1924 the League was subsumed into LePlay House and the Sociological Society. Bérard, *Movement*, p.65; Selleck, *op cit.*, p.323.

[152] See *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, p.1; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, pp.11-13; Gould, *National Need*.

[153] *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.4.

the civic spirit." Farquharson called for the League to "take the lead in raising discussion and suggesting ways and means of improving matters."[154]

The League's efforts during the war focused on civic education. Activities included conferences and meetings, often in collaboration with other organisations (a discussion on citizenship during the Annual Conference of Educational Associations in January 1916, a summer school in civics in Aberystwyth in 1916, a three-day meeting in London the following year);[155] and curriculum development (the development of a new, larger, syllabus for elementary schools).[156] The League endeavoured to engage teachers, offering a £20 prize for the best essay on the "reform of civic and moral education of the present day",[157] and requesting information for a new 'return' on what teachers were doing by way of civics teaching.[158] The League also developed guidance for teachers in the more controversial sphere of sex education and engaged in debates and conferences in this area.[159] Clearly, then, the League was active during the war. Nonetheless, there was pressure on staff and resources – in 1917 Alexander Farquharson was released from his work as Secretary to take up a position in the Ministry of Food, and the League had to move to other premises – and opportunities for activism were severely curtailed.[160]

This is the place to end this detailed analysis of the League's activities. With the increasing emphasis on civics it moved away from the focus of this thesis, and the pressure on resources means that evidence on its organisational activities and identity becomes increasingly hard to find. This chapter will now assess the League's impact and achievements.

---

[154] *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, pp.2-3; MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, p.1.
[155] MEL, *Particulars of a Discussion on Training for Citizenship to be held in the Jehangier Hall, University of London on Tuesday, 6th January 1916, Circular M7*; CMEL, *Particulars of a Summer School of Civics to be held at Aberystwyth from Saturday, 5th August, to Saturday, 19th August, 1916, Circular M12*; CMEL, *A Year's Work at Civics Teaching, Circular M13*, November 1916, MEL Circulars and Pamphlets 1915-21; *Particulars of a Summer Meeting for the Discussion of Problems of Civic and Moral Education 21-23 August 1917*; *Circular M18*, T-GED 12/1/99, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers.
[156] *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.3. I have not located a copy of this new syllabus.
[157] MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, p.1; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.151-152.
[158] MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, pp.3-4; MEL, *A Year's Work in Civics Teaching, Circular M13*, p.1.
[159] *The Times*, 22 August 1917, p.3; MEL, *Notes to Members and Friends, Circular M6*, p.3.
[160] CMEL, *Civic and Moral Education League, Circular M15*, MEL Circulars and Pamphlets 1915-21.

Chapter Two

The Moral Instruction League: *impact and achievements*

How successful was the League, and what impact did it have? Assessing its achievements is a difficult task. In some respects its impact was highly impressive, yet it failed to achieve its key objectives.

The League was able to generate interest and debate in moral education. As indicated in the previous chapter, the League operated at a time when many were concerned with the moral condition of society, and its emphasis on the formation of character and moral elements of schooling was eagerly received.[161] Unsurprisingly, sympathy with its general aim permeates much commentary on the League in the educational press. An editorial on the League in *The Teacher* noted that "the highest type of child-training and the worthiest work of the teacher is the moulding of character."[162] The League's propaganda raised public awareness about moral education and stimulated debate. According to Michael Sadler, it also prepared English public opinion to welcome the First International Moral Education Congress in 1908.[163] Even Professor Findlay, prominent critic of the League's pedagogical approach, was "sincerely thankful that the efforts of the League [were] helping to stir the waters".[164]

The actions of the Board of Education and Local Education Authorities also indicate some support for the League's programme of systematic moral instruction lessons. The Codes of 1904 and 1906 and the 1905 *Handbook of Suggestions* can be seen as partial endorsement of its programme, and moral instruction was taken up by a significant minority of LEAs in England and Wales.[165] Even if not as much as the League hoped for, this was enough to concern the League's critics and spur them into action (as evidenced by correspondence and

---

[161] Selleck, *op cit.*, p.311.
[162] Moral Instruction. The Opportunity of the Secularist, *The Teacher*, 9 December 1905, pp.1169-70.
[163] M. Sadler, The International Congress on Moral Education, *International Journal of Ethics*, January 1909, 158-72, p.158. The League was mentioned in connection with the Congress in the English press: e.g. *The Times*, 7 October 1908, p.11.
[164] Findlay, *Growth of Moral Ideas in Children*, p.35. Cited in *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, p.4.
[165] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.xi-xii. The 1904 Introduction and the provision for moral instruction introduced in 1906 remained in the Code till 1925, when all directions on the teaching of subjects were omitted. The introduction of the 1904 Code was then reproduced in the *Handbook of Suggestions* when it was revised in 1927, but the provision for moral instruction was not transferred. Gould, *Moral Education*, pp.6-9.

editorials in the educational press and the circular in favour of moral education on a religious basis issued in 1905).[166]

The League was able to reach many teachers at grass-roots level. It must have reached thousands through its graduated syllabus, handbooks, and demonstration lessons. According to *The Head Teacher*, many teachers had been won over by the League's syllabus and literature,[167] while the Reverend Sydney Smith argued that its books contained much useful material even for Christian teachers.[168] The League's curriculum materials were undoubtedly an advance on much of what counted as moral training at the time. American psychologist Granville Stanley Hall conceded that the League's books were better than the sentimental "be-good literature" of a generation before.[169] The League's conviction that demonstration lessons converted sceptics has already been noted (though the evidence examined sheds limited light on practising teachers' views).[170] Later researchers have also argued that the League influenced curriculum and pedagogical developments in the long-term.[171]

Much of the League's influence was not in this country, but overseas. International links were developed from an early stage, often through the ethical movement. In 1912 the League claimed to have members in twenty-one countries.[172] Its syllabus was adopted overseas, particularly within the British Empire, its handbooks were translated into a number of languages, and Moral Instruction Leagues modelled on the UK League were established in Germany in 1906 and in France and India in 1911.[173] Moreover, Gould's tours of America in 1911 and 1913-14, and India in 1913, appear to have stimulated activity in these countries.[174]

---

[166] Moral Instruction. The Opportunity of the Secularist, *The Teacher*, 9 December 1905, pp.1169-70 and editorial and correspondence in *School Guardian*, 20 April 1907, pp.355-56, 27 April 1907, p.370; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.128-29. See also the earlier criticisms of the League by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the National Society's 1903 annual meeting reported in the *School Guardian*, 13 June 1903, p.500.
[167] This paper had condemned the League's direct action campaign in 1901. *The Head Teacher*, 15 May 1901, pp.18-19, 15 July 1907, pp.53-54.
[168] Rev. S.F. Smith, A Further Danger for our Schools, *The Month*, December 1906, 601-18, p.606.
[169] Bérard, *Movement*, p.66; Hall, *op cit.*, p.234.
[170] The League claimed in 1908 that "probably no other propaganda ... has done so much to further the cause." Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, p.143.
[171] Bérard, *Movement*, p.66; Gordon, *Commitment*, pp.48-49.
[172] *MILQ*, 28, 1 April 1912, p.3.
[173] See *MILQ*, 7, 1 October 1906, p.8; *MILQ*, 14, 1 October 1908, pp.14-15; *MELQ*, 17, 1 July 1909, p.8; *MELQ*, 26, 1 October 1911, pp.6-7; *MELQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, pp.8-10; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, pp.3-4; *MELQ*, 38, 1 October 1914, p.7.
[174] See *MELQ*, 25, 1 July 1911, pp.3-5; *MELQ*, 26, 1 October 1911, pp.3-4; *MELQ*, 31, 1 January 1913, pp.4-5; *MELQ* 32, 1 April 1913, pp.1-6; *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, pp.7-9; *MELQ*, 36, 1 April 1914, pp.6-11; *MELQ*, 37, 1 July 1914, pp.4-6 and Gould, *Life Story*, pp.123-57 for details of these tours.

Harrold Johnson perceived "something universal in our movement which appeals not only to one country, but to all."[175]

Despite these significant achievements, the Moral Instruction League nonetheless failed to obtain its original object of systematic non-theological moral instruction lessons in the nation's elementary schools. The reasons for this failure lay in the complex politics of the Board of Education (examined above), a failure to convince educational and public opinion that this was the best approach to moral education, and also, perhaps, in internal divisions and weaknesses within the League.

As noted in the previous chapter, leading educational theorists and psychologists thought utilising other school subjects for moral purposes and general school discipline would be a more effective approach to moral education. League activists were disappointed by its overall lack of influence on educationalists. In 1914 EM White, having reviewed a number of recent books, concluded that while educationalists uttered "the parrot-cry of character-training" they were still ignorant of the League's aims and work.[176] On more practical grounds, comments from teachers who attended Gould's demonstration lessons indicate that fitting lessons into a crowded timetable was a persistent concern.[177]

The main source of criticism of the League's approach, however, was its position on religion. The League's assumption that morality could be separated from religion was challenged by educationalists like G Stanley Hall, religious spokesmen like the Roman Catholic Reverend Sidney Smith, and practising teachers who attended demonstration lessons.[178] It appears that the notion that morality imparted in schools should be based on religion, discussed in the previous chapter, remained widespread well into the twentieth century.

---

[175] Johnson argued that a common system of moral education could bind different parts of the Empire. *MELQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, p.8.
[176] *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914, pp.5-7; *MELQ*, 36, 1 April 1914, pp.2-3.
[177] *MELQ*, 24, 1 April 1911, p.5; *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, p.7.
[178] Hall, *op cit.*, p.207; Smith, *A Further Danger*, pp.609-18; *MELQ*, 24, 1 April 1911, p.5; *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, pp.7-8. The League's position on religion was also criticised in the educational periodical press. For example see: Moral Instruction. The Opportunity of the Secularist, *The Teacher*, 9 December 1905, p.1169-70.

Furthermore, the League's attitude to religion confused politicians, teachers and the broader general public. As late as 1919, eighteen years after dropping their original demand of replacing religious instruction with moral lessons, the League complained about having to give "interminable explanations that "moral" does not mean anti-religious".[179] The League's position on religion was undoubtedly puzzling. On the one hand it claimed that moral lessons could be given in a way "acceptable to people of all theologies and of none," obviating the need to deal with sanctions. On the other hand it publicly criticised religious instruction and, as Hilliard rightly suggests, failed to engage seriously with religious as well as secular morality.[180] These mixed messages may have been too complex for the public to comprehend.

For these various reasons the League failed to convince educationalists and the general public. However, the failure to achieve its objectives could also be attributed to weaknesses and divisions in the League itself. Religion was always a difficult issue and, as noted earlier in this chapter, one which divided members of the League. There were also tensions over strategy and priorities. Stanton Coit and Gustav Spiller prioritised legislative or administrative change, and therefore emphasised central government propaganda. FJ Gould on the other hand was more concerned with producing educational material and working with teachers.[181]

These tensions were brought into sharp relief around the change of title, and subsequent shifts in activity, around 1909-10, because after this date the League's influence, or at least its newsworthiness, declined. Spiller argues that the change of name to Moral Education League in 1909, signifying a broader remit, "took the definiteness and challenge out of the title and apparently out of the League."[182] Moreover, he criticises the decision to move away from central government and local education authority propaganda to more educational work after about 1909 for decreasing the League's influence over policy and public debate.[183]

---

[179] This was part of the rationale for removing moral from the League's title. CMEL, *The Future of the Moral and Civic Education League.*
[180] MIL, *Moral Instruction League*, p.1; Hilliard, *op cit.*, pp.61-62.
[181] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.154-56.
[182] The change of name was first proposed in January 1907. There was no time for discussion at the 1907 annual general meeting, and it appears the decision was finally taken in 1908. *MILQ*, 8, 1 January 1907, p.13; *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, pp.3-4. Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.154-55.
[183] Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.154-56.

Perhaps the more significant problems were, firstly, the failure, for a number of years after the change of title, to develop other approaches to moral education and bring these approaches into the public domain, and, secondly, changes over time in the opportunities for propaganda that were available to the League. Although there had been developmental work behind the scenes,[184] it was only after 1914 that these broader approaches were put into practice (for example, through the League's collaboration with other organisations such as the Historical Association and the Eugenics Education Society). The League had less control over opportunities for propaganda. Between 1910 and 1912 there were no major congresses or inquiries or education bills which the League could seize on in public campaigns. Its change in priorities was not so much a misguided move (as Spiller implies), but rather a calculated response to the circumstances of the time.

A further internal weakness after 1910 was the loss of key personnel. Harrold Johnson gradually lost faith in the League's objects and resigned in 1913. Long before this date, Spiller argues, "the fire and fervour of the pioneering reformer had departed from the League, a vague and impotent idealism taking its place."[185] Johnson was clearly a very able and committed organiser. Alexander Farquharson apparently did not invest the same time and energy in organising and campaigning. Moreover, the League had to terminate FJ Gould's employment as demonstrator in 1915 due to lack of funds, thus losing not only another energetic worker, but also the opportunity to engage with teachers at the grass-roots which his demonstration work had offered.

Ultimately, the League's achievements in generating the response it did from central and local educational authorities, and in generating broader interest in moral education, were highly impressive for a small pressure group. The League had accomplished much with

---

[184] This developmental work included Gould's "correlation scheme" in which the whole elementary school curriculum was subordinated to the aim of forming character. This scheme abandoned traditional subject divisions. MEL, *A Scheme for the Correlation of Certain Subjects of Instruction in Subordination to the Aim of Character Training (Signed F.J. Gould)*, 1912, 1865.c.1.(83), British Library. The syllabus was discussed at the League's quarterly meeting in May 1912. *MELQ*, 29, 1 July 1912, pp.4-5. Occasional lectures and articles in the *Quarterly* also signalled an interest in moral education broadly defined.

[185] *MELQ*, 33, 1 July 1913, p.6; Spiller, *Ethical Movement*, pp.153-54. Spiller suggests that Johnson's involvement in the international inquiry was responsible for a change in his views. Johnson was later ordained as a Unitarian minister serving at Cross Street Chapel in Manchester (Unitarianism was a common stopping-off point for those entering or leaving the ethical movement. See Budd, *op cit*, pp.16-18, 276.)

"exceedingly limited resources."[186] Nevertheless, it failed to attain its key objectives of changing educational policy in line with its object of introducing moral instruction lessons, and many were, undoubtedly, unconvinced or unaffected by its propaganda. It was, for political, ideological, and internal reasons, ultimately unable to transform its "stirring of the waters" into sustained activity.

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed the nature of the relationship between central government, and individuals and pressure groups, in the promotion and development of programmes of moral education in elementary schools. It has revealed that although the central government emphasised in various ways the importance of moral education throughout the period 1879 to 1918, they were unwilling to compel schools to follow a particular method and it was therefore left to pressure groups and individual campaigners to develop programmes. It has also argued that despite the Moral Instruction League's unprecedented coordination of efforts and skilful propaganda, the government's core policy position of not compelling particular methods did not change. Moreover, the League was ultimately unable to overcome a widespread commitment to moral education on a Christian basis. Its programme of "strictly human" moral instruction was deemed incompatible with this commitment.[187]

Still, it is remarkable that a radical and controversial body, originating in organised freethought, and promoting a minority educational perspective, was able to influence central government and public opinion to the extent that it did. Part of its influence must be attributed to the general climate of thought in the 1890s and 1900s which prioritised moral improvement and character formation. Yet the League itself also influenced this climate. Demand for moral education was in part, though not entirely, stimulated by the League. Unfortunately, as EM White pointed out, this did not necessarily indicate sustained effort and activity. Prominent educationalists were unmoved, and, as the League acknowledged, it appears that often little changed on the ground.[188]

---

[186] MIL, *To All Interested in Moral and Civic Education in Schools.*
[187] MIL, *Our Future Citizens*, p.8.
[188] H.M. Thompson argued that the "man on the street" appreciated inconsistencies in Christian morality but was not ready to accept the MIL position that the supernatural should be dissociated with the teaching of morality. H.M. Thompson, Moral Instruction in Schools, *International Journal of Ethics*, July 1904, 400-418, p.405.

This is something of a paradox, which cannot be explained by an analysis of the activities and reception of the League alone. We need to find out more about the pedagogy and content of moral instruction lessons to understand why they were taken up in some quarters but not in others. We also need to know more about local conditions, priorities and personalities to see why some places but not others introduced moral instruction, and to assess what moral instruction may have meant to teachers and schools on the ground. It is to these detailed and localised analyses that this thesis will now turn.

CHAPTER THREE:
THE MORAL INSTRUCTION CURRICULUM: EVIDENCE FROM TEACHERS' HANDBOOKS

In 1999 Barry Franklin noted the potential for differences between the "rhetorical curriculum" (what educationalists and policy-makers intended) and the "taught curriculum" (what went on in classrooms).[1] This chapter will assess the "taught" moral instruction curriculum through an analysis of materials intended for use in the elementary school classroom: primarily teachers' handbooks, supplemented by other texts used for moral instruction. Following on from the discussion of the Moral Instruction League and its educational programme in the last chapter, it will explore the pedagogy of moral instruction and also the content of the moral instruction curriculum. What do these sources have to say about how moral lessons should be conducted and how teaching materials were used? Which values and qualities were included in the moral instruction curriculum, and how were these defined? Can handbooks help us explain the success, or otherwise, of the moral education movement?

After a brief discussion of sources, pedagogical approaches suggested by handbook authors will be evaluated. The main body of this chapter will look in more detail at the content of the moral instruction curriculum. Three themes – obedience, patriotism and tolerance – will be examined in order to ascertain different authors' treatment of these themes in their work. This analysis reveals a pedagogy which was perhaps more innovative and sophisticated than critics implied, but which would also have challenged the elementary school teacher. It also suggests that although the authors examined had a similar view of which values and qualities should be addressed by moral education, their treatment of these values and qualities varied according to their political and religious views, and even according to their different personalities.

---

[1] B. Franklin, The State of Curriculum History, *History of Education*, 28:4, 1999, 459-76, pp.463, 475.

Chapter Three

The sources

Studies of moral education in Japan, Canada, and France where it was a compulsory part of the school curriculum reveal that such teaching materials can be usefully analysed for evidence on the particular values promoted among schoolchildren.[2] A detailed investigation of books intended for use in English elementary schools is similarly revealing.

Where work has been carried out in the English context, the main sources used have been textbooks and readers rather than teachers' handbooks. They have been used as evidence on curriculum development and on how teaching and learning were conducted in the past, and also as evidence for authorial opinion.[3] Much existing research, focusing on the political and social content of past textbooks, has investigated authorial views. There has been a concern to highlight perceived bias and prejudice (national, racist, sexist), perhaps in an attempt to understand the processes by which particular ideas and behaviours have been passed on to the rising generation.[4] While textbooks and readers were designed to be placed directly in pupils' hands, the content of teachers' handbooks was intended to be mediated to the pupil through the teacher.

This chapter is based on an analysis of the content of twenty moral instruction handbooks, by ten authors. Books were selected in an attempt to achieve good coverage of the period 1879-1918 (although in practice no handbooks written between 1883 and 1899, or after 1914, were found). I aimed to select handbooks which were popular and widely used (using the imperfect evidence in Harrold Johnson's *Return* and reviews in educational periodicals).[5] I

---

[2] See S.D. Hoffman, School Texts, the Written Word, and Political Indoctrination: A Review of Moral Education Curricula in Modern Japan (1886-1997), *History of Education*, 28:1, 1999, 87-96; N. Sheehan, Indoctrination: Moral Education in the Early Prairie School House, in D. Jones, N. Sheehan, R.M. Stamp (eds.) *Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West*, Calgary: Detselig, 1979, 222-35; F.J. Glendenning, Attitudes to Colonialism and Race in British and French History Schoolbooks, *History of Education*, 3:2, 1974, 57-72.

[3] G.H. Harper, Textbooks: An Under-used Source, *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 25, 1980, 30-40, pp.31-32; W.E. Marsden, *The School Textbook: Geography, History and Social Studies*, London: Woburn Press, 2001, pp.1-5.

[4] Marsden, *School Textbook*, p.5. Examples of historical research of this sort include: W.E. Marsden, Rooting Racism into the Educational Experience of Childhood and Youth in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Centuries, *History of Education*, 19:4, 1990, 333-53, pp.346-52; Glendenning, *op cit.*; V. Chancellor, *History for their Masters*, London: Adams & Dart, 1970; S. Heathorn, 'Let us Remember that we, too, are English': Constructions of Citizenship and National Identity in English Elementary School Reading Books, 1880-1914, *Victorian Studies*, 38:3, 1995, 395-427; Mackenzie, *op cit.*, pp.174-97.

[5] Though Harrold Johnson's *Return* on moral education was compiled using official documents submitted by Local Education Committees, there is a potential for both editorial bias towards MIL methods and also self-

also aimed to reflect a range of authorial backgrounds and views. This has not been easy. Moral instruction as a strategy, it seems, tended to attract those of a politically progressive, broad church or secularist persuasion. This seems true for authors of moral instruction handbooks as it was for the general membership of the Moral Instruction League. Indeed, a number of handbook authors were in fact connected with the League. Anglicans tended, in contrast, to favour moral training through denominational religious instruction.

In order to redress potential imbalances handbooks are supplemented with three additional texts. The edited collection of *Essays on Duty and Discipline* is included as a popular example of a more conservative moral vision.[6] HO Arnold-Forster's *Citizen Reader* is also included as an example of a popular elementary school reader which, although not ostensibly intended for moral lessons, contained strong moral messages.[7] I also include *Moral Instruction Essays* by John Hollingworth, Headmaster of St Margaret's Boys' School, King's Lynn. This is labelled a "scholar's book" – intended to be read by pupils – and is intended for the "incidental teaching of moral subjects through English composition" rather than for use in moral instruction lessons. However, in content and style it is not far removed from the handbooks for teachers examined. Indeed, Hollingworth was criticised for setting essays on the same lines as moral lessons in a scathing review.[8] The schemes adopted by Aberdare and Dorset County LEA are also illuminating as an explicitly Christian, though systematic, approach to moral education, but have not been analysed closely.[9]

The twenty-three texts analysed in this chapter are indicated in Table 3.1 below:

---

selection in the Education Committees which contributed material (these are likely to be those which were particularly interested in moral education and possibly even favoured MIL methods).

[6] *Essays on Duty and Discipline*. See Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.103-05 for more on the Duty and Discipline Movement.

[7] H.O. Arnold-Forster, *The Citizen Reader*, 8th edition, London: Cassell & Company, Ltd., 1887. This 8th edition was published only four years after the book was first issued. Heathorn notes that readers would have been more common in elementary schools than textbooks, and were provided for in successive education codes from 1880. Heathorn, *op cit.*, p.398.

[8] J. Hollingworth, *Moral Instruction Essays*, London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1907. Hollingworth was also criticised for introducing inappropriate and complicated terminology. *Journal of Education*, November 1907, p.753.

[9] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.1-6, 16-17.

Table 3.1 Moral instruction handbooks and supplementary texts

Date	Author/Title
1882	Mrs. C. Bray, *Elements of Morality*
1883	F.W. Hackwood, *Notes of Lessons on Moral Subjects*
1887	H.O. Arnold-Forster, *Citizen Reader* (8th edition)
1899, 1903, 1904, 1907	F.J. Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons*, (First, Second, Third, Fourth Series)
1900	L. Bates, *Story Lessons on Character Building (Morals) and Manners*
1904	A.J. Waldegrave, *A Teacher's Hand-book of Moral Lessons*
1905	A. Chesterton, *Garden of Childhood*
1907	J. Hollingworth, *Moral Instruction Essays*
1907, 1909	H. Major, *Moral Instruction*, (Junior, Middle, Senior, Advanced Stages)
1908	J. Reid, *A Manual of Moral Instruction*
c.1908	A. Chesterton, *The Magic Garden*
1911	*Essays on Duty and Discipline*
1912	A.J. Waldegrave, *Lessons in Citizenship*
c.1912	A. Chesterton, *The Pansy Patch*
c.1913	J.H. Wicksteed, *Conduct and Character*
1913	F.J. Gould, *Moral Instruction*
1913	W.H. Baldwin and W. Robson, *Lessons on Character-Building*

A number of handbook authors were teachers. FW Hackwood and John Hollingworth were elementary school headmasters when they wrote their handbooks, and Gould was an elementary school teacher for twenty-five years from 1871 to 1896. Wicksteed claimed that he gave all the lessons in his book before a class.[10] Mrs Charles Bray worked as a governess, while Lois Bates referred to her experiences of teaching in the preface to her handbook.[11] There is no evidence as to whether Alice Chesterton was a teacher herself but she claimed that her lessons were tested on elementary school pupils.[12] Henry Major claimed "fifty years

[10] J.H. Wicksteed, *Conduct and Character*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, c.1913, pp.4-5. (This book was published by the time *MELQ*, 35, 1 January 1914 was issued).
[11] R. Ashton, Bray, Caroline (1814-1905), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32048], accessed 14 March 2006; L. Bates, *Story Lessons on Character-Building (Morals) and Manners*, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900, pp.v-vi.
[12] A. Chesterton, *The Garden of Childhood*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd., 1905, p.v.

scholastic experience", but served not as a teacher but as the inspector for Leicester School Board and subsequently Leicester Education Committee.[13]

Most of the authors in the Moral Instruction League series were connected in some way or another with the ethical movement. Alice Chesterton, Waldegrave and Wicksteed all served on the League executive, and Waldegrave and Wicksteed both gave lessons for the League's Moral Instruction Circle.[14] Biographical information on Baldwin and Robson, and Reid is not available. By contrast, authors of the *Essays of Duty and Discipline* and Arnold-Forster were members of the political and military establishments. They were far removed from both the practical work of elementary education, and the world of organised freethought and the Moral Instruction League.

Chris Stray and Peter Mandler indicate the importance, when analysing texts as evidence of opinions, of considering conditions of production, use and consumption, and how the texts were received.[15] Although information about the market in which these books were produced and sold, and how books were actually used in the classroom is not available, we can nonetheless gain some insight into considerations of production, reception and the broad acceptability or otherwise of authorial views. Book reviews give evidence on reception, as does the popularity of most of the selected handbooks. Though moral instruction was always a minority approach, it seems likely that the more commercially successful authors would have aimed to produce a marketable product. Impractical or unpopular teaching methods, or very extreme opinions, would not have been used in the classroom. To find out more, however, it is necessary to turn to the content of the handbooks themselves.

The moral instruction curriculum: pedagogy

What do these handbooks reveal about the pedagogy of moral instruction? How did authors visualise moral instruction in the classroom, and, more specifically, how did they intend their

---

[13] H. Major, *Moral Instruction. Junior Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1907, p.16.
[14] See *MILQ*, 8, 1 January 1907, p.16; *MILQ*, 9, 1 April 1907, pp.3-4; *MELQ*, 30, 1 October 1912, p.11; *MELQ*, 31, 1 January 1913, p.6. Waldegrave also contributed specimen lessons and articles on moral instruction to the *Ethical World*: for example 12 September 1903, pp.294-95, 15 May 1909, p.67, 15 February 1911, p.29.
[15] C. Stray, Paradigms Regained: Towards a Historical Sociology of the Textbook, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26:1, 1994, 1-29; P. Mandler, The Problem with Cultural History, *Cultural and Social History*, 1, 2004, 94-117.

publications to be used? These handbooks reveal a surprisingly sophisticated pedagogy, based on the principles of engaging pupils' interest, systematic treatment of the moral arena, and appropriateness of content and method to those being taught. Indeed, such approaches may have proved rather challenging for teachers and presented certain problems in the overall efficacy of classroom-based moral instruction.

The production of moral instruction handbooks was based on the assumption that some form of direct moral teaching in the elementary school was desirable. This set authors apart from many who also believed in the value of moral education in elementary schools but who felt that indirect methods were more effective. Nonetheless, the handbooks examined reveal that in practice there was no simple divide between direct and indirect methods. "It is not expected that Moral Lessons will constitute the whole moral training given in the school" wrote Waldegrave. "Their function is to provide an opportunity of focussing the instruction in matters of conduct which is constantly being called forth by the events of the school-day. Moral Lessons without an ethical atmosphere and discipline in the school would be worse than useless."[16]

Handbook authors outlined what they deemed the essential components of effective moral instruction. Firstly, they believed that to be successful, moral instruction had to interest and engage the pupil. This tallied with the Board of Education's emphasis on engagement in the 1906 Code: "Unless the natural moral responsiveness of the child is stirred, no moral instruction is likely to be fruitful."[17]

One way moral responsiveness might be stirred was through presentation. We can observe changes over time away from detailed explanations of all elements of a moral quality, dry maxims and prohibitions in earlier handbooks towards a more positive approach which sought to inspire pupils with concrete examples of moral qualities. Hackwood's book, for instance, written in 1883, is full of aphorisms, quotations and definitions for pupils to memorise, and detailed descriptions of negative qualities which pupils should avoid. Maxims

---

[16] A.J. Waldegrave, *A Teacher's Hand-book of Moral Lessons*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1904, p.vi. See Chapter Two for similar argument in the Moral Instruction League's publicity literature more generally.

[17] Board of Education, *Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools*, London: HMSO, 1906, Article 2.

also dominate the handbook of Mrs Charles Bray, writing for a younger age group in 1882.[18] There was a lighter touch in most books produced after the late 1890s. Authors focused on positive elements of morality in an attempt to attract and inspire the pupil. Moral points were not laboured or drawn out explicitly to the extent they were in earlier works.[19] Later works also tended to advocate interactive pedagogical strategies that involved pupils in the moral lesson. It is quite likely that moral instructors were influenced by a general shift from lecturing and rote-learning towards child-centred, progressive approaches around the turn of the century.[20]

Progressive educational ideals and methods at this time might also have caused a shift over time towards a positive treatment of morality. Earlier works like Hackwood's devoted space to vices as well as virtues, and told children why they should not steal, be rude, be late, or lie, as well as to virtues. Later handbooks, on the other hand, emphasised the positive, indicating behaviour and ideas they wanted to encourage. Such an emphasis on the positive was particularly strong in authors connected with the Moral Instruction League.[21]

Caution should be exercised in passing judgement on what would or would not have been engaging. Hackwood's handbook seems dry to the modern reader compared with texts written twenty years later, but a reviewer in the *Educational Times* in 1883 thought it could enable a "lively and earnest teacher" to give moral lessons "that would not only not be dull and sermon-like, but would do his pupils real and lasting good, and be the treat of the

---

[18] Bray, *op cit.*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882. Hollingworth's approach – with maxims and quotations to be memorised – is unusual among the later authors. We can speculate that he was out of tune with teachers', as well as reviewers', tastes. *Journal of Education*, November 1907, p.753.

[19] Gould in particular railed against the use of maxims. This fits with his positivist belief in a morality governed not by a universal and immutable law but as context sensitive and developing as the human race evolved. Wright, *Morality without Theology*, pp.25-26.

[20] Gordon and Lawton, *Curriculum Change*, pp.145-50. Michael Sadler, however, pointed to an "often ... hidden divergence ... of educational ideals" between moral instructors and the progressive educators who favoured indirect approaches to moral education. Sadler, *Introduction*, pp.xl-xlii.

[21] See, for instance, F.J. Gould, The Moral Instruction of Children, in S. Coit (ed.) *Ethical Democracy: Essays in Social Dynamics*, London: Grant Richards, 1900, 163-93, p.167 and F.J. Gould, *Moral Instruction. Its Theory and Practice*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913, pp.55-61 for a discussion of the reasons for focussing on positive rather than negative morality. There is a similarly positive mode of expression in the Scout Law, suggesting an educational trend in the 1900s which cut across political and religious boundaries. R. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys. A Handbook for Instruction on Good Citizenship*, London: Horace Cox, 1908, pp.48-51.

week."[22] Thus definitions of 'engaging' and 'approachable' changed. Readers' tastes altered over time, influenced by (and influencing) changing educational ideals and methods.[23]

Several authors used illustrations – made-up stories, legends, and concrete examples from real life – in an attempt to engage pupils. Gould is probably the most famous proponent of this approach, which he described as the "concrete and dramatic" method. Moral lessons for Gould should be conveyed through "concrete illustrations" – stories from the lives of historical or legendary figures – which he saw as the "vehicles which convey moral truths to the imagination and heart of the child." Gould emphasised that this was not a new educational innovation but an ancient method used by moral teachers for thousands of years.[24] Biography, popularised as a tool for inspiring young readers in the mid-nineteenth century in collections of stories by authors such as Samuel Smiles and Charlotte Yonge, was the main source of Gould's concrete illustrations. As a positivist, Gould relied heavily on biographical illustrations from history, which were also prominent in Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook*.[25] Other handbook authors (particularly Major, Hackwood and Reid) also used biographical illustrations, but to a lesser extent, alongside maxims and quotations.

Alice Chesterton's and Lois Bates's books of lessons for younger children consist almost entirely of stories of good and bad, mostly made up by the authors; stories about boys and girls, talking animals, and monsters and fairies. For both authors children had to enjoy the stories in order for them to be effective as a vehicle of moral education. Chesterton hoped children listening to a story would "feel touched by the lesson it seeks to embody, without realising that a lesson is being imparted." She suggested no additional explanation or intervention on the part of the teacher. Bates on the other hand advocated 'blackboard sketches' to illustrate and reinforce the moral of the story.[26]

---

[22] *Educational Times*, December 1883, p.340.
[23] We lack direct evidence of the views of ordinary readers as opposed to reviewers.
[24] Gould, *Moral Instruction*, pp.38-39.
[25] For more on the influence of positivism on Gould's methods see Wright, *Morality without Theology*, pp.18-34 and Bérard, *Frederick James Gould*, pp.239-40. The prominence of biographical illustrations in Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook* could be because he borrowed from Gould's *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* in compiling this text. Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.v-vi.
[26] Chesterton, *Garden of Childhood*, p.v; Bates, *op cit.*

Authorial style and choice of illustration were similarly important to reviewers in assessing how effective a handbook would be to the classroom teacher. The anonymous reviewer of Mrs Charles Bray's *Elements of Morality* praised the "simple language and easy illustrations" and the "healthy simplicity" of the style. Hackwood was commended for the "apt illustrations" and his "good taste and judgement in selection" in the *Educational Times*.[27] The *Journal of Education* praised the first series of Gould's *Childrens' Book of Moral Lessons*: "This is a capital little book ... there is little or no preaching ... the stories and illustrations are remarkably well chosen, and there is a wholesome vigorous tone throughout."[28] A review of Alice Chesterton's *Garden of Childhood* in the same journal was mixed. While praising "the plain stories such as "Doris and the Jam-pot" ... incidents of child-life related with some dramatic power", the reviewer criticised the "stage machinery": "Nothing is gained by putting into the mouth of a caterpillar the advice not to cry when you tumble down." And, with reference to James Reid's manual, it was felt that "unless life were breathed into them, the lessons would be dull."[29] Clearly, reviewers felt that the quality of the stories and illustrations, and the way in which they were presented, would affect the delivery of lessons.

A second important component of effective moral instruction was that moral lessons should be appropriate to pupils' age and understanding. Different pedagogical strategies were favoured for different age groups. Lois Bates, in her handbook aimed at young children, wrote: "Picture-teaching is an ideal way of conveying truths to children, and these little stories are intended to be pictures in which the children may see and contrast the good with the bad, and learn to love the good." Gould saw his 'dramatic and concrete' method as appropriate for seven to fourteen-year-olds who were at an age when they were naturally interested in the concrete. Lessons aimed at older children, he argued, should move away from dramatic or pictorial methods towards a more discursive approach to moral and social issues.[30]

---

[27] *Journal of Education*, 1 February 1883, pp.68-9; *Educational Times*, 1 December 1883, p.340.
[28] *Journal of Education*, 1 March 1900, p.188. However, G Stanley Hall argued that Gould's volumes were "less systematic and ... pedagogically impressive" than French books devoted to the same aim. Hall, *op cit.*, p.230.
[29] *Journal of Education*, 1 February 1906, p.129; *Journal of Education*, 1 November 1908, pp.744-5. The reviewer of James Reid's book also criticised the content of some lessons for inconsistencies, but on a more positive note felt it would be effective "in the hands of a good teacher." Another reviewer felt that Reid's scheme was "worked out with marked ability and judgement", *Educational Times*, October 1909, p.423.
[30] Bates, *op cit.*, p.vi; Gould, *Moral Instruction*, pp.23-27. For examples of more discursive moral lessons aimed at the top end of the age group see Wicksteed, *op cit.*; A.J. Waldegrave, *Lessons in Citizenship*,

The subject matter of lessons varied according to the age of the pupils. Authors concentrated on what was most familiar to the youngest pupils – the individual and their immediate family – moving outwards to the school, the local community, and eventually to the nation and humanity for the oldest pupils. Thus lessons for younger pupils were on 'personal duties' or 'duties to the immediate family', whereas 'social' or 'civic' duties were the focus of most of the lessons aimed at pupils at the top end of the elementary school.

This desire for appropriate and intelligible moral lessons was manifested in the 'systematic' treatment of morality in all these handbooks. The moral arena was classified, subdivided and ordered, and this classification was reflected in the arrangement of values and behaviours into lessons under particular headings like 'kindness' or 'obedience'. This careful planning and ordering aimed at comprehensive coverage of the moral arena. It was feared that indirect methods, however effective, might not achieve the desired outcomes.[31]

Hackwood's handbook was probably the most sophisticated in structure and organisation of the handbooks produced in the 1880s. His cycle of forty lessons was intended to cover the school year. He suggested that this cycle be repeated each year with teachers adding additional material each time as pupils grew older and were able to understand more.[32] More comprehensive were the graduated systems of moral lessons developed around the turn of the century, which were carefully designed to ensure comprehensive and appropriate coverage over several years. The moral universe was analysed into its component parts, and a course of lessons was mapped out on the basis of this analysis. Lessons were divided and ordered so they followed logically from one to another, and so they were appropriate to the age and understanding of the pupil. Probably the most ambitious example was the Moral Instruction League's *Graduated Syllabus* for elementary schools. Subdivided by Standard, the League's syllabus outlined in some detail the subject matter to be included in moral lessons

---

London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1912; F.J. Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons. Fourth Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1907; H. Major, *Moral Instruction. Senior Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1907; H. Major, *Moral Instruction. Advanced Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1909. The latter volume was aimed at "older" elementary school pupils and continuation schools.

[31] See, for instance, R.W. Dale's arguments in favour of moral instruction at the meeting of Birmingham School Board outlined in Chapter Five, p.166.

[32] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.v. James Reid's concentric arrangement of lessons designed to accompany the Moral Instruction League's graduated syllabus twenty-five years later seems to develop this approach. J. Reid, *A Manual of Moral Instruction*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1908.

for elementary school pupils from infants to Standard VII. Other sophisticated, though less ambitious, graduated approaches were the Leicester syllabus (from which Henry Major's handbooks were probably developed), the Dorset LEA syllabus, and FJ Gould's graduated series of lessons for ten to fourteen-year-olds presented in his four-volume *Children's Book of Moral Lessons*. John Hollingworth is exceptional as a post-1900 author who did not attempt to organise his lessons into any sort of graduated system.

As noted already, all handbooks were aimed directly at teachers, with the intention of assisting them in giving moral lessons to their pupils in elementary schools.[33] Authors and reviewers felt, however, that these books could be used in settings outside the elementary school classroom. Lois Bates thought her stories "as suitable for the home as the school."[34] Gould felt that the first series of his *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* was suitable for both the day and the Sunday school,[35] as did the reviewers for Reid's *Manual of Moral Instruction* and Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook of Moral Lessons*.[36] Waldegrave's *Lessons in Citizenship* was based on Standard VII of the Moral Instruction League's *Graduated Syllabus*, but also kept in view the "needs of continuation and secondary schools."[37]

Handbook authors were also flexible about the way the lessons in their books should be taught within the school setting. Even in the books written to accompany the Moral Instruction League's *Graduated Syllabus*, in which the lessons were intended to illustrate the themes designated for particular standards, authors were open to their lessons being used for different Standards and age groups. "Although specially arranged for one standard," wrote Waldegrave in the preface to his *Teacher's Handbook*, "it is hoped that, pending the issue of further volumes, the book will be found of general usefulness." Baldwin and Robson felt their handbook could be used for incidental references as well as systematic lessons.[38] Henry

---

[33] As noted above, Arnold-Forster's and Hollingworth's texts were intended for pupils. The intended audience for the *Essays on Duty and Discipline* is unclear.
[34] Bates, *op cit.*, p.v.
[35] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*, p.iii. The lessons in this series were originally published in *Ethical World*. Stanton Coit requested that readers try these lessons out and submit comments. *Ethical World*, 12 March 1898, p.172.
[36] *Journal of Education*, November 1908, pp.744-45, *Educational Times*, November 1909, p.423 (Reid). The review of Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook* in the *Sunday School Chronicle* was reproduced in Chesterton, *Garden of Childhood*.
[37] Waldegrave, *Lessons in Citizenship*, p.4.
[38] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, p.v; W.H. Baldwin and W. Robson, *Lessons on Character-Building*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1913, p3.

Major suggested a wide range of possible uses for his illustrative material designed to accompany the moral lessons in his *Moral Instruction. Junior Stage*:

> [These stories] are designed to follow the oral instruction given by the teacher ... They are also intended to give illustrative material for the self-education of the child in this important subject, in silent and in class reading ... It is hoped that these pages will also furnish auxiliary help in adding to the variety of the reading; and in furnishing subjects for Composition and Dictation Exercises. In some instances the selections given might also be employed for the Repetition exercises in "English".[39]

Clearly, authors of teaching materials intended chiefly for one form of moral education – the moral lesson in the elementary school classroom – believed that a variety of settings and teaching practices were appropriate. Moreover, Harrold Johnson's *Return* indicates that moral instruction books were used in schools which introduced moral lessons into the timetable, and also in schools which made no provision for such moral lessons.[40] It is important, when analysing the content of moral instruction handbooks, to be aware of this range of possible settings and possible pedagogical strategies.

It is harder to assess how the editors of *Essays on Duty and Discipline* intended their books to be used. The preface reveals only that the *Essays* aimed to "counteract the lack of adequate moral training and discipline, the effects of which are so apparent in these days amongst many British children".[41] A closer reading, however, suggests that essays were aimed at parents, teachers, and pupils, with the majority being aimed at parents. Based on current evidence it is only possible to guess how they might have been used in a school setting.

One important assumption shared by the authors of most of the handbooks examined was that their works should be used to assist teachers in preparing and giving lessons.[42] Authors did not intend their books to be slavishly followed. Teachers were exhorted to adapt the lessons to make them appropriate for their pupils, to interpret and select from the material available, to 'personalise' the delivery, and to offer additional or different illustrative

---

[39] H. Major, *Stories to Remember. Junior Book*, London; Blackie & Son, 1907, p.3. Major published similar volumes of illustrative material to accompany his Middle Stage and Senior Stage handbooks.
[40] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, passim.
[41] *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, p.vii.
[42] Out of the authors of teachers' handbooks examined, only Lois Bates and Alice Chesterton do not suggest that their work should be adapted by the teacher. Their lessons, intended for younger children and consisting almost entirely of made-up stories, might have been less suitable for adaptation than the more complete lesson format adopted by other authors.

examples from fiction or from their own experience. "Wherever possible," wrote Gould, "the teacher should collect his own material, clothe it in his own language, and give it that personal force which no book can adequately convey." Major intended his suggestions to "serve as pegs on which to hang better methods, and as a skeleton which the class-teacher may clothe with real, living, flesh and blood." And Waldegrave aimed to "suggest lines on which [the teacher] may accumulate and adapt material for himself."[43]

Still, authors differed to a degree in how much innovation they expected on the part of the teacher. Hackwood's aim, "not so much to give perfect lessons on certain set subjects, as to provide materials ... valuable in their suggestiveness to the young teacher needing guidance in his preparatory work", stopped short of other authors' positive encouragement for teachers to adapt and personalise lessons. This may be partly because the book was originally prepared for pupil teachers in Hackwood's own school. It may also be a reflection of Hackwood's personality. The tone throughout – as with Hackwood's school log book entries – is strident and dictatorial.[44] However, despite Hackwood's less than encouraging tone, the review of his handbook in the *Educational Times* suggested that teachers should feel at liberty to alter Hackwood's sometimes unhelpful definitions.[45]

The different forms in which material was presented in the handbooks also required varying degrees of initiative from teachers. For instance, Gould suggested that the full lessons in his texts could be relied on heavily by "inexperienced teachers" (though he hoped that more experienced teachers would adapt them as much as possible).[46] Hackwood's outline notes perhaps required more work from the teacher. Stanton Coit commented from his own experience using Hackwood's "pioneer work" that it could take a long time to prepare the 'outlines', and further suggested it would have been more helpful if "anecdotes, historical incidents, and passages for quotation had always been given, instead of often referring the

---

[43] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*, p.iii; Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, p.16; Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.v-vi.
[44] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.iv. Hackwood was headmaster at Dudley Road Board School in Birmingham when he wrote this book. Dudley Road School Log Book (Boys) 1878-95, S194/1/1, BCA. Log Book references in this thesis refer to mixed schools or mixed departments within schools unless otherwise stated.
[45] *Educational Times*, December 1883, p.340.
[46] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*, p.iii.

reader to sources."[47] Waldegrave and Major presented a 'hybrid', with a combination of notes for teachers and illustrative passages which the teacher could cite directly.

Maybe teachers followed the advice of not following texts slavishly, maybe they did not. Existing evidence does not reveal how authorial tone and intention, and the advice of manuals, translated into classroom practice. As one reviewer put it, "much would depend upon the teacher."[48]

In producing works which were to be mediated to the pupil through the teacher, and which they intended the teacher to adapt rather than read to the pupil word for word, handbook authors made assumptions about teachers' competence and abilities. Their approach assumed confidence and experience, the ability to adapt material to suit the class, skills of interpretation and assimilation, and articulacy in delivery on the part of the teacher. Moral lessons, according to an editorial comment in the *Journal of Education*, "unless given with very considerable skill and with real earnestness, are likely to fall dead and cold upon the children."[49] This suggests the potential for a gulf between authorial expectations and reality. Reflecting on his time as an inspector of schools, Edmond Holmes wrote in 1922 that although payment by results ended in 1895 it took a long time for the mechanical techniques, rote learning and strict adherence to a syllabus associated with the annual examination to disappear from elementary schools.[50] If Holmes was right, teachers may have been ill-equipped for the role of adapter and articulate storyteller envisaged by handbook authors.

The moral instruction curriculum: content

This section will consider the content of the moral instruction curriculum, and how authors dealt with morality. Firstly, authors were confident that there was a body of morality, of shared values, which could be passed on to pupils in the elementary school classroom.

---

[47] *Ethical World*, 12 March 1898, p.182.
[48] Review of Alice Chesterton's *The Magic Garden* and Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook of Moral Lessons in School*, March 1909, Supplement (A Selection of Recent Educational Works), p.6.
[49] *Journal of Education*, May 1911, p.307. For similar arguments see *The Head Teacher*, 15 July 1907, pp.53-54 and *Journal of Education*, November 1908, pp.744-45.
[50] E.A. Holmes, The Confessions and Hopes of an ex-Inspector of Schools, *Hibbert Journal*, 20:4, 1922, 721-39, pp.727-28. For more on Holmes see P. Gordon, Holmes, Edmond Gore Alexander (1850-1936), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46694], accessed 19 June 2006.

Equipping pupils for the moral dilemmas they would face in the future meant motivating them to adopt a particular set of values and behaviours, and "inculcating" certain moral qualities. This didactic approach to teaching was linked to the assumption of a shared value system, and the assumption that these values were right, illustrated well in Hackwood's comment that "every teacher has the same feelings on the subject of morality, and would probably seek to impress the same conclusions."[51] It differs from current approaches to moral education and citizenship, which aim to develop skills and knowledge to enable pupils to decide which values and behaviours are appropriate; approaches which acknowledge, at least implicitly, the existence of a number of different value systems in our society.[52]

In contrast with present day methods, pupils were not invited to discuss the issues raised or articulate their views. Yet within this general framework, some authors – notably Gould and AJ Waldegrave – welcomed a degree of controversy, particularly in lessons aimed at older pupils. Here is Gould:

> A measure of controversial matter is wholesome for both teachers and taught. ... nothing is gained by disguising the fact that the civic life is beset with problems. The noblest aim of moral instruction is realised when the teacher can inspire his young fellow-citizens to recognise the existence of social difficulties, and earnestly to devote their powers to the support of love, order and progress.

Gould stopped short of advocating class discussion: any controversy was to be handled by the teacher.[53] Nonetheless, in his aims, if not in his methods, we can see a link to the more transformative versions of citizenship education today.

All schemes aimed to teach 'social' and 'civic' morality ("duty to others" in Henry Major's words), analytically separate from "duty to God".[54] As noted in the previous chapter, the Moral Instruction League was frequently criticised for separating morality from religion. Indeed, an editorial in *The Teacher* claimed that the "attitude to revealed religion" in the

---

[51] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.iv.
[52] For recent research on how teachers approach values in education see J. Stephenson, L. Ling, E. Burman, M. Cooper (eds.) *Values in Education*, London: Routledge, 1998. For an overview of recent approaches to moral education see J. Halstead and M. Taylor, *The Development of Values, Attitudes and Personal Qualities: A Review of Recent Research*, Slough: NFER, 2000.
[53] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.vi. Gould believed that overt discussion of moral issues would be an effective method of moral education for over fourteens, but not for the ten to fourteen year-old age groups targeted in his Children's Books of Moral Lessons. Gould, *Moral Instruction*, pp.23-27.
[54] Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, p.15.

League's books was "offensive ... to every Christian."[55] Major included biblical illustrations throughout his series of handbooks and Mrs Charles Bray discussed God and religious belief in some of her lessons.[56] However, Major's and Bates's lesson plans were – like the League's syllabus – organised around social duties. This contrasts with the definitively Christian morality, in which faith and love of God were central, in various schemes of 'moral and religious instruction' formulated around the turn of the twentieth century.[57]

The qualities covered in most handbooks give the impression of a shared body of morality. Handbook authors were remarkably consistent in the range of values and behaviours they covered. Basic Judaeo-Christian morality, often expressed in a list of abstract nouns, formed the basis of all schemes of moral instruction examined for this chapter. Cleanliness and tidiness, cheerfulness and good manners, habits of punctuality and hard work, temperance, prudence, self-control, truthfulness and honesty, kindness and generosity, courage and self-denial, patriotism, fairness and justice featured regularly. Thus the affinities between the Moral Instruction League's graduated syllabus and the qualities delineated in the 1904 and 1906 Codes noted in the previous chapter are also there in other handbooks by authors unconnected with the League.

Many of these qualities could be seen as conservative, tending towards the maintenance of order, and of the current order, rather than reform and change: this is clear in the treatment of obedience and patriotism which is discussed further below.[58] Moreover, beyond the individual moral qualities chosen for inclusion, texts could present a view of the world – through the stories or examples chosen for illustration – which reinforced this message. Alice Chesterton's stories, for instance, depicted a world where animals talked, where trips to

---

[55] *The Teacher*, 16 December 1905, pp.1193-94.
[56] See Major's *Moral Instruction* books (passim) and Mrs Charles Bray's lesson on 'Our Union with the Unseen'. Bray, *op cit.*, pp.151-56. God is also mentioned briefly by Hollingworth in his lesson on benevolence and by Lois Bates in her lesson on love of the beautiful and goodness. Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.46; Bates, *op cit.*, pp.99-101.
[57] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.16-17. This list of duties corresponds closely with the "Christian ideal of education" suggested by Lady Laura Ridding in her contribution to the *Essays on Duty and Discipline* which emphasised duty, loyalty, courage, obedience, humility, faith, love, truth and self-sacrifice. L. Ridding, Discipline and Development, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 327-46, p.346.
[58] See also Chancellor, *History for their Masters*, pp.7-8, 139-40 and Heathorn, *op cit.*, passim for similar arguments related to history textbooks and elementary school readers.

fairyland were common, but more importantly where rich and poor children were friends and emerged from their adventures content with their particular station in life.

Recognising an element of conservatism even in books by politically progressive authors is not to suggest that there was a concerted effort by a powerful elite (or an educated and socially active middle-class) to preserve the existing order, and their own position in it, by conscious and deliberate indoctrination of the rising generation through the social content of the curriculum. Despite much common ground, there are too many differences in the way they treated particular qualities to suggest that authors somehow combined forces in a controlling project. In the selection of illustrative material, and in their descriptions and illustrations of particular themes, their different social, political and religious views and their different personalities are apparent.[59]

Three themes, expressed in the form of abstract nouns to follow common usage in the handbooks and syllabuses of the time, will be examined in detail: obedience, patriotism, and tolerance. Obedience and patriotism are among the most common lesson headings and shall be examined in this order, flowing from individual to social and civic duties, following the conventions in handbooks. Closer examination, however, indicates that boundaries between the individual and the social were permeable. As Wicksteed argued, individual manners and larger national and civic themes could be inextricably linked: "there is no doubt that the manners of individuals and of ages and nations ... are intimately connected with their larger destinies, and there is much to be said for approaching the heights of conduct from these lowly beginnings in personal and social life."[60]

'Tolerance' is different. It was not as a lesson heading in any of the handbooks examined, and does not fit easily on the gamut of individual to social values. Nevertheless, it is a useful quality to examine. Evaluating the ways in which different authors tackled differences in social background, culture, behaviour, and opinions offers additional insights into the range of authorial views.

---

[59] My interpretation here differs somewhat from Heathorn's argument that constructions of citizenship and national identity in readers were "an attempt to reconstitute hegemony from above." Heathorn, *op cit.*, p.423.
[60] Wicksteed, *op cit.*, p.6.

Obedience

Nearly all handbook authors dealt with obedience in their schemes of moral lessons in some form or another, although the degree of emphasis and the way it was treated varied. For some authors, notably those who contributed to the *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, it was fundamental to their view of morality. For others it was less central but still one of the headings within their schemes of moral lessons. For a third set of authors obedience was not a discrete lesson but was instead covered within lessons on other themes including cleanliness and manners, the family, and justice. These diverse methods of treating obedience reflected differing attitudes on the place of obedience in a scheme of morality, as well as differences in authors' political, religious and social views.

Obedience was frequently treated as an aspect of personal morality or duties to immediate others, so it was often a theme in lessons aimed at younger pupils (up to about age ten). Less often, obedience was treated as an aspect of wider social and civic morality – linked to justice, patriotism, and the duties of the citizen – in lessons aimed at older pupils. Authors followed their usual pattern of moving from the individual outwards. "If we learn to obey our father," Gould argued, "we have learned how to obey captains, masters and kings ... and when we do our honest day's work, and obey the laws which the people have made, we are good children of the Fatherland." For Mrs Charles Bray obedience to parents extended to obedience to divine law: "The obedience of a child to its parents or teacher is just the beginning of obedience to the laws of right and justice ... It is the beginning of that Order which is "Heaven's first law.""[61]

Definitions of obedience tended to have two elements: doing what one was told and submission to law and authority.[62] Aspects of self-restraint were also emphasised (as discussed further below). Authors aimed both to inculcate the desire to obey, and to provide reasons for obedience. Such an approach, which aimed to engage pupils' emotion and intellect, was a common feature of moral lessons. It is exemplified well in lessons (mostly

---

[61] F.J. Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons. Second Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1903, p.23; Bray, *op cit.*, p.30.
[62] Bray, *op cit.*, p.23; Hackwood, *op cit.*, pp.25-26.

aimed at children below the age of ten) which aimed to encourage obedience to parents and teachers.

Some handbooks contained highly sentimental (at least to modern tastes) portrayals of parental love, and the hardships parents endured on their children's behalf. Interestingly, the most striking example comes from Gould (who stressed self-control more than obedience to external commands or authority) in his depiction of the mother's selfless love, and her constant anguish and worry for the child.[63] Mrs Charles Bray also used a degree of overt emotional manipulation that would be uncommon in texts today: "When children are required to do what is unpleasant to them, they should remember how many things their parents ... have to do for them which would not be at all pleasant to them if they cared only for themselves." Hackwood similarly urged the teacher to "dwell a little upon the all-absorbing nature of a Mother's Love, and the sacrifices parents so frequently make for their children."[64]

Authors also urged obedience on the grounds that obedience was pleasing to parents and teachers. "It is often a weary task to teachers to spend hour after hour in giving out those crumbs of knowledge," wrote Mrs Charles Bray, exhorting children to be obedient in order to make this work more pleasant. In a similar vein, Reid urged the child to be obedient in the home in order to bring happiness and goodwill to their parents, and to be obedient at school in order to be a source of pleasure to the teacher. Hackwood and Gould, on the other hand, focused on the negative effects of disobedience. "Disobedience is, to a parent, one of the greatest cruelties a child can inflict," stated Hackwood. Gould told the story of a father who felt he had to whip his two sons for disobedience, but shed "tears of sorrow" at having to chastise them. "If you do not wish to give your father pain you will *obey* him," he urged.[65] This emphasis on the consequences of disobedience is surprising given Gould's general emphasis on positive rather than negative aspects of morality.[66]

---

[63] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, pp.1-13, especially pp.1-5 for his descriptions of the mother and child in Raphael's paintings.
[64] Bray, *op cit.*, p.28; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.25.
[65] Bray, *op cit.*, p.26; Reid, *op cit.*, pp.176-77; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.27; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, 22.
[66] See Gould, *Moral Instruction*, pp.55-61 and Gould, *Moral Instruction of Children*, p.167 for a discussion of the "positive method".

Lois Bates and Alice Chesterton used stories to illustrate this point in their lessons for younger children. Lois Bates' lesson on obedience contained the story 'The Dog that did not like to be Washed'. The dog misbehaved while being washed. The owner decided to take no notice of her dog until he was willing to have his bath quietly. The dog realised that his behaviour had upset his mistress and agreed to be washed. The moral was stated emphatically: "The dog could not bear to grieve his mistress; and how much more should children be sorry to grieve kind mother and father, who do so much for them." Although the central theme of Alice Chesterton's story for infants 'The Land Where there are no Punishments' was cleanliness, parental distress at disobedience was also addressed in this story. One day, Geoffrey and Daisy refused to bathe or wash or brush their hair. Because they had misbehaved, they were taken to Fairlyland that night. There they learned that their conduct upset their mother and was the reason why she would not hug them. When they returned home they bathed and cleaned their hair, and their mother was happy again.[67]

A common principle underpinning several of these emotive appeals to obedience was that children should obey their parents and teachers to reciprocate what had been done for them: "gifts and privileges imply duties" was how Reid put it. "The duty of fathers and mothers," wrote Mrs Charles Bray, "is to provide for their children, and take care of them and teach them ... A child's first duty, therefore, is Obedience."[68] Major expressed this principle in terms of the love between parents and a child. Parents, he argued, showed their love by earning money to "feed, clothe, educate, and shelter" their children, nursing them when sick and protecting them from harm. Children could show their love of their parents through obeying them "as taught in the Fifth Commandment". For Waldegrave repaying parents' gifts through obedience was an aspect of justice.[69]

Pupils were also informed that adults knew best while children lacked the experience and knowledge to know what is right and wrong. "A child who has been in the world only a few years knows so little, that he cannot tell for himself what is best for him to do", wrote Mrs Charles Bray, urging obedience to those who "know better than he can know, what is good

---

[67] Bates, *op cit.*, pp.7-8; Chesterton, *Garden of Childhood*, pp.10-19.
[68] Reid, *op cit.*, pp.179-80; Bray, *op cit.* pp.23-24.
[69] Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, pp.51-52; Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.47. Major is the only author who mentions the fifth commandment when referring to obedience to parents.

for him."[70] Alice Chesterton illustrated this point in her story for pupils in Standards I and II: 'The Rat Family'. A young rat, disobeying his mother's orders not to go out of the corn-rick in which they lived, went into a field. He was spotted by humans, putting his whole family at risk. He learned the importance of obeying orders from adults who knew best and promised to be obedient in future. Chesterton's story 'The Country of the High Mountain' aimed at pupils in Standard III similarly illustrated the wisdom of obeying those who are older and wiser. A boy, Victor, set out on a journey to the country of the high mountain. He met a giant and giantess, who instructed him that if he wanted to reach the high mountain he must keep to the main road and follow his guides. He resisted the temptation to hurry ahead of his guides and take shortcuts. After many adventures, he reached the magic mountain, as the giant and giantess had promised.[71]

Parents and teachers were depicted as guides who should be trusted implicitly. For instance, Lois Bates used the example of a ship's captain, sailing to Hull, who decided to navigate the Humber himself, without the help of a pilot. The captain became stuck on a sandbank, and had to accept the help of a pilot to guide him into the port. "Fathers and mothers are like the pilot, who knew which was the best way to take," wrote Bates, urging children to be guided because they, like the captain, do not know the way.[72] Similarly, Reid exhorted children to obey teachers and parents because they knew what was right to do, and were trying to do the child good.[73] There is a clear tension between this portrayal of parents as trustworthy and knowledgeable in lessons on obedience, and the mistrust of working-class parents and the working-class home environment on the part of advocates of moral instruction.[74]

Handbook authors selected biographical examples to illustrate the quality of obedience to parents. Reid, Gould and Hackwood used the example of Casabianca (the "boy" who "stood on the burning deck" in Felicia Heman's 1829 poem, a staple for recitation lessons).[75]

---

[70] Bray, *op cit.*, pp.23-24.
[71] A. Chesterton, *The Pansy Patch. Stories for Children at Home and at School*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c.1912, pp.13-21; A. Chesterton, *The Magic Garden. Stories for Children at Home and at School*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c.1908, pp.52-69.
[72] Bates, *op cit.*, pp.6-7. Hackwood, *op cit.*, pp.25-26 also depicts parents as guides.
[73] Reid, *op cit.*, pp.174-75.
[74] These themes were prominent in discussions around moral education in Leicester and Birmingham. See Chapter Five, pp.153-55.
[75] Reid, *op cit.*, p.174; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, pp.22-23; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.26. Casabianca was included in the lists of poems for recitation by two of the schools in my sample for Chapter

Casabianca and his father were sailing on a ship. Casabianca died because he obeyed his father's command to stay on the deck, even when the ship caught fire: his father died before he could revoke his order. Only Gould questioned whether Casabianca did the right thing:

> Ought children to obey their parents? Yes. Was it Casabianca's duty to obey his father? Yes. Did he do right in staying at his post? Yes. Then did he do right in waiting to be blown up? This puzzles you ... The boy made a mistake, but he was noble to remain at his post.[76]

Major used a different exemplar. A boy was given 40 pieces of silver by his mother. On his way from his home he was stopped by a gang of robbers who asked him to give them anything he had on him. Obeying his mother's command not to lie, he told the robbers he had 40 pieces of silver. This show of love and obedience convinced the chief robber to change his ways and to obey God.[77]

Following obedience to parents and teachers, handbook authors established the duty of obedience to rules and laws. Obedience to rules was deemed necessary for order and efficiency. The armed forces during conflict were the obvious example tackled by Sir Robert Baden-Powell in his contribution to the *Essays on Duty and Discipline*. Baden-Powell argued that obedience in the army should be praised. Disobedience, on the other hand, could lead to losses in battles and campaigns and therefore should be severely punished. He urged admiration for the unquestioning obedience of the soldiers who died in the Balaclava charge. These soldiers were killed because they obeyed an order given by mistake. However, unlike Gould with Casabianca, Baden-Powell did not question whether their obedience was right.[78]

Authors similarly urged that obedience to the laws of the country was necessary for the well-being of all citizens. Obeying the laws of the country was, according to Reid, "necessary for our own sakes and for the good of others." "Anarchy ... would result", urged Hackwood, "if people ceased to be law-abiding."[79] Here is Henry Major, in his *Senior Stage* volume: "As [the

---

Six. St. Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 4 February 1884, 18D68/1, Record Office for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (henceforward RLLR); Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, Recitations for 1896 (among January 1895 entries), 19D59/VII/437, RLLR.

[76] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, p.23.

[77] Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, p.53. Unfortunately Major does not reveal the source of this story.

[78] R. Baden-Powell, British Discipline, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 347-57, pp.348-53. Obedience was also an important aspect of the section on self-discipline in Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*, pp.253-55. See also Reid, *op cit.*, p.177 and Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, p.102 for the importance of obedience in the armed forces at times of conflict.

[79] Reid, *op cit.*, p.177; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.25.

Law] is for all and for each, each and all ought to obey these Laws." Citizens therefore, he argued, had a duty to obey the laws made by those representing them, and if they believed a law needed changing they should go through the due process of voting for a party who would try to change the law once elected.[80] Reid, on the other hand, noted that this process did not always work and suggested rebellion "may be justified as the only means of getting better laws made".[81]

Obedience to rules in a range of settings was deemed necessary. Mrs Charles Bray stressed the importance of rules in the home. She urged children to obey the rules their parents made "for the comfort and welfare of the family". If each child did as he pleased, she argued, "nothing could be done in peace, and nothing could be really enjoyed." Baldwin and Robson and Reid similarly emphasised the need to keep to rules in a range of settings – at home, at school, in the street, and in the workplace – in order to avoid confusion and ensure that everyone could do their work more effectively.[82]

The *Essays on Duty and Discipline* added another dimension to obedience which, perhaps, reflected the increasing attention to evolutionary theories and doctrines of national efficiency: the threat of national degeneration and a consequent inability to maintain imperial power.[83] The Earl of Meath argued that if people were too soft, idle, selfish and undisciplined they would be unable to rule the empire effectively: instead, a strong sense of duty, endurance, and obedience was needed. Likewise, Earl Field Marshall Roberts urged his young audience to obedience and a sense of duty so they were ready to take on the inheritance of the empire. Shades of eugenicist thought can be detected in Reverend JF Peacocke's argument that softness in discipline would lead to moral deterioration in the community and to national degeneration.[84] Other handbook authors did not raise the spectre of imperial decline and degeneration in this way.

---

[80] Major, *Moral Instruction Senior*, pp.64, 66. See also Reid's argument that it was the "citizen's duty" to obey the laws the state made for their wellbeing. Reid, *op cit.*, p.180.
[81] Reid, *op cit.*, p.177.
[82] Bray, *op cit.*, p.29; Baldwin and Robson, *op cit.*, pp.87-91; Reid, *op cit.*, pp.176-77 (Baden-Powell also argued that workers submitting to superiors and obeying rules in the workplace resulted in greater productivity. Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, pp.350, 354-5).
[83] See Chapter One for discussion. Also see Reeder, *op cit.*, pp.80-81.
[84] Earl of Meath, Duty and Discipline in the Training of Children, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 53-64, pp.59-64; Field-Marshal Roberts, An Appeal to British Boys and Girls, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 455-60, Rev. J.P.

Authors emphasised not only the act of obedience, but also the motives for and the manner of obeying. Love – both of parents and of country – was promoted as a good motive for obedience, whereas mechanical obedience or obedience out of fear was condemned. "Obedience," Major urged, "should be considered as a *test of love* from child to parent". For Hackwood, the act of obedience itself was of less importance than the spirit in which it was done: "mere compulsory obedience without the right motive is like a nut which has a shell but no kernel."[85] Regarding the manner of obedience, Baden-Powell emphasised the importance of unquestioning obedience to parents and to superiors in the armed forces.[86] "We should obey willingly, cheerfully, instantly, and to the fullest extent," urged Hackwood.[87] For younger pupils, Lois Bates depicted a desirable manner of obedience in her stories 'Robert and the Marbles' and 'Jimmy and the Overcoat'. She contrasted Robert's cheerful and quick obedience to his mother's command to stop his game of marbles with Jimmy's sulking and fussing response when he was told to put on his coat.[88]

As noted above, some handbook authors were not convinced that 'obedience' should have a central place in a moral scheme. Gould and Hollingworth did not include obedience as a lesson heading in their handbooks. They emphasised the control of thoughts and behaviour, over and above submission to external commands. So Hollingworth had a lesson on self-denial, while Gould included lessons on self-control in his scheme.[89] Similarly, Baldwin and Robson discussed keeping to rules – which other authors dealt with under the heading of obedience – under the heading of 'Restraint and punishment'. They used the example of team games to illustrate that people "cannot always do as [they] like," but must exercise restraint, co-operate and keep to the rules if everyone is to enjoy the game.[90]

It was Gould who argued most strongly that there were contradictions and ambiguities in the notion of obedience. He saw it as a means to an end rather than a "true moral activity" such

---

Peacocke, Lack of Discipline in the Training of Children – and the Remedy, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 189-94.
[85] Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, p.53; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.26.
[86] Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, pp.348-53.
[87] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.26, see also Bray, *op cit.*, p.23.
[88] Bates, *op cit.*, pp.9-10.
[89] Hollingworth, *op cit.*, pp.42-43; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*, pp.7-13.
[90] Baldwin and Robson, *op cit.*, pp.87-89. Waldegrave illustrates the idea of balance between giving and receiving by reference to games. Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, p.47.

as generosity, kindness, love, justice. Gould also felt that the quality of obedience was morally ambiguous, that it was possible to obey good or bad leaders and good or bad commands.[91] This was also a matter of concern to other authors. Reid urged children to obey only the "right persons" – parents, teachers, masters, doctors – and not "those who do not desire our welfare but only want to make tools of us ... [or] those who try to persuade us to do what we know is wrong." Hackwood also acknowledged, in a note to teachers, that some children may have "wicked parents ... obedience to whose orders may be wrong, and entail misery" and that in this situation there was no "moral obligation" to obey, but did not recommend alluding to this possibility in class.[92] In contrast to Gould, this concern did not lead Reid or Hackwood to avoid treating obedience as a discrete theme.

This analysis has indicated that the concept of obedience was rarely absent from a scheme of moral lessons, but how it was treated varied. The treatment of obedience can shed light on authors' social and political views. To generalise, an emphasis on unquestioning obedience to external commands and external authority seems to go with a vision of the moral and social world that emphasises stability and maintenance of an existing status quo. On the other hand, an emphasis on consideration of consequences rather than blind obedience, and self-control over and above submission to external commands seems to go with a vision of reform and change. Hollingworth's inclusion in the latter category, and Gould's emphasis on punishment and the results of disobedience to parents, even when he notes the ambiguity of obedience as a moral category, complicate any attempts at generalisation.

Patriotism

Other research has revealed that the English elementary school was an important site for fostering patriotism in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries,[93] and thereby played a key role in developing what Benedict Anderson has termed the "imagined community" of

---

[91] Gould, *Moral Instruction*, pp.51-55.
[92] Reid, *op cit.*, pp.174-75, 178; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.28.
[93] For example J.A. Mangan (ed.) *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988; Bloomfield, *op cit.*; I. Grosvenor, 'There's no place like Home': Education and the Making of National Identity, *History of Education*, 28:3, 1999, 235-50, pp.246-48; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.101-03. The emphasis on imperialism in this research is indicative of the importance of the empire in the teaching of patriotism in schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as noted in Heathorn, *op cit.*

the nation.[94] Most relevant to this chapter are the various studies which look at patriotism in history and geography textbooks and readers.[95] Moral instruction texts have hitherto been a neglected source, and this analysis, therefore, adds to existing research.

Most handbook authors, treating patriotism as an aspect of wider social or civic morality, addressed it in lessons aimed at older pupils, or where there was graduation within lessons (as with Reid) in the material intended for older pupils.[96] Waldegrave and Mrs Charles Bray included patriotism among their lessons for a younger age group, treating it somewhat differently from the majority of authors, as an extension of love of family (Mrs Charles Bray) and a duty within the local community (Waldegrave). Patriotism – or for Gould the phrase "Our country" – was a lesson heading in all the texts for older pupils examined, except Waldegrave's *Lessons on Citizenship*, and was usually treated as a separate theme. A detailed reading of handbooks indicates that patriotism overlapped with other 'social' or civic values and behaviours and with 'personal' duties.

Several authors started with an etymological definition of patriotism as love of fatherland or country (based on the Greek root of *patria*, meaning fatherland).[97] Patriotism was also defined through particular attitudes, social practices or modes of behaviour which were deemed 'patriotic'. A closer reading of lessons on patriotism reveals, however, that although there were certain common themes authors did not always agree in the detail about what attitudes and practices being patriotic entailed.

Lessons on patriotism aimed to inculcate the attitude or sentiment of love of country. This was interpreted as both love of the physical features of the land (landscape, climate) and as an affinity or sympathy with fellow countrymen who share a language, culture and history. Love of country was illustrated through stories of people missing their homeland when elsewhere. For example, Mrs Charles Bray and Gould both told the story of an "eskimo"

---

[94] B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.
[95] Readers are used in Heathorn, *op cit.*; history textbooks in Chancellor, *History for their Masters* and Horn, *English Elementary Education*, pp.43-46. Geography textbooks are examined in Marsden, *School Textbook*.
[96] Reid intended his lesson on patriotism for Standards V to VII only. Reid, *op cit.*, pp.192-202.
[97] Reid, *op cit.*, p.192; Hackwood, *op cit.*, pp.168, 171, Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, p.45, Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, p.24. Gould expands on this theme in his lesson on 'father': the child who learns to love and obey their father by extension learns to love and obey the dictates of their fatherland. Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, p.23.

boy, taken away from the harsh conditions of his homeland by well-meaning sailors. The boy missed the landscape, climate and lifestyle and was not happy till he returned home.[98] Hackwood was more concerned with the second dimension to love of country – "kindly feeling towards fellow men" – which he thought was prompted by identity of interest. His choice of illustration was the story of Marcus Curtius, "a noble youth who, in full armour, mounted his noble steed and leapt into the chasm which had appeared in the Forum at Rome ... which, according to the soothsayers, could be filled up only by such a noble sacrifice."[99]

The concepts of 'national character' and 'national characteristics' were used to introduce peculiarly 'English' characteristics which authors encouraged pupils to admire. Democracy, freedom (of speech, belief and action), justice, and security are the 'characteristics' most often mentioned.[100] This message was reinforced through comparisons with other countries, for instance in Wicksteed's illustration of a Russian gentleman who was imprisoned for his political opinions.[101] Authors also urged reverence for national symbols – most often the Union Jack – and the qualities they were deemed to represent: notably freedom and protection. Arnold-Forster argued that under English law no one could be a slave so wherever the Union Jack flew everyone must be free. Wicksteed's Russian political prisoner escaped to a port in China, and selected the ship flying the Union Jack for his escape because "he knew that the English sympathized with liberty". For Hollingworth the Union Jack afforded "protection to our countrymen wherever it floats."[102] Such descriptions of national characteristics and symbols were also common in history schoolbooks of the period.[103]

The main focus of these lessons, however, was on the 'duties' which being patriotic was thought to entail. In defining 'patriotic' behaviour several authors distinguished between 'true' and 'false', or 'good' and 'bad', patriotism. Particular attitudes and their concomitant social practices were positively or negatively defined. For example, Mrs Charles Bray defined

---

[98] Bray, *op cit.*, pp.115-16; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.50. The terminology of the period has been used here.
[99] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.172.
[100] For example, Roberts, *An Appeal*, p.457; Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, pp.45-48; Reid, *op cit.*, pp.193-94.
[101] Wicksteed, *op cit.*, pp.78-79.
[102] Wicksteed, *op cit.*, pp.78-79; Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.31; Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, p.129.
[103] Horn, *English Elementary Education*, pp43-46; Chancellor, *History for their Masters*, pp.112-38; Heathorn, *op cit.*, especially pp.413-21.

false patriotism as "a narrow prejudice in favour of what belongs to ourselves" – being boastful about one's own country and rude about others. True patriotism, on the other hand, involved doing justice to the merits of other nations, seeing faults in one's own country and trying to mend them, encouraging free trade and communication between countries, and loving one's country "not for her size, not for her military power, but for the noble work she does, and for the means she has of making other nations intelligent, good and happy." Similarly, in his lesson on 'Loyalty and Patriotism' Hackwood defined false patriotism as "hatred and hostility to other nations" and "blindness to our own defects as a nation." "Patriotism does not consist of singing songs and flying flags," he urged.[104] For others the distinction between true and false or good and bad was not stated explicitly, but implied in the depiction of certain actions as genuinely patriotic. Discussing the South African War, Major contrasted the volunteers "leaving home and all that it holds dear, to fight for something which they deemed dearer even than home" with the "greedy grabbers ... who sold themselves and their fellow-countrymen to make money – to the utter disgust of every true lover of his country."[105] These attitudes and practices are discussed in more detail below.

Authors hoped that inculcating a love of country would stimulate in pupils a desire to serve England and work for her benefit. Different ways of serving the country were identified for different people, reflecting divisions of labour and divisions of gender, occupation, and class. Individuals, whoever they were or whatever they did, were called upon to sacrifice their individual desires and individual gain for the benefit of the country as a whole.

The highest praise was reserved for individuals who fought for (and were prepared to die for) their country in battle.[106] Admiration for this kind of service was encouraged through illustrations. Hollingworth praised the "sailors and soldiers, like Drake and Nelson, Clive and Wellington" who "maintained the British character for bravery and kept the country free

---

[104] Bray, *op cit.*, pp.117-18; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.173. See also Reid, *op cit.*, pp.201-02 and Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, pp.25-26, 30-31 for similar distinctions.
[105] Major, *Moral Instruction Senior*, p.50. See also Wicksteed's criticism of those who used the power of England "for their own bad purposes" and were "cruel and tyrannical" for "disgracing the name of [their] country." Wicksteed, *op cit.*, p.81.
[106] For example, Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.30, Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.173. Gould told the story of King Codrus of Athens who gave his life to save the citizens of Athens. Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, pp.52-54.

from invasion." Baden-Powell depicted Nelson's actions at the Battle of Trafalgar.[107] Henry Major, on the other hand, also praised the "martyrs" who died on the scaffold and the "civic heroes" who sacrificed time and money, and in some cases their freedom and their lives, for the extension of the freedoms and liberties – "free thought and free action", the rights of citizens – which all Englishmen could enjoy.[108]

Reid and Major extolled different forms of work – the labours of the doctors and scientists, the engineers, the explorers, the inventors and the manufacturers whose efforts had led to improved health, improved housing, a strong commercial position and large colonies for the benefit of the country as a whole. Wicksteed argued that the welfare of the state also required "praying men" – thinkers or idealists, including artists and poets – to generate ideals and inspire others, while "working men" were exhorted to serve their country through "[keeping] things going".[109] Women's service to the country was perceived primarily through traditional 'feminine' duties. Thus Major described the "silent agonies of women",[110] who waited anxiously (and passively) for sons and husbands fighting for the country on the battlefield. Mothers were also exhorted to serve their country by training their children to be good citizens, and beyond this to influence public morals more generally through what Major described as "moral warfare."[111]

Beyond these specific patriotic duties, all were urged to serve their country through their general conduct. "An industrious schoolboy is doing his duty to his country; a steady workman promotes his country's welfare by excellent work," argued Hollingworth. For Reid "every idle, thriftless, person is the enemy of his country," while "all good work and good character is patriotic."[112] Thus, the fortunes of the country as a whole, it was claimed, depended upon the actions of individual citizens.

---

[107] Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.26; Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, pp.347-48.
[108] Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, pp.48-49. See also Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, pp.195-97.
[109] Reid, *op cit.*, pp.194-95; Major, *Moral Instruction Senior*, p.49; Wicksteed, *op cit.*, pp.94-102.
[110] Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, p.50.
[111] Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.30; Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, p.51. See also Earl of Meath, An appeal to British Women, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911, 209-18. For an extensive discussion of these themes see A. Davin, Imperialism and Motherhood, *History Workshop Journal*, 5, 1978, 9-65.
[112] Hollingworth, *op cit.*, p.30; Reid, *op cit.*, p.196. See also Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, pp.56-57 and Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, pp.21-22.

Some authors emphasised the duty of serving the country through maintaining her territories, her position in world affairs, and her military and naval strength. When discussing these aspects of patriotism, authors can seem, at least to the present day reader, self-congratulatory and arguably blinkered. They described a glorious present, and looked back to a glorious past which they sought to preserve, ignoring more awkward aspects of imperialism. Hackwood, for instance, praised the country's "pre-eminence" in freedom of speech and conscience. Reid emphasised the country's "high position of power among the nations" – her large colonies, institutions of government, commercial advantage and reputation for science and invention. He described the country's development from a barbarous race to civilised nation, and defined patriotism as "the effort to keep our nation in a high and progressive state."[113] However, as we shall see, what keeping the nation in a "progressive state" entailed was debated.

The *Essays on Duty and Discipline* offered a conservative and imperialistic vision of patriotism. Contributors focused on victories in past battles, and the sacrifices of soldiers and sailors.[114] They called for a return to the qualities of discipline and order which had made England great and enabled her to win battles and expand her Empire. Baden-Powell exhorted his young readers to "be a good brick in this great nation of ours, be strong and stick to your duty ... play the game ... in order that your side may win – that the great Empire to which you belong may be strong and flourish for ever." Similarly, Field Marshall Roberts urged boys to prepare for "the responsibilities as well as the advantages of the glory you have inherited." Bishop Welldon offered a different, religious, perspective on imperial power. "God has endowed the British race with a world-wide Empire," he wrote, "not for their own aggrandisement, but that they may be the executants of His sovereign purpose in the world." Welldon therefore called on the citizens of the Empire to cultivate a "sense of a mission to humanity."[115]

The notion of inheritance from the past was invoked by other authors to encourage pupils to preserve the country's great position and good character to hand on to the next generation.

---

[113] Hackwood, *op cit.*, pp.174-75; Reid, *op cit.*, pp.195, 197-200.
[114] For example, Roberts, *An Appeal*, pp.458-59; Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, pp.347-8, 350-52.
[115] Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, p.357; Roberts, *An Appeal*, pp.455, 460; Bishop Welldon, The Early Training of Boys in Citzenship, *Essays on Duty and Discipline*, London: Cassell and Company Ltd, 1911, 39-51, p.50.

Reid urged the duty of "preserving the liberties gained for us" by dealing justly with others and standing up for their liberties, and by "honouring the names of those who have wrought and suffered to gain us our position." Major similarly argued that it was incumbent on the present generation to "hand down untarnished to those that come after us ... the gift of a heritage that has been so hardly won."[116] This notion of inheritance was used to urge not only the preservation but also the extension of liberties. Major urged the extension of the hard-won liberties of Englishmen – "There are many rights that we have not yet obtained, and that we must yet struggle to obtain for ourselves and for others."[117]

Indeed, a further aspect of patriotic duty was serving the country through working for reform. "Because a true patriot loves his country," argued Mrs Charles Bray, "he is quick to see her faults, and will do all that one man can do to help her to mend them."[118] Authors varied in the emphasis and urgency they placed on reform. Comparing Gould and Hackwood is revealing. Hackwood was for slow and steady improvement, arguing that errors in social policy would "no doubt ... be corrected when time serves". There was a greater sense of urgency with Gould's condemnation of child labour: "These things are not for the good and the honour of England. Our country can never be a happy land, nor our people a great nation, while such things are done."[119]

For Gould, remedying the country's problems was, apparently, more important than preserving present and past glories, whilst Major wanted to link the preservation of past glories with continued social reform. Authors of the *Essays on Duty and Discipline* on the other hand looked back to a golden age of past glories and barely mentioned future reform. Perhaps more than any other aspect of lessons on patriotism, this tension between preservation and reform reveals authors' differing social and political ideals.

Some handbook authors viewed patriotism as international in scope. It has already been noted that 'true patriots' were called on to appreciate the good points of other countries.

---

[116] Reid, *op cit.*, pp.194-96; Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, pp.49, 52.
[117] Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, p.55. See also Arnold-Forster, *op cit.*, p.203 and Wicksteed, *op cit.*, p.93.
[118] Bray, *op cit.*, p.117.
[119] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.173; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.54. Here Gould refers to the Factory Acts of 1833 and 1844, but, as is typical in his books, the specific example is intended to illustrate a general point.

Pupils were also exhorted to recognise and admire patriotism in nations other than their own.[120] This point was reinforced through illustrative examples of patriotic individuals from different points of history and different countries. For instance, Major offered examples of Roman patriotism while Gould told the story of King Codrus who sacrificed his life for the sake of the citizens of Athens. Hackwood in 1883 and Reid twenty-five years later included Alfred the Great, Robert the Bruce, William Tell, Joan of Arc and George Washington in their overlapping lists of exemplars.[121]

Gould was more controversial than others in his argument that love of country underpinned political movements such as the Polish movement for freedom against Russia, the Irish claim for self-rule and the Indian desire for a greater part in ruling their country.[122] Gould's allusion here to ambiguities in imperial policy and government, perhaps reflecting wider socialist and liberal misgivings about imperialism, contrasted with authors of the *Essays on Duty and Discipline* who tried to inculcate unquestioning love of and admiration for the empire and for English imperial rule.

For some authors the international dimension in lessons on patriotism rested on a common basis of humanity. For Major, a wider love of humanity, reflecting God's love of all his offspring, was a vital aspect of patriotism – "All are equally the object of His love and pity, as they should be of ours" – while Mrs Charles Bray urged that "the social love which begins at home ... will seek and find brothers and sisters of the human race in every part of the Earth."[123] A religious basis for patriotism was largely absent in the handbooks examined, except for Major's. This contrasts with the Aberdare "Syllabus of Moral and Biblical Instruction" in which patriotism was to be illustrated entirely through references to the "life and work of Isaiah".[124]

Waldegrave focused instead on local dimensions to patriotism. He listed examples of co-dependence and cooperation among plants and animals, extending the analogy to people

---

[120] See Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, p.56.
[121] Major, *Moral Instruction Advanced*, pp.45-46, 56; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, pp.52-53; Reid, *op cit.*, p.192; Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.171.
[122] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.56.
[123] Major, *Moral Instruction Senior*, p.50, Bray, *op cit.*, p.119.
[124] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, p.5.

living together and depending on one another in human communities.[125] He argued further that all have a duty to look after their town's institutions and services: schools, fire brigades, libraries, roads, water and sanitation. "It is quite natural and proper to be proud of our town, but such pride is only justifiable when we do our best to make it a town worth being proud of" he urged.[126] Hackwood also mentioned local patriotism, albeit briefly, using the more militaristic illustration of the bravery of the inhabitants of Calais who were prepared to die to save their town when it was besieged by Edward III in 1347.[127]

Although patriotism was addressed by all authors whose handbooks were aimed at older pupils, a close reading of the content of relevant lessons reveals some similarities but also differing visions of patriotic duties. Looking beneath the surface it is clear that the meaning of patriotism, and the duties it entailed, were contested.

Tolerance

Tolerance – respect for different opinions, faiths, cultures and social practices – is central to both the content and methods of modern moral educationists. It is, at first glance, less prominent in handbooks than obedience and patriotism. No handbook includes tolerance as a lesson heading. One could see it as a cross-curricular theme.

Tolerance, even in this cross-curricular sense, was barely touched on in the *Essays on Duty and Discipline* series. Authors acknowledged social divisions – of labour, of social class or status – and either implied or stated explicitly that people should be dutiful and content in whatever position they found themselves in. Here, for instance, is Baden-Powell: "He may have a humble place where he is not much seen, or he may be in a showy position, but, wherever he is, he has got to do his duty."[128] Beyond this there was no discussion of difference and how to live with it. Discussion of such issues might have threatened the qualities of dutifulness and obedience to authority emphasised in the essays. Other handbook authors dealt with differences in background, social practices, or behaviour under the headings of justice and

---

[125] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.32-35.
[126] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp. 36-45. Waldegrave urged teacher to visit local institutions himself and if possible to arrange class visits, p.41.
[127] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.172. The story of King Edward III and the citizens of Calais was also used as an illustration of patriotism by Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.53.
[128] Baden-Powell, *British Discipline*, p.356.

kindness or courtesy. Only Gould and Waldegrave tackled the issue of different political, moral and religious views explicitly.

Some authors treated tolerance as an aspect of 'justice' (or 'fairness' in lessons aimed at younger pupils). They argued that justice or fairness meant treating people equally. Alice Chesterton covered this issue in a story aimed at infants, 'The Bag of Sweets'. Nina was given a bag of sweets by an old man to share equally between all her friends. She gave more sweets to her three best friends than to the others. Nina then had a dream in which she received less than her 'share' of chocolate. She learned that she should have given each child a "fair share."[129]

Gould and Waldegrave, writing for older pupils, dealt with some wider social repercussions of fair treatment. Waldegrave urged the recognition and appreciation of goodness, "whatever may be the creed of the person in whom it is found." Gould argued that justice and mercy should be shown towards "savage races" – "men and women and children whose skins have a different colour from ours, but who know how to help each other, to deal fairly, and to pity." In his illustrative stories the Red Indians, the Arabs of the Sudan, the Kaffirs and Negroes of Africa demonstrated self-control, courage, justice, industry and kindness, qualities which other authors such as Mrs Charles Bray saw as the preserve of 'civilised races'.[130]

Authors also argued that justice required fairness and lack of prejudice in forming an opinion of, or judging the behaviour of, others. Several used the image of 'blind justice'. "Justice must be blind to the influence of beauty, rank, opulence, and power," stated Hackwood. "[It] does not see son, or father, or brother, or enemy" argued Gould.[131] For Waldegrave, differences of age, sex, creed, and social position should not influence the way people are judged and treated, either officially through the process of the law, or informally in interactions between

---

[129] Chesterton, *Garden of Childhood*, pp.124-26.
[130] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, p. 57; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, pp.57-59; Bray, *op cit.*, pp.67-69.
[131] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.161; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, pp.6-7.

friends and neighbours.[132] Impartiality thus viewed required tolerance and acceptance of difference.

In order to ensure such fairness, pupils were exhorted not to judge other people too hastily, and to ensure that they had full knowledge before forming an opinion. Here is Hackwood: "We must not form unjust estimates of our neighbours' characters; we should not be prejudiced ... we should not condemn that of which we have no knowledge and, therefore, of which we can form no just opinion." Alice Chesterton's story 'Farmer Green's Mistake' revealed the folly of forming a judgment too hastily. A group of village boys stole apples from Farmer Green's orchard, and Farmer Green wanted to catch the culprits. One day he caught a boy eating an apple next to his orchard, and, thinking he was one of the thieves, "thrashed [him] soundly." Farmer Green would not accept the boy's claim that he had brought the apple from home. "If Farmer Green had stopped to think," Chesterton wrote, "he would have said to himself, "I am not *sure* that this was the boy, because I did not see him take the fruit. I cannot punish him till I know." But Farmer Green did not stop to think."[133]

Gould and Waldegrave extended this notion of understanding a person's background and circumstances. Gould described an occasion when a bricklayer called him a 'rascal': "He could think of no pleasanter word than "rascal" ... we must not always judge a person by his words. We must try to understand the spirit in which he speaks. That which seems rude is not always really rude." Waldegrave urged pupils to allow for circumstances when forming judgments on people's behaviour:

> When we are tempted to blame people for being shiftless and drunken, like so many in the slums of our large towns, it is only fair to ask whether the conditions under which they have lived from their childhood have been such as to bring out the best in them. Perhaps they have been under-fed; have lived in miserable, overcrowded houses; have had no regular employment on growing up; and have been familiar all their lives with degrading scenes and vicious practices.

The "spirit of justice", he argued, should prompt pupils not only to make allowance for such circumstances, but also to strive to save future generations from "evil surroundings" and to

---

[132] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.51-66.
[133] Hackwood, *op cit.*, p.166; Chesterton, *The Magic Garden*, pp.154-56.

ensure they have "a fair chance in life."[134] Gould and Waldegrave went further than other authors in examining some of the practical implications of acknowledging and understanding difference, forming judgments on the basis of that understanding, and acting on those judgements.

Gould and Waldegrave also acknowledged that justice was not always perfectly executed in practice. In this they were exceptional among the handbook authors examined. Whilst others presented an idealised image of 'blind' justice, Waldegrave stated that justice was not always blind in practice. "It is still too true, in common practice, that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor," he argued, citing the differential treatment of a rich person and a poor person by a railway official as an example. Gould's list of those "waiting for justice" included unemployed men, the low-paid and underfed, children without a proper education, over-worked mothers, lonely and homeless people, and coloured tribes "unfairly treated by the whites."[135]

The present day reader can detect Gould's socialism in his arguments that low wages and impoverished conditions constituted an injustice which should be eliminated. This contrasts with Hackwood's plea, twenty years earlier, to give help only "where we think it deserving," and his praise for the Charity Organisation Society system because it guarded against "indiscriminate charity".[136] Although authors' political and social perspectives were implied rather than stated explicitly they are evident to the historian, and might also have been evident to readers at the time.

Tolerance was also discussed as an aspect of kindness or courtesy. Mrs Charles Bray, for instance, argued for kind and courteous behaviour on the grounds that "everything that lives and feels is entitled to our kindness, and ... to our respect." For Gould, courtesy went beyond politeness and kindly treatment. It also meant sensitivity towards other people's opinions, and particularly their religious views. He told the story of Sir John Craddock's

---

[134] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, p. 48; Waldegrave, *Lessons in Citizenship*, pp. 86-87.
[135] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, p.63; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons IV*, p.18.
[136] Hackwood, *op cit.*, pp.98, 101. Gould was a socialist (for detail on his socialism see Manton, *Filling Bellies and Brains* and Manton, *Socialism and Education*, especially pp.94-97). No information has been obtained on Hackwood's political beliefs. His tone in his handbook and in his school log books is quite authoritarian. Nevertheless, he refers to meetings at George Dixon's house, which may suggest involvement with the local Liberal Party (or that he was working closely with the Liberal members of the Board).

departure from the army in India in 1806: "He had shown no respect for the feelings of the Hindus. He had shown no respect for the wishes and customs of men who belong to a different nation and a different religion. Quite rightly he was sent away from the army of Madras."[137]

Aspects of tolerance were also addressed through discussions of the social duty of sympathy and goodwill towards all people. Henry Major, in a lesson on 'Human affection for those in distress', urged pupils to show kindness towards "unfortunate children" – the "deaf, blind, weak-minded; poor, ill-fed, ill-clad; sick, crippled – who cannot help themselves. As members of "one great Family", he urged, all should love their brethren as bidden by God.[138] For Mrs Charles Bray there was a "social duty" to show sympathy and "fellow-feeling" to all: "Can we love all mankind? No; not in the same way that we love those who are very near and very dear to us. But we can feel sympathy and good-will to them all." This good-will could be demonstrated through charity (for instance sending relief to the "poor starved natives" in India or Asia), or through promoting "industry, commerce, education, and all that tends to the well-being of others, all the world over." However, this sympathy was to be restricted to the "civilized body of mankind". "Some races of men ... live in a wild state [and] seem little more capable of learning anything fresh, or of improving their condition, than the animals," she argued.[139] Waldegrave, by contrast, described the "virtues of uncivilised people." "[We] should be kind and helpful towards them, and teach them all we can, without expecting them to like all our ways or follow all our customs," he urged.[140]

It has already been noted that freedom of thought and action was central to Major's treatment of patriotism. However, he did not enter into discussion on what people might think differently about, or how to deal with these differences. This was left to Gould and Waldegrave who included lessons on 'Differences of Opinion' in their handbooks.[141] Both treated the subject in a very similar way: indeed, Waldegrave acknowledged that he used part

---

[137] Bray, *op cit.*, p.49; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons II*, pp.53-54. This is another example of Gould condemning vices and wrongdoing within his general emphasis on positive morality.
[138] Major, *Moral Instruction Junior*, pp.67-68.
[139] Bray, *op cit.*, pp.65-69. Bray described savage races as naturally idle, lacking in bodily strength through want of regular feeding, and lacking in social feeling.
[140] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.73, 76.
[141] Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, pp.97-101; Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*, pp.153-61.

of Gould's lesson as the basis for his own.[142] We can speculate that these authors' experiences as secularists may have led them to emphasise respect for different opinions.[143]

It is useful to compare Gould's and Waldegrave's lessons on differences of opinion, as such a comparison reveals important differences even where one author drew on the other's work. Both started by discussing different opinions or preferences in eye colour, hair colour, clothes, and paintings. They moved on to more serious differences of opinion: political opinions, and opinions on moral questions including Sabbath observance, meat eating, and temperance. "What is to be done in these cases?" asked Waldegrave. "We must not quarrel and call one another hard names. We must ask questions, and tell one another our thoughts, and try to understand one another's reasons." Finally, both discussed differences of opinion about religion, noting that adherents of various religions all believed theirs was the one true faith. Waldegrave suggested that the teacher ask the class to name various religions. Gould used his usual narrative technique and presented a tableau of adherents of different religions – past and present – going about their rituals and attending their places of worship, and called on the pupils to "salute" them all. Both narrated this part of the lesson with George Lessing's somewhat controversial parable of the ring.

Gould's lessons on differences of opinion aroused controversy. In 1905 the Cheshire Diocesan Committee campaigned against Gould's *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* series being used for moral instruction lessons in their local schools on the grounds that these books were offensive to religion. Their campaign focused on the content of this particular lesson. Correspondence on the matter, some supporting the Diocesan Committee, some in favour of Gould's book, filled the letters pages of the Cheshire and Yorkshire press for a number of weeks.[144] There is no indication of a similar response to Waldegrave's lessons. Indeed, Waldegrave's book was listed among Cheshire Education Committee's recommended books

---

[142] Waldegrave acknowledged that he used Gould's adaptation of Lessing's parable of the ring. Waldegrave, *Teacher's Handbook*, p.99.
[143] While a teacher in London, Gould was prevented from giving Bible lessons on account of his contributions to the secularist press. Gould, *Life Story*, pp.63-70.
[144] Gould collected this correspondence in the Leicester Secular Society (henceforward LSS) Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06, 10D68/10, *RLLR*.

for their moral instruction lessons (though in the wake of the Diocesan Committee's campaign Gould's were removed from this list).[145] Why was this?

A close reading of the lessons suggests important differences in the detail of the illustrations selected. Gould was more controversial than Waldegrave in the examples he used. For instance, he included a secularist alongside adherents of various religions to be 'saluted'. And in a handbook written during the South African War, his list of moral issues on which people disagreed included pacifism (which Waldegrave did not mention).

Perhaps the most significant difference was one of authorial tone and personality. Gould enjoyed being provocative.[146] This comes across in these lessons. He went that bit further than Waldegrave in challenging his audience. He was more insistent and demanding. Gould spelled out the lesson to be taken from Lessing's parable of the ring: "And will good men quarrel about the differences in their rings? And should good men quarrel about their differences in religion?" Waldegrave on the other hand left his audience to work out the moral for themselves. Gould also commented on parental views on religion in what contemporaries could easily have perceived as a critical manner:

> At home your mother or your father may tell you which of all these religions they like the best. But before you go home I will tell you this: that the people of different religions ought to respect each other, just as we have done when we saluted them all.

Waldegrave said nothing about parents' opinions. Gould also stressed, perhaps provocatively, that minority views could eventually be proved right, arguing that it was allowable to attempt to persuade others to your own way of thinking if it was done in a "friendly manner." Waldegrave steered clear of potentially controversial territory and said nothing on this issue. Significant differences between authors are thus evident within the content of individual moral lessons. Not only authors' opinions, but also their personalities and their style of writing, influenced the treatment of values and behaviours in the handbooks examined.

---

[145] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.12-13.
[146] See Chapter Five regarding Gould's activities in Leicester.

Conclusion

This evaluation of the contents of lessons using handbooks has revealed much about moral instruction which could not have been gleaned from official pronouncements, abstract debates among educationalists, or even the propaganda of the Moral Instruction League. While handbooks do not indicate what actually took place in the classroom, these sources reveal what those who produced material for classroom use intended regarding the process of moral instruction. Similarly, a close reading of the content again fails to tell us what teachers told their pupils, but reveals much about the resources on which teachers could draw.

The handbooks examined embodied a pedagogy which was undoubtedly an advance over much classroom practice and even (if the evidence of Gould and others is to be believed) much religious instruction at the time.[147] It was a more sophisticated and, in the hands of the best authors, interesting and appealing approach than their critics gave them credit for. However, it was an approach which was, potentially, demanding for teachers. This was a 'new' subject for which teachers were untrained. Moreover, the materials produced to assist teachers demanded that they were adaptable, imaginative, able to use their initiative, and able to communicate verbally, which textbooks and readers (designed for use directly by pupils) did not. Unfortunately, we lack direct evidence on how these texts were used and how teachers responded to them

The range of moral qualities covered in the twenty three texts examined was similar. However, this analysis of the content of lessons has revealed not only common aspects of the treatment of the themes selected, but also, to a surprising degree, differences – in tone, in the examples selected for illustration, in the discussion of particular qualities – through which authors' varying views and personalities are revealed. FH Hayward's comment that handbooks were "just a little too individual and stereotyped to convince the educational public," and "stamped too definitely with the personality of this man or that," seems apposite here.[148] The non-compulsory nature of moral lessons may have left space for individual innovation and for different authorial views to come through. There may also be

---

[147] Bérard, *Movement*, p.66.
[148] *MELQ*, 25, 1 July 1911, p.1.

truth in Felix Adler's claim that the "crudeness of our moral vocabulary," with conflicting usage of the same terms, created the illusion of a comprehensive moral code on which all agreed.[149] The difference in these handbooks undermines bland statements about a golden age of shared values in the past, and also suggests that the Moral Instruction League's assumption of a workable version of a shared morality may have been over-optimistic.

This analysis of handbooks sheds light on why, despite agreement on the importance of the formation of character as an educational aim, there was not a stronger or wider commitment to moral instruction lessons. It would have been, the handbooks reveal, a difficult pedagogical approach to implement in practice. An examination of the pedagogical approach through these sources enables us to understand comments in the educational press that moral instruction would only work in the hands of skilled teachers.[150] This analysis also suggests issues of content beyond the separation of morality from religion which dominated contemporary debates. Teachers may also have struggled to deal with the subtly different treatments of the same moral qualities in the various handbooks and as, Hayward suggests, have been put off by strong authorial personality. It is necessary to look beyond debates on the curriculum, and at actual teaching materials, to reveal issues such as these.[151] Unfortunately, however, given the lack of direct evidence on how these handbooks were used, we can not tell how teachers coped with these potential difficulties over pedagogy and content in practice.

---

[149] F. Adler, The Scope and Aim of Ethical Education, in G. Spiller (ed.) *Papers on Moral Education Communicated to the First International Moral Education Congress*, Second edition, London: David Nutt, 1909, 7-14, p.11.

[150] For example, *The Head Teacher*, 15 July 1907, pp.53-54; *Journal of Education*, May 1911, p.307.

[151] H. Amsing, Unexpected Similarities: Gendering Dutch History Textbooks for Secondary Education, 1870-1920, *History of Education Researcher*, 76, 2005, 69-79, p.77 similarly argues that an examination of teaching materials (in this case history textbooks) can question the assumptions in more abstract educational debates.

CHAPTER FOUR:
MORAL EDUCATION IN BIRMINGHAM AND LEICESTER: THE LOCAL CONTEXT

The remaining three chapters focus on moral education in two large urban areas: Birmingham and Leicester. As noted previously, these local studies enable a more detailed analysis than is possible from national-level sources of the struggle for moral education. They allow us to examine attitudes to moral education, and the local socio-economic, political, and religious contexts in which moral education was introduced. Birmingham and Leicester have been selected because there are good surviving educational records and, for the reasons set out in the introduction, there is the scope for significant comparisons and insights.

Chapters Five and Six analyse the detail of moral instruction on Birmingham and Leicester School Boards and Education Committees, and how moral education was approached and addressed in practice in a sample of schools. Before this analysis it is useful to examine relevant aspects of life in these cities which affected both School Board and Education Committee policy-making and the provision of moral education in individual schools on the ground. Factors examined are: population expansion, social and spatial structure, the local economy, local political life and government, local religious life, and local elementary educational provision and policy. This chapter will then introduce George Dixon and FJ Gould – prime movers behind the introduction of moral instruction lessons in Birmingham and Leicester respectively – and locate them within the social, political and organisational life of the two cities. The background information here helps us understand the apparent moral problems which stimulated debate and activism related to moral education in schools. It also helps us understand the political and organisational environments within which moral instruction was introduced, and aspects of social life in the two cities which affected implementation in schools.

Birmingham and Leicester: local history and context

Table 4.1 indicates a number of strong similarities and also significant differences between Leicester and Birmingham which are outlined in the introduction to this thesis. This combination of similarities and difference indicates why a comparison between the two is illuminating.

Table 4.1 Birmingham and Leicester: main features of local history and context

	Birmingham	**Leicester**
Population and spatial expansion	-rapid population growth nineteenth century -boundary expansion 1891 and 1911 -concentric pattern of expansion (with exceptions) -slum demolition 1850s and after 1900 but pockets of severe poverty and poor quality housing remained	-rapid population growth nineteenth century -boundary expansion 1892 -concentric pattern of expansion (with exceptions) -slum demolition after 1870s but pockets of severe poverty and poor quality housing remained
Local economy and economic condition	-diverse manufacturing economy: 'city of a thousand trades' -mainly workshop mode of production nineteenth century /early twentieth century, relatively late and only partial shift to factories -complex subdivision of labour within trades (e.g. guns and jewellery) -generally well off compared with other cities but pockets of deprivation -small and permeable gap between employers and employees	-dominant trades: hosiery, boot and shoe-making -mainly workshop mode of production and small companies nineteenth century, relatively late and only partial shift to factories -firms owned by local family 'dynasties' -generally well off compared with other cities but pockets of deprivation -strong artisan culture through dominance of small workshops
Religion and religious institutions	-Nonconformists (especially Unitarians and Quakers) dominate local politics from 1840s -Anglican attendance remained high -interdenominational rivalry -expansion and church building by all denominations second half nineteenth century but problems in central areas -Nonconformist preachers promoted "civic gospel" -Intermittent secularist activity from 1866 to 1913	-Nonconformists (especially Unitarians) dominate local politics from 1835 -Anglican attendance remained high -less interdenominational rivalry -expansion and church building by all denominations second half nineteenth century but problems in central areas -Leicester Secular Society organisational continuity 1866 to 1915
Organisational life	-trade unions weak -relatively late independent labour representation -nineteenth century 'radical tradition' of working-class/middle-class cooperation -middle-class organisations: philanthropy, political reform, scientific enquiry	-trade unions more organised and sustained -earlier independent labour representation -nineteenth century tradition of working-class radicalism and organisational life -middle-class philanthropic and charitable organisations

Municipal government and politics	- incorporation charter granted 1838 -Liberal majority on town council from 1842 -'civic gospel' reforms 1860s and 1870s – 'municipal socialism' and reform of local government -working-class representation through Liberal Party from 1876, independent working-class representation from 1894	-incorporated before 1835 -Liberal majority on town council 1835-1909 -municipal reforms 1870s -working-class representation through Liberal Party from 1873, through ILP from 1895
Elementary education	-limited provision prior to 1870 -Liberal majority on School Board 1873-1900 -no Bible reading or religious instruction 1873-79, Bible reading without note or comment from 1879, Religious instruction from 1901 -Chairmen of School Board (Dixon, Edward Knox) were national figures -long service of key members of School Board and continuity in personnel between School Board and Education Committee	-limited provision prior to 1870 -Liberal majority on School Board 1874-1900 -Religious instruction 1872-74; Bible reading with non-doctrinal explanations in board schools from 1874 -Chairmen of School Board were not national figures -long service of key members of School Board and continuity in personnel between School Board and Education Committee

These features of the local context will now be outlined in more detail.

Population and spatial expansion

Like many large English towns and cities, Birmingham and Leicester both experienced rapid population growth and spatial expansion through the course of the nineteenth century.[1] The population of Birmingham, already large in 1800, expanded very rapidly through the nineteenth century from 110,914 in 1831, to 343,787 in 1871 and 522,204 in 1901 (with boundary extensions in 1891 and again in 1911).[2] For Leicester the 1831 census indicated a population of 38,904, which rose to 95,364 by 1871 and 211,574 by 1901. Even taking the boundary extensions of 1892 into account this was a very rapid growth which was accompanied by rapid spatial expansion: the overall area of city expanded over five times between 1870 and 1911.[3] Nineteenth century urban growth in both Birmingham and Leicester was characterised by high levels of local rural-urban migration (and immigration from further afield), and also high levels of population movement within the cities,

---

[1] Birmingham became a County Borough in 1888 and attained City Status in 1889. Leicester was granted city status in 1919. For consistency, and also in recognition of the late conferral of city status in both cases, the word city will be used throughout this thesis.
[2] The Growth of the City, *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 7: The City of Birmingham* (1964), pp.4-25, [http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.asp?compid=22959], accessed 1 August 2006.
[3] Gill, *op cit.*, pp.156-57; R.M. Pritchard, *Housing and the Spatial Structure of the City*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, p.86.

particularly among the poorest elements of the population.[4] In common with many other urban areas, the rate of expansion led to overcrowding, inadequate and unsanitary housing, and severe public health problems which the local authorities in both cities attempted to deal with through municipal improvement schemes in the second half of the nineteenth century. Slum clearance in the late nineteenth century in both cities led to a decline in the stock of old, small, cheap and unsanitary dwellings, but re-housing proved difficult and the problem of substandard housing for the poorest inhabitants remained into the early twentieth century.[5]

Both Birmingham and Leicester expanded on roughly concentric lines. By the end of the nineteenth century, in both, the poorest quality housing was located in the centre and highest quality towards the outskirts. In Birmingham the desirable suburbs were located at some distance from the centre: first Edgbaston, and later also Erdington, Moseley, and Handsworth. Good quality housing in Leicester was concentrated to the south east of the city on a hill while much of the poor quality housing was in the bend of the River Soar, on the floodplain. Differences in housing were reflected in differences in health, with high death rates in the central wards compared with the suburbs in both cities.[6]

This was accompanied by social segregation. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated in Birmingham.[7] Edgbaston, built on the Calthorpe estate, was the first 'upmarket suburb' in Birmingham and during the nineteenth century housed many of Birmingham's elite families. For many years its landlords set strict regulations to maintain exclusivity, but by the later nineteenth century allowed lower middle-class housing to be built at the edge of the estate. By the late 1880s, Edgbaston and other desirable suburbs were separated from the remaining city centre slums by an 'inner ring' of terraced housing.[8] In other areas of the city, however, the practice of infill building meant that both workers and the lower middle-class could live

---

[4] Pritchard, *op cit, passim*; S. Page, The Mobility of the Poor: A Case Study of Edwardian Leicester, *The Local Historian*, 21:3, 1991, 109-19.
[5] Pritchard, *op cit.*, pp.71-73; C. Upton, *A History of Birmingham*, Chichester: Phillimore, 1993, pp.135-6, 153-55.
[6] Pritchard, *op cit.*, pp.43-49, 187. Upton notes that in 1875 the death rate for St Mary's ward, a poor central ward, in Birmingham was 26.82 per thousand, twice the level of Edgbaston. Upton, *op cit.*, p.136.
[7] There was also clear social segregation in Leicester, though Pritchard found an imprecise match between housing and "social geography". Pritchard, *op cit.*, pp.79-89.
[8] D. Cannadine, *Lords and Landlords: The Aristocracy and the Towns, 1774-1967*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1980, pp.94-123, 175-86; V. Skipp, *The Making of Victorian Birmingham*, Studley, Warwickshire: Brewin Books, 1983, pp.80-81.

on the same street. This social segregation was reflected in the socially differentiated provision of schooling.[9]

Local economy and organisational life

There were pockets of deprivation in Birmingham and Leicester. Nevertheless, on the basis of several indicators – average wages, working conditions, housing stock, mortality rates – the socio-economic condition of both cities by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries appears to have been better than that in many other large urban areas.[10] FJ Gould, for instance, compared East London where he "often enough saw humanity in rags" with Leicester where "the ill-clad are far less frequent." Similarly, HMI Osmond Airy commented in 1894 on a "change for the better in the apparent standard of comfort among the children" over the eighteen years he had visited Birmingham.[11]

Both Leicester and Birmingham were dominated by small-scale manufacturing industry. Birmingham was well known for the exceptional diversity of its economy in the nineteenth century epitomised in the label the 'City of a thousand trades'.[12] The local historian William Hutton put this down to the lack of a charter and the consequent freedom from corporate regulation, which allowed immigrant entrepreneurs to establish many different trades during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[13] Leicester's economy, also centred on manufacturing, was dominated by hosiery and boot and shoe making (by 1891 62.5% of Leicester's industrial workforce was employed by these industries), with engineering and elastic web manufacturers also emerging as significant employers by the 1880s and 1890s.[14]

---

[9] Skipp, *op cit.*, pp.84-87; C. Chinn, Was Separate Schooling a Means of Class Segregation in late Victorian and Edwardian Birmingham?, *Midlands History*, 13, 1988, 95-112.
[10] D. Fraser, *Power and Authority in the Victorian City*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979, pp.78, 93 (The exception for Leicester is probably the exceptionally high rate of infant mortality into the early twentieth century Fraser, *Power*, p.130); E. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Manufacturing Town. Birmingham and the Industrial Revolution*, 2nd edition, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998, pp.181-83; E. Hopkins, *Working-Class Self-Help in Nineteenth Century England*, London: UCL Press, 1995, pp.39-40.
[11] F.J. Gould, The Betting-Ring and Three Visions, *Leicester Pioneer*, 19 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902, 10D68/8; General Report for the Year 1893 on the Schools in the East Central Division, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1893-94*, London: HMSO, 1894, p.72.
[12] Kelly's directory of 1870 listed 953 types of (mostly manufacturing) firm for Birmingham. Upton, *op cit.*, pp.173-79; J.B. Smith, The Economic History of Birmingham, in C. Chinn (ed.) *Birmingham: Bibliography of a City*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2003, 157-80, pp.158-60.
[13] Fraser, *Power*, pp.78-79.
[14] B. Lancaster, *Radicalism, Cooperation and Socialism: Leicester Working-Class Politics 1860-1906*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987, pp.xx, 187; J.Simmons, *Leicester, Past and Present, Vol. II*, London: Eyre Methuen, 1974, pp.2-5.

In both Birmingham and Leicester a high proportion of the workforce was housed in small and medium-sized workshops in this period. Compared with other urban areas, factories were slow to develop.[15]

The local economies in both Birmingham and Leicester were dominated by mainly, but not exclusively, Nonconformist business dynasties which made up the social, cultural, economic and political elite of the two cities. In Birmingham the elite lived in the same desirable suburbs, many attended the same churches, and most were Liberal in their politics. Some of the most important families, such as the Kenricks and the Chamberlains, were tied by business interests, friendship and marriage. Membership of the town council or other civic activity was seen as a legitimate ambition for these groups, and became an established tradition in some families.[16] Similarly, Isabel Ellis describes a close knit and almost parochial society in nineteenth century Leicester in which the elite family 'dynasties' intermarried, owned local firms, engaged in philanthropic and charity work, and dominated the town's intellectual and cultural life and local government.[17]

The diversity of trades in Birmingham, coupled with a complex sub-division of labour and closer links than existed elsewhere between employers and employees in small premises, helps explain the relative under-development of trade union activity and the late move to independent labour representation in the city.[18] There was some union activity but it appears to have been ephemeral and lacking in organisational continuity.[19] This fits in with a tradition of radicalism based on cooperation between classes rather than independent working-class organisation.

---

[15] Smith, *Economic History*, p.161; Lancaster, *op cit.*, pp.22-23; G.L. Bernstein, Liberalism and the Progressive Alliance in the Constituencies, 1900-1914: Three Case Studies, *The Historical Journal*, 26:3, 1983, 617-40, pp.629-30.

[16] P. Bartley, *Moral Regeneration*, pp.144-46; H. Plant, 'Ye are all One in Christ Jesus': Aspects of Unitarianism and Feminism in Birmingham, c.1869-90, *Women's History Review*, 9:4, 2000, 721-42, pp.724-30.

[17] I.C. Ellis, *Records of Nineteenth Century Leicester*, Private printing, 1935, *passim*. See also D. Freer, The Dynasty-Builders of Victorian Leicester, *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and Historical Society*, 53, 1977/78, 42-54.

[18] See A. Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, London: Penguin Books, 1990, pp.186-87; Hopkins, *Rise of the Manufacturing Town*, pp.179-80. Dennis Smith compares the gulf between the absentee employers and workers in Sheffield's factories with the closer relations between Birmingham employers (who by and large lived in the city) and workers there. D. Smith, *A Comparative Study of Class Relationships and Institutional Orders in Birmingham and Sheffield between 1830 and 1895, with Particular Reference to the Spheres of Education, Industry and Politics*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leicester, 1981, pp.396-97.

[19] Hopkins, *Working-Class Self-Help*, pp.105, 132.

This tradition has been questioned by recent historians.[20] Nonetheless, the way organisational life in Birmingham developed contrasts with Leicester where there was a strong artisan culture and tradition of independent working-class politics, which Lancaster attributes to the dominance of workshop production and the associated large number of self-regulating independent skilled and semi-skilled workers.[21] According to FJ Gould, "Nonconformist Radical, Chartist, and Owenite elements found a natural home in the city." Through the nineteenth century these groups, along with Hampden Clubs and a Secular Society, flourished.[22] Organised unions and various socialist societies developed from the 1870s, and a systematic campaign for independent labour representation was established with the formation of the Leicester branch of the Independent Labour Party (ILP) in 1894.[23] There are important ideological differences between the ILP and earlier radical organisations. The "radical individualists", to use Sidney Gimson's description, among the members of Leicester Secular Society were uneasy about socialism. Even so, these earlier organisations constituted a radical tradition on which the ILP could draw and which continued into the twentieth century.[24]

Local politics and municipal government

In both Birmingham and Leicester local government and the local political scene were for much of the nineteenth century dominated by the Liberals. Leicester's nineteenth century political history echoes that of other large towns and cities: a primarily Anglican and Tory corporation was replaced after the 1835 Reform Act by a Town Council dominated by Liberal Nonconformists till the end of the century. Birmingham on the other hand was initially unincorporated and a Town ouncil was not established until 1842.

---

[20] For example see D. Leighton, Municipal Progress, Democracy and Radical Identity in Birmingham, 1883-86, *Midland History*, 25, 2000, 115-42 and C. Behagg, Myth of Cohesion: Capital and Compromise in the Historiography of Nineteenth-Century Birmingham, *Social History*, 11:3, 1986, 375-84 for revisionist accounts of the historiography.
[21] Lancaster, *op cit.*, pp.xix-xxi; 183-84.
[22] Gould, *Life Story*, p.84. See also Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.28-29; Lancaster, *op cit.*, p.xix.
[23] By 1912 Leicester was the second largest ILP branch in the country with c.800 members. D. Cox, The Labour Party in Leicester: a Study in Branch Development, *International Review of Social History*, 6:2, 1961, 197-211, p.207.
[24] S. Gimson cited in Royle, *op cit.*, pp.234, 237; D. Nash and D. Reeder with P. Jones and R. Rodger (eds.) *Leicester in the Twentieth Century*, Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1993, pp.97-98; Bernstein, *op cit.*, pp.129-30.

Histories of Birmingham identify a distinctive and long-standing tradition of radicalism based on cooperation between classes.[25] Thomas Attwood's Political Union in the 1830s, the consolidation of local powers under a single authority in 1851, and the municipal renewal projects undertaken by the Liberal radicals who dominated the city council from the late 1860s have all been deemed part of this tradition. However, the Political Union and the move to consolidation were resisted by radical artisans on the one hand and wealthy businessmen and Conservatives on the other.[26] Moreover, revisionist historians note that Birmingham's political leaders deliberately drew on this 'radical tradition' to bolster claims that they were representing the interest of the city as a whole, and to gloss over divisions of opinion.[27] Still, there is strong evidence for less class antagonism in Birmingham than in other cities.[28]

From its inception Birmingham Town Council was dominated by Liberals, who also held most of Birmingham's parliamentary seats over this period. The Council reformed both local government and the physical structure of the city. The dominant historiography describes resistance, economy, inaction, infighting and a poor record of reform prior to the late 1860s, leaving a vacuum to be filled by a talented and dedicated group of Liberal men who promoted a 'civic gospel' of municipal reform.[29] It is easy to find fault with this interpretation. Nevertheless, the scale and ambition of municipal reform during the 1870s, and particularly during Joseph Chamberlain's time as mayor from 1873 to 1876, was exceptional. Birmingham Liberals in this period claimed a distinctive agenda of 'gas and water socialism'.[30] Gas and water supplies came under municipal ownership and control. Major sewerage and sanitation and slum clearance schemes were initiated. New housing and major civic buildings were developed. These programmes entailed an increase in the

---

[25] G.J. Barnsby, *Birmingham Working People. A History of the Labour Movement in Birmingham 1650-1914*, Wolverhampton: Integrated Publishing Services, 1989, p.495.
[26] Skipp, *op cit.*, pp 18-19, 24; Fraser, *Power*, pp.86-88; Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.187-89.
[27] For example, Leighton, *op cit.*; Behagg, *op cit.*.
[28] For example, Hopkins, *Rise of the Manufacturing Town*, pp.179-81; Smith, *Comparative Study*, pp.396-97.
[29] Prominent works in this Whiggish tradition are A. Briggs, *History of Birmingham. Volume II: Borough and City 1865-1938*, London: Oxford University Press, 1952, pp.67-134 and Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.184-240. Fraser, *Power*, pp.78-110 and T. Hunt, *Building Jerusalem. The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004, pp.232-81 are more recent works in this broad tradition. These interpretations have been interrogated with historians questioning the novelty and reach of these municipal reforms and focusing on the contribution of groups such as women and working-class activists who have been neglected in the dominant historiography. Bartley, *Moral Regeneration*; Leighton, *op cit.*
[30] For more on municipal socialism see H. Fraser, Municipal Socialism and Social Policy, in R.J. Morris and R. Rodger (eds.) *The Victorian City. A Reader in British Urban History 1820-1914*, London: Longman, 1993, 258-80.

responsibilities of the Town Council, which were codified in the 1883 Birmingham Corporation Consolidation Act.[31] The Liberal leaders called on citizens of all classes to support the leaders of the municipal corporation in their efforts to improve the city. The civic gospellers brought respectability, importance, and, Dennis Smith contends, almost glamour, to municipal organisation.[32] They also applied "the economics of the market-place" (borrowing, take-overs and long-term planning, to locate sources of revenue other than the rates) to local government.[33] Improvements in the 1880s and 1890s appear modest in comparison to the ambitious schemes of the 1870s, but Birmingham councillors maintained their reputation for being a "progressive force".[34]

The Liberal majority on Leicester Town Council was, likewise, for a number of years unable to achieve much in the way of improvements. The 1835 Reform Act did little to enlarge the functions of municipal government. There was some progress, particularly in the public health arena, but in the 1840s to 1860s a number of development schemes collapsed in the face of ratepayer resistance.[35] Nothing as ambitious as Birmingham's civic renewal programme of the 1870s was attempted in Leicester, but major and costly schemes – including civic building, the municipalisation of gas and water, sewage and flooding schemes – were undertaken at a similar time. The Corporation opened or took over a range of amenities (baths, public libraries, museum and art gallery, parks). By the turn of the twentieth century the Town Council had many more functions than it had in 1835. These were to increase much further to include welfare, and after 1920, some town planning functions.[36]

How were Liberals in Birmingham and Leicester able to retain their dominance through so much of the nineteenth century? By the late 1860s activists were, as already noted, tied together not only by Liberal politics but also by business, marriage and sometimes by

---

[31] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.72-88; Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.217-31; Fraser, *Power*, pp.101-10; E.P. Hennock, *Fit and Proper Persons. Ideal and Reality in Nineteenth-Century Urban Government*, London: Edward Arnold, 1973, pp.104-30.
[32] Smith, *Comparative Study*, pp. 398-99.
[33] E.P. Hennock, Finance and Politics in Urban Local Government in England 1835-1900, *Historical Journal*, 6:2, 1963, 212-25, pp.220-23.
[34] Bartley, *Moral Regeneration*, pp.143-44; Briggs *History of Birmingham*, pp.88-99.
[35] R.H. Evans, The Local Government of Leicester in the Nineteenth Century, in A.E. Brown (ed.) *The Growth of Leicester*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1970, 71-77, pp.74-75; Simmons, *Leicester, Past and Present, Vol. I*, London: Eyre Methuen, 1971, pp.171-73; Hennock, *Finance and Politics*, pp.218-19; Fraser, *Power*, pp.86-101.
[36] Evans, *Local Government*, pp.76-77; Simmons, *Leicester, Past and Present, Vol.I*, pp.172-73.

religion. In Birmingham these ties combined with highly efficient party machinery to make Liberalism a powerful and effective political force. Birmingham Liberal Association was established in 1868 to select candidates for parliamentary and local elections and to marshal Liberal voting.[37] It was seen by some as potentially undemocratic and a threat to individual opinion, but was an effective means of achieving party discipline and stimulating interest and activity among supporters.[38]

There was nothing like the Liberal Association or the civic gospel in Leicester, but Liberalism gained a hold on the local imagination and was the subject of local pride. The Liberal Party retained an absolute majority on the Town Council from 1835 to 1909 and locals were proud of their achievements. As in Birmingham mainly Nonconformist members of business dynasties dominated the top jobs. Ramsay MacDonald reflected in 1918: "There was a time when Leicester Liberalism was a strong robust faith expounded by strong men of independent minds and massive ideas ... I could not dissociate these giants from Leicester Liberalism. Their spirit brooded over the town."[39] By the late 1920s, however, MacDonald's "giants" were no longer seeking public office, though they continued in their philanthropic work, and the "Liberal hegemony" was broken.[40]

Liberal dominance in Birmingham was weakened significantly by the late 1880s with the split in the national Liberal party over Home Rule. Many Liberals in Birmingham went over to the Unionists with Chamberlain, including a strong base of working-class support.[41] There were also indications by the end of the nineteenth century that the Liberal elite were not seeking political office to the extent they were a generation before.[42] Further, by the late 1880s Conservative opposition had grown stronger and more effective. Liberal attempts to weaken and displace traditional Conservative strongholds through controlling municipal powers had

---

[37] Birmingham Liberal Association was set up to marshall voting and supervise the selection of candidates for the School Board, Town Council, and parliamentary elections. Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.164-75; Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.190-91.

[38] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.164-75; Fraser, *Power*, pp.103-4; Hennock, *Fit and Proper Persons*, pp.131-38. The Birmingham caucus system was used as the model for the National Liberal Federation established in 1877.

[39] Cited in Nash et al., *Leicester*, p.96.

[40] Nash et al., *Leicester*, pp.94-96.

[41] J. Boughton, Working-Class Conservatism and the Rise of Labour: A Case Study of Birmingham in the 1920s, *The Historian*, 59, 1998, 16-20, pp.16-17.

[42] An article of 1895 noted a decline in young men's interest in public affairs, which was attributed to the split in the Liberal Party and the collapse of the Liberal Club. F. Dolman, The Young Men of Birmingham, *The Young Man*, c.1895, 194-99, p.198, E.15 592746, BLSL.

not been entirely effective.[43] By reforming their own party machinery and fielding artisan or petit bourgeois candidates, Conservatives were able to marshal the support of poorer voters who resented the expense of Liberal reforms.[44]

Independent labour representation emerged later in Birmingham than in many other towns and cities. Working-class representation on municipal bodies became a possibility after the 1867 Reform Act, but for much of the nineteenth century labour organisations pledged their support to the Liberals. WJ Davis, local trade unionist, stood as a Liberal candidate in 1876 and from then on there was always at least one place for a 'working man' on the Liberal slate for the Board.[45] It was not until 1893 that Birmingham Trades Council (under Davis' lead) sponsored its own candidates for municipal elections (its first direct representative on the School Board was elected in 1894).[46] The first Labour MP for Birmingham was returned thirty years later in 1924 (for King's Norton). Even in 1929, when the Labour Party won six of Birmingham's twelve seats in the general election, Neville Chamberlain saw this not as a politicised conversion to socialism but as "merely the present discontents showing themselves in a desire for change."[47]

In Leicester, on the other hand, the decline of Liberalism was associated more directly and at a much earlier date with the emergence of independent labour representation. Working-class representation from the 1870s was achieved mainly through co-operation between the Leicester Trades Council (founded 1872) and the Liberal Party. The Leicester branch of the ILP started to run its own candidates. Labour representation gradually increased until the Liberal Party finally lost its absolute majority on the Town Council in 1909.[48] FJ Gould's description of his work as a Labour councillor (for most of the period 1904-10) suggests the development of a rudimentary party organisation and a policy of municipal socialism:

---

[43] Smith, *Comparative Study*, pp.404-07.
[44] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.175-79; Boughton, *op cit.*, p.17.
[45] P. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain. Entrepreneur in Politics*, London: Yale University Press, 1994, pp.98-99.
[46] W.J. Davis organised Birmingham Labour Association (which supported Liberals in a number of ways). Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.192-95, For details on the membership of the various Birmingham School Boards between 1870 and 1903 see A. Taylor, *The History of the Birmingham School Board 1870-1903*, Unpublished MA dissertation: University of Birmingham, 1955, appendix.
[47] Boughton, *op cit.*, pp. 17-18, 20.
[48] Cox, *op cit.*, pp.199-200, 206-07. The first "working-man", Daniel Merrick, was elected to the Town Council as Liberal candidate in 1873. Evans, *op cit.*, pp.73-74.

> Once a month we met in an upstairs room in an undistinguished street ... and we conspired to raise wages, cheapen tram fares, and secure municipal free meals for hungry schoolchildren ... At the monthly Council meetings ... we fifteen Labour men sat in a proletarian group in the curve of the horseshoe line of chairs.[49]

Labour representation in parliament was also secured earlier than in Birmingham, initially through the Lib-Lab pact negotiated by Ramsay MacDonald in 1903. MacDonald himself was elected as MP for Leicester under this arrangement in 1906.[50]

Religious life and institutions

As with other large towns and cities, Nonconformists dominated municipal administration in Birmingham and Leicester for much of the nineteenth century. In both cities it was mainly, though not entirely, Nonconformists who made up the Liberal elites which campaigned through the century to enlarge the functions of municipal government and to control the new institutions they created. An "elite and extremely cohesive subset" of Unitarian families in Birmingham – the Chamberlains, Kenricks, Crosskeys, Taylors, and Oslers[51] – and to a lesser extent Quakers monopolised the most important positions in local politics. Similarly in Leicester a small and close-knit network of Unitarian families intermarried and dominated the top municipal positions. The first seven mayors after the 1835 Reform Bill were members of the Unitarian Great Meeting (which became known as the "mayor's nest"). Hoewever, Anglicans in Birmingham and Leicester retained a powerful role in local politics, often allied with the Conservative Party, through their consistent representation on local bodies such as the Board of Guardians and the School Board.[52]

For this expansion of administration to happen, involvement in municipal government had to become socially acceptable. In Birmingham municipal service and political responsibility were made religious imperatives through the development and dissemination of a "civic gospel" by Nonconformist preachers from the 1850s to 1870s. George Dawson preached a radical, undenominational theology at the Church of the Saviour in the 1850s. He was followed by the Unitarian HW Crosskey at the Church of the Messiah, the Congregationalist

---

[49] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.101-02.
[50] Local grass-roots support for the Lib-Lab pact was weak and the arrangement collapsed during the First World War. Nash et al., *Leicester*, pp.94-95; Bernstein, *op cit.*, pp.630-37.
[51] Plant, *op cit.*, pp. 728-29.
[52] Gill, *op cit.*, pp.158-59; Freer, *op cit.*, pp.48-49.

RW Dale at Carr's Lane Congregational Church, and the Baptists Charles Vince and John Skirrow Wright.[53] These preachers espoused an incarnational theology, with affinities to muscular Christianity, which emphasised that Christians had social as much as theological obligations, and political responsibility. They looked to municipal authority as a mechanism for civic renewal.[54] Though there was no high-profile equivalent to the civic gospel in Leicester, prominent members of some churches were similarly involved in local politics.

There were both similarities and differences in religious activity and culture in Birmingham and Leicester. Birmingham, and to a lesser extent Leicester, developed reputations for being Nonconformist strongholds. Nonconformists grew in numerical strength in both Birmingham and Leicester through the nineteenth century, particularly after 1850. Yet in neither was Nonconformist dominance complete. Both Anglicans and Nonconformists built churches and chapels in the second half of the nineteenth century,[55] and also engaged in outreach work, with mission halls and mission churches in poorer areas of the two cities. Despite these efforts, all denominations in Birmingham and Leicester struggled to establish a presence in central areas, and ministers feared that organised religion was failing to reach the very poor.[56]

Differences between the two cities can be seen in levels of church attendance. The 1851 and 1881 censuses revealed the proportion of the population attending any place of worship in Birmingham to be among the lowest in the country. Church attendance in Leicester, on the

---

[53] Hennock, *Fit and Proper Persons*, pp.61-79, 94-97, 154-69; Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.68-69; Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.195-202; J.H.Y. Briggs, Elite and Proletariat in Nineteenth-Century Birmingham Nonconformity, in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 71-98, pp.80-81.

[54] This description glosses over the nuances of the theological beliefs of the individual preachers. For more detail on Dale see D.M. Thompson, R.W. Dale and the 'Civic Gospel', in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 99-118 and for more on Crosskey see Plant, *op cit.*, pp.725-26, 730-36.

[55] Church of England Attendance for Birmingham, King's Norton and Aston combined rose from c.24,650 in 1851 to c.44,000 in 1892, while Nonconformist attendance rose from c.21,560 to c.52,250 over the same period. Briggs, *Elite and Proletariat*, p.83. There were 35 churches and chapels in Leicester in 1851 rising to 86 in 1900. Simmons, *Leicester Past and Present Vol. II*, pp.33-35.

[56] Briggs, *Elite and Proletariat*, pp.71-98; E. Knox, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian 1947-1934*, London: Hutchinson & Co., 1934, pp.161-63; Nash et al., *Leicester*, pp.159-60; G. Rimmington, Methodism and Society in Leicester, 1881-1914, *The Local Historian*, 30:2, 2000, 74-87; G. Rimmington, The Baptist Churches and Society in Leicester 1881-1914, *Baptist Quarterly*, 38:7, 2000, 332-49, pp.339-40. See Chapter One for discussion of these issues.

other hand, was above the urban average.[57] There were also differences in religious culture. In the wake of the Test Acts, various small sects or denominations felt they could establish a foothold in Birmingham, presumably on the basis of its reputation for tolerance of new and non-traditional ideas. However, there was a history of severe and sometimes violent religious strife, including the 1791 Priestly riots,[58] and Anglo/Irish disturbances (the "Murphy riots") in 1867.[59] Though Birmingham suffered less from sectarian hostility than, for instance, Manchester and Liverpool, relations between Anglicans and Nonconformists in the late nineteenth century appear to have been antagonistic. Edmund Knox, Bishop of Coventry 1894 to 1903, and Chairman of the last Birmingham School Board 1900-1903, noted that "hostility between Church and Chapel" survived long after toleration had been secured, and that "attempts at conciliation had been very ineffective."[60] In nineteenth century Leicester there were also conflicts between Dissent and the established church.[61] However, by the end of the century inter-denominational relations appear to have been more conciliatory than they were in Birmingham. The Reverend H Gow, a local minister, described Nonconformist culture in Leicester: "There was little sectarian zeal. They were not 'fervent in spirit', but they were practical Christians."[62]

The depth of religious hostility in Birmingham may also help explain the inability of secularism to flourish there. Although there was a Secular Society in the city from 1866 to 1913 its fortunes fluctuated. Birmingham secularists were divided between two branches (one affiliated to the National Secular Society and the other to the British Secular Union). They were unable to combine their energies and resources and maintain either permanent premises or regular, ongoing activity.[63] They were also unable to achieve representation on

---

[57] Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp.13-14; H. McLeod, Class, Community and Region: The Religious Geography of Nineteenth-Century England, *Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 6, 1973, 29-72, pp.41-48.

[58] D.L. Wykes, 'A Finished Monster of the True Birmingham Breed': Birmingham, Unitarians and the 1791 Priestley Riots, in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 43-69.

[59] Bartley, *Moral Regeneration*, p.143.

[60] Knox, *op cit.*, pp.195-96.

[61] John Stafford JP wrote of 'Church rate persecution' (the imprisonment of Nonconformists for the non-payment of church rates in the first half of the nineteenth century). Ellis, *op cit.*, pp.243-44.

[62] Quoted in Ellis, *op cit.*, p.309.

[63] Royle, *op cit.*, pp.58, 338. Birmingham Secularists were in conflict with Birmingham School Board for the use of school premises for their Sunday meetings. The School Board disallowed the use of school premises in 1899, and subsequent attempts by secularists to get this decision reversed failed. BSB Minutes, 27 January 1899, SB/B/1/1/10, BCA; Birmingham Education Committee (henceforward BEC) Minutes, 25 September 1903, 30 October 1903, BCC/BH/1/1/1, 14 December 1906, BCC/BH/1/1/5, BCA.

municipal bodies. Secularist candidates for election to Birmingham School Board, for instance in 1870 and 1900, were not returned.[64]

Leicester Secular Society, on the other hand, was exceptional outside the capital London in its years of continuity (from 1866 to 1915). Founded initially in 1852 from a breakaway group of the Unitarian Great Meeting, Leicester Secular Society rejected the aggressive atheist stance of the national secular movement under Charles Bradlaugh, and maintained conciliatory relations with local Christians. With influential local patronage from the powerful and wealthy Gimson family it was also able to tap into other local elites.[65] With what was sarcastically described as their "handsome and commodious home" at the Secular Hall in Humberstone Gate from 1881, Leicester secularists gained a measure of respectability in the town denied to their colleagues elsewhere.[66]

Elementary Education

Birmingham had from the late eighteenth century developed a reputation for educational reform, with the efforts of Joseph Priestley, the Edgeworth family and others in the Lunar Society; the Hill family with Hazelwood Schools; and George Dawson with the Birmingham and Midlands Institution. These innovations focused on adults and middle-class children of secondary school age, who were also the main beneficiaries of educational efforts of this time in Leicester.[67] Elementary educational provision in the two cities, by contrast, was limited. An 1851 census of schools showed 35.5% of Birmingham's five to fourteen year olds were enrolled in a day school (well below the average of 52% for the 'principal towns' in England and Wales).[68] At least 130 new schools were founded in the greater Birmingham area between 1839 and 1870, the majority of these as a result of Church activity. Twenty-three

---

[64] Royle, *op cit.*, pp.309-10, 314. In 1875 Charles Cattell, who had established Birmingham Secular Union in 1867, complained of the composition of Birmingham School Board: seven parsons, seven purses, one profession, and no poor. Cited in Royle, *op cit.*, p.310.
[65] Nash, *Secularism Art and Freedom*, pp.37-40, 50-51; Nash, *F.J. Gould*, p.127; Royle, *op cit.*, pp.55-57. According to Gould (writing in 1923) Sidney Gimson "became President of the Society in 1888, and has held the office, with scarce any interval, ever since". Gould, *Life Story*, p.87.
[66] *The Freethinker*, 30 November 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03, 10D68/9. This comment was probably penned by GW Foote, who was editor of *The Freethinker* at the time.
[67] I. Grosvenor and R. Watts, Schooling and Education in Birmingham, in C. Chinn (ed.) *Birmingham: Bibliography of a City*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2003, 181-99, p.181.
[68] Skipp, *op cit.*, p.121.

schools were opened in Leicester between 1846 and 1870.[69] Despite this activity, many additional places were needed. The Birmingham Education Society's survey of educational facilities in 1868-69 found that only 39% of children aged five to fifteen were attending a day school, and that the average length of attendance was low (one year nine months for boys and two years three months for girls).[70] It was calculated that of the estimated population of 17,903 children in Leicester aged three to thirteen, only 10,047 were attending voluntary schools.[71]

The School Boards established in 1870 in Birmingham and 1871 in Leicester struggled in the 1870s and 1880s to provide the additional places needed. The first new board school in Birmingham opened in March 1873 for 1059 pupils. By 1880 there were twenty eight new board schools (providing places for 28,827 children) and there were over sixty council schools attended by 70,000 children by 1914.[72] Many of the board schools in Birmingham were designed by the local firm of Martin and Chamberlain (another example of family connections in municipal provision).[73] Leicester School Board also engaged in a substantial school building programme in its early years. By 1903 it supplied 30,000 of the total of 45,000 places available in elementary schools in the town.[74]

Birmingham, on the initiative of a town council with a large Liberal majority, became the first town to form a School Board on 28 November 1870. The Liberals fielded too many candidates and the 'Church Party' gained a majority. By the next School Board election three years later the Liberals knew how to work the voting system. They fielded just enough candidates to gain a majority and won.[75] Birmingham Liberal Association selected candidates and marshalled voting. A similar system was used at each subsequent School Board election,[76] and the Liberal majority ruled uninterrupted (and, according to Bishop Knox,

---

[69] Skipp, *op cit.*, pp.123-25 (Seventy-five of these Birmingham schools were established by Anglicans, eleven by Roman Catholics, while Nonconformists established eight Wesleyan and twenty-two British schools); Simmons, *Leicester, Past and Present, Vol. II*, p. 22.
[70] Skipp, *op cit.*, p.127.
[71] Simmons, *Leicester, Past and Present, Vol. II*, p.22; Gill, *op cit.*, p.156.
[72] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.106, 108; Upton, *op cit.*, pp.161-62.
[73] Upton, *op cit.*, pp.161-62.
[74] Gill, *op cit.*, p.176.
[75] Bishop et al., *op cit.*, p.2; Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, p.104. See Gill, *op cit.*, pp.157-58 for a useful description of the School Board voting system.
[76] Election flyers for the 1900 School Board election showed voters how to distribute their 15 votes among the Liberal candidates to ensure a majority. *Birmingham School Board Election Literature, 1900.*

"despotically") from 1874 to 1900.[77] The Liberals and the Church Party[78] formed the two main factions throughout the life of the Board, although, as Searle notes, the cumulative voting system allowed for the election of some minority representatives.[79] In 1900 the Liberal majority was finally broken and, with the Roman Catholic member voting with the Church Party on many issues and the chairman Bishop Knox holding the casting vote, there was effectively a Church Party majority for three years.[80]

In Leicester too there was a Liberal, and predominantly Nonconformist, majority on the School Board for most of its existence. The only exceptions were the first and last Boards – those of 1871-74 and 1900-03 – when the balance of power was held by independent candidates. The Church Party never gained a majority on Leicester School Board. However, the voting system allowed them to maintain substantial representation.[81] FJ Gould in his autobiography indicates the strength of Church as well as Liberal representation: "The Leicester Liberals and Bible Orthodoxy presided, in sworn alliance, over the education of the young citizens in the board schools."[82]

More generally, the 'plumping system' for voting allowed for the election of independent and working-class candidates, and the representation of minority opinions.[83] The Liberals in both cities often had one or two 'artisans' or 'working-men' on their slate from the mid-1870s.[84] By the end of the nineteenth century there were more independent labour candidates. The first independent labour candidate in Birmingham, fielded by the Trades Council, was elected to the School Board in 1894. The first ILP candidate was elected to Leicester School Board

---

[77] Knox, *op cit.*, p.188.
[78] While Liberals on the Birmingham School Board were known as such for the entire period 1870-1902, the name of the opposition changed over time (Church Party, Conservative Party, Denominational Party). Taylor, *History of Birmingham School Board*, pp.32-33. The label Church Party will be used here for the sake of clarity.
[79] Searle, *A New England?*, pp.221-22.
[80] There were charges of rigging in the local press over the appointment of Knox as chair. Taylor, *History of the Birmingham School Board*, pp.83-84. Knox himself does not refer to any controversy, simply noting that in "due course" he became chairman of the Board. Knox, *op cit.*, p.193.
[81] Gill, *op cit.*, pp.157-60.
[82] Gould, *Life Story*, p.92.
[83] One option open to the voter was to 'plump' all their votes on one candidate. Gill, *op cit.*, p.157.
[84] The first member of Leicester School Board designated a 'working man' was elected in 1877 and after this date the Liberal Party included artisans in their list. Gill, *op cit*, pp.159-62, In Birmingham W.J. Davis was elected to the School Board as an independent working men's candidate in 1875. Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.192-93.

in 1895.[85] As noted above, working-class representation in Birmingham was in general weaker than in Leicester. Yet in both cities the dominance of the Liberal Party, although eroded, was retained when the Education Committees were established in 1903.

Many who were involved in Birmingham's civic renaissance were also involved in educational reform. Several long-term members of the Birmingham School Board, who occupied key positions, came from the liberal elite described earlier. Joseph Chamberlain was the second chair of the School Board from 1873 to 1876. George Dixon was elected to the Board in 1870, served as chairman from 1876 to 1896, finally retiring owing to ill-health in 1897. The Reverend EFM MacCarthy, renowned preacher of the civic gospel, was first elected to the Board in 1875, became vice chair in 1880, and finally chairman in 1896. George Davis, ex-headmaster of Severn Street British School, served as clerk from 1871 till his death in 1897. He was replaced by Thomas Palmer who then remained in post till 1919. RW Dale and Crosskey were members of the Board from 1870 to 1880, and 1876 to 1893 respectively.[86] There was continuity in personnel between the School Board and the Education Committee, though the proportion from the local Liberal elite was perhaps lower by the first decade of the twentieth century than it had been previously.[87] Although there was at least one female board member from 1873 onwards, none filled the leading positions, and those who were elected or co-opted to sub-committees often contributed specifically to the education of girls or infants.[88]

Compared with Birmingham, we know relatively little about the background of Leicester School Board and Education Committee members, but it is clear that a good proportion came from the local Liberal elite. Alexander Baines, Congregationalist, vice chair of Leicester School Board 1888 to 1897 and chair from 1898 to 1903, James Ellis, chair of Leicester School Board before Baines, and Miss Evans, first female member of the Board who served from 1874 to 1892, are examples. All were members of the elite 'dynasties' of Victorian

---

[85] Barnsby, *op cit.*, pp.275-76; Gill, *op cit.*, pp.161-62.
[86] A.W.W. Dale, *Life of R.W. Dale of Birmingham*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898, pp.475-76; Taylor, *History of the Birmingham School Board*, pp.44, 60-62, 96-99; Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.8-10, 285-88; Aldrich and Gordon, *Dictionary of British Educationists*, pp.64, 66. MacCarthy was the only survivor from the early days of the Board who transferred to the City Council.
[87] Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.290-96.
[88] Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.169-73; Hollis, *op cit.*, pp.150-52.

Leicester.[89] There was also stability in the transition from School Board to Education Committee as a number of Board members sought re-election or served as co-opted members of sub-committees. For instance Alexander Baines and Dr Bennett, chair and vice chair of the last School Board respectively, were appointed (along with four other Board members) as co-opted members of the Education Committee.[90] A cursory glance at the membership of the Education Committee reveals fewer members of the clergy and more independent labour candidates than were on the School Board. Nevertheless, the Church and Liberal parties remained dominant after 1903.[91]

Proceedings on the two School Boards were influenced not only by interdenominational relations in the two cities, as discussed above, but also by personalities. The first Church Party-controlled School Board in Birmingham was constantly in dispute with the Liberal Town Council (in a state of "deadlock" according to Asa Briggs).[92] While the first School Board in Leicester was also under denominational control, the chairman, Vaughan, was a moderate figure and there was apparently less antagonism. Furthermore, three Birmingham School Board chairs – Joseph Chamberlain, George Dixon, and Bishop Knox – were developing their national careers while on the School Board. The political success of these individuals was bound up with the School Board. In Leicester, no one in a prominent role was trying to forge a national career through their work on the Board.[93]

Religion generated division and controversy on both Boards out of proportion to the time devoted to it in the school curriculum. The triennial School Board elections in Birmingham became, according to Knox, "an opening for a battle-ground between creeds." Candidates for School Board (and after 1902 Borough Council) elections in Leicester frequently

---

[89] Ellis, *op cit.*, pp.41, 106-10; Freer, *op cit*, pp.43-44. Alexander Baines was elected to Leicester School Board as a Liberal member in July 1884, and served continuously on the Board and Education Committee till his death in April 1907. Leicester Education Committee (henceforward LEC), *Report on the Work of the Education Committee from the Appointed Day 1st July 1903 to the 9th November 1912*, pp.4-5, 19D59/VII/472/I, RLLR.

[90] G.T. Rimmington, *Education, Politics and Society in Leicester 1833-1903*, Hantsport, Nova Scotia: Lancelot Press, 1978, p.218.

[91] LEC, *Report on the Work of the Education Committee from the Appointed Day*, pp.38-41.

[92] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.104-05.

[93] Rimmington *Education, Politics and Society*, p.86; Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.143, 155-57. However, as Chapter Five demonstrates, George Dixon gained a reputation not for brinkmanship but for his moderation and ability to persuade others to his view.

campaigned on the "religious issue".[94] The Church Party in both cities was concerned to preserve a system of Anglican schools and saw publicly provided schools under lay control as a threat. The Liberals generally aimed to extend educational provision and provide an alternative system free from doctrinal colour. On the provision of school places the Liberals favoured building new board schools, while the Church Party aimed to provide more places in voluntary schools and on occasions tried to obstruct the building of board schools too close to existing voluntary ones.[95]

Despite these similarities, the religious issue in Leicester generated less controversy than in Birmingham where it could be truly explosive. Once a 'compromise' on religious instruction had been reached in 1874, religious tensions in Leicester tended to flare up mainly at School Board election times. In Birmingham, however, disputes over religious teaching were a regular feature of School Board meetings throughout the life of the Board.[96]

There are several reasons why the background information in this chapter is important for an understanding of the local studies of the promotion and implementation of moral instruction, and moral education (more broadly defined) in a sample of schools, that follow. It tells us of the challenges that educators faced in Birmingham and Leicester. They had to deal with an expanding, shifting, and in some areas volatile, population, and elementary educational provision struggled to keep up. It also tells us of the different socio-economic environments in which schools were located that had an impact on the day-to-day life of the school.

Political and religious networks and organisations, and the relations between these various groupings, in the two cities affected proceedings on the School Board and Education Committee. Bishop Knox wrote of the "quasi-political battle" between the Church Party and Liberals on Birmingham School Board, whilst proceedings in Leicester were calmer.[97] These were the different contexts in which Dixon and Gould attempted to promote and implement

---

[94] Knox, *op cit.*, p.182; Gill, *op cit.*, pp.167-68.
[95] Gill, *op cit*, pp.163, 165-67; G. Rimmington, *The Rise and Fall of Elected School Boards in England*, Peterborough: IOTA Press, 1986, pp.18, 22; Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.104-05.
[96] The debates around the introduction of moral instruction in 1901 indicate that this was a common perception in Leicester. See Chapter Five for further discussion.
[97] Knox, *op cit.*, pp.195-96.

moral instruction, which help explain the very different tenor of the School Board debates in the two cities, and the different organisational connections that Dixon and Gould employed. Dixon had his friends among Birmingham's Liberal elite, while Gould, along with other School Board members outside the dominant parties, was able to rely on working-class networks and organisations.[98]

Finally, this discussion has revealed the local dimensions of the urban expansion and population growth, and the mixed fortunes of organised religion, which were thought to lead to the very problems that fuelled a demand for improved moral education in schools. As we shall see in the next two chapters, perceptions of these problems informed debates over moral education in Birmingham and Leicester.

George Dixon and FJ Gould

George Dixon and Frederick James Gould – the prime movers behind moral instruction lessons in Birmingham and Leicester respectively – will now be introduced and located within the local contexts in the two cities through a brief discussion of salient aspects of their lives and careers.

George Dixon (1820-1898) was the most prominent figure behind the introduction of moral instruction lessons in Birmingham. By 1879 he had already gained a local and national reputation for educational reform. He was a prominent member of Birmingham's civic elite. A partner in Rathbone Bros & Co., foreign merchants, from 1844, he was elected Town Councillor for Edgbaston Ward in 1863, served as magistrate and president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, and was elected mayor in November 1866. He was Liberal MP for Birmingham 1867 to 1876, and for Edgbaston Division from 1885 to 1898. In early 1867 he instigated a number of meetings with men from different religious and political backgrounds on the state of education in the town. These meetings resulted in the formation of the Birmingham Education Aid Society, out of which emerged the National Education League (NEL) in 1869. Dixon was elected president of the League.[99]

---

[98] S. Wright, *The "Universal Objector": Frederick James Gould and Education in Leicester 1899-1910.* Paper given at HES/ANZHES Conference, Swansea, 29 November-1 December 2002.
[99] V. Chancellor, Dixon, George (1820-1898), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7697], accessed 5 August 2005; Marsh, *Joseph*

The NEL campaigned for eight years for free, unsectarian and compulsory education, paid for from the rates, with state aid and inspection and local management.[100] Dixon as MP was active in parliamentary debates leading up to the 1870 Education Act. Although the Act fell short of some of the NEL's demands, the League's activities helped gain Birmingham, and particularly Dixon and his allies in the League, a reputation for educational innovation. Dixon was elected to the first Birmingham School Board in November 1870. After the November 1876 School Board election, Joseph Chamberlain resigned as chair. Dixon was voted unanimously into his place, and served as chair for twenty years.[101]

Dixon was one of a select cadre of Birmingham public figures, manufacturers or merchants, Liberal in politics, who campaigned for expanded municipal power in order to provide for the "well-being of the people, and the improvement of their social, moral, and intellectual condition."[102] As an Anglican, however, he stood apart from the Nonconformist majority in his set,[103] and it appears to have been over religious issues that he disagreed most with other Liberal colleagues on the Board.[104] Also, as the next chapter will reveal, religion was a key source of some of his Liberal colleagues' unease at his proposals for moral instruction.

FJ Gould (1853-1938) was one of the rising stars of secularism when he came to Leicester as Secretary and Organiser for the Secular Society in April 1899 and "began a very active and earnest period of organisation and reorganisation".[105] By the time he arrived in Leicester he was already gaining a reputation for his work on moral education.

Chamberlain, p.15; George Dixon, *The Biograph and Review*, September 1879, pp.301-04, BLSL. Dixon's financial assistance helped secure Aston Hall for the town in September 1866, and as mayor he started a fund to relieve poor families during the severe winter of 1866-67.

[100] Birmingham men William Lucas Sargant, Joseph Chamberlain, and Jesse Collings, J.T. Bunce (editor of the *Birmingham Daily Post*), R.W. Dale, Charles Vince and George Dawson dominated the top jobs in the National Education League. Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.101-02; Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp.34-44.

[101] *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 24 January 1898; Chancellor, *Dixon, George*; Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp.110-11.

[102] George Dixon, *The Biograph and the Review*, September 1879, p.301.

[103] George Dixon was born of Nonconformist stock but Dixon appears to have converted to Anglicanism during his adult life. His wife was from a Unitarian family. K. Rathbone, *The Dales. Growing up in a Victorian Family*, Compiled and edited by B. and H. Walker. Birmingham: Northstep Ltd., 1989, p.4. Reverend E.F.M. MacCarthy was the other prominent Anglican member of the Liberal majority on the School Board. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, p.98.

[104] Taylor, *History of the Birmingham School Board*, pp.63-64.

[105] S. Gimson, *Random Recollections of the Leicester Secular Society, with Digressions*, unpublished typescript, Part I March 1932, pp.51-53, 10D68/15, RLLR.

Gould was an elementary school teacher for twenty-six years, first in Buckinghamshire then in London where he moved when he lost his Christian faith. He states in his autobiography that he emphasised the moral elements of Bible stories in his daily religious instruction lessons (before he was forbidden by London School Board to give them in the late 1880s on account of his writings in the secularist press). He first came across the idea of secular moral instruction while working in London, when he heard John Trevor (later founder of the Labour Churches) speaking about moral instruction lessons in French primary schools in 1889. Through the 1890s he taught at East London Ethical Society Sunday School where he found the space, outside the constraints of Board School teaching, to experiment with his own approach to moral instruction. This was outlined in *Our Children*, a plan of moral teaching which he developed into his four-volume *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* (analysed in the previous chapter). His career as an elementary school teacher ended in 1896 when Stanton Coit recruited him as worker and lecturer for the ethical movement. He spent three years teaching at a number of ethical Sunday schools, lecturing, and helping establish the Ethical Union and the Moral Instruction League.[106]

Soon after he arrived in Leicester Gould started publicising his ideas on education in general and moral education in particular – verbally through lectures and public meetings, and in writing through letters and articles in the local press.[107] He stood as an independent candidate in the December 1900 School Board election. This was uncomfortable for the Secular Society as his candidature clashed with that of John Potter, Vice President of the Secular Society, who stood as a Liberal.[108] Nonetheless Gould claimed that he was fully supported by Gimson in his refusal to submit to the request of Alexander Baines and Dr Bennett (then

---

[106] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.64-65, 75-79. Gould's autobiography is the key source of biographical information for the early part of his life. Obituaries and tributes collated by Hayward and White (Hayward and White, *Last Years*) and Dictionary of National Biography entries add very little additional information for the period considered here. R.N. Bérard, Gould, Frederick James (1855-1938), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/38882], accessed 14 March 2006.

[107] *Leicester Free Press*, c. September 1899, reported on a talk by Gould on moral instruction. For this and other examples see LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.

[108] There had been discussion within the Secular Society over a possible clash between Gould's candidature and that of Mr Potter. It was decided that Gould would not be officially put forward by the Society but would be referred to by chairman on Sunday meetings as "representing the Society's principles". LSS Minute Book 1885-1902, 10 October, 7 November 1900, 10D68/3, RLLR.

chair and vice chair of the Board) that he should not stand for fear of dividing the 'Liberal vote' to the benefit of the Church.[109]

The main plank of his election platform was "purely secular moral education." Gould produced and distributed a syllabus which, he argued, "captured the imagination of Leicester sufficiently to secure my election." The list of moral qualities which he promoted during his campaign included self-respect, temperance, courage, perseverance, truthfulness, kindness/manners, sympathy for suffering, work and duty, and Society and State.[110] Many of these qualities were typical of the schemes reviewed in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, the way this list is framed provides evidence of Gould's growing socialist and positivist sympathies. Also, as will be discussed in the next chapter, it is broader than anything the School Board had previously considered.

Gould came second in the poll, with 15,669 votes. John Potter was not elected, but was voted onto the Board in March 1901 to fill the space left vacant by the resignation of another Board member, Mr Drinkwater.[111] Gould also served on the Education Committee as a Labour Councillor for Castle Ward from 1904 to 1907 and again for Wyggeston Ward from 1908 till 1910.[112]

Gould resigned from the Secular Society in 1908. He later put his resignation down to the increasing divergence between his own increasingly positivist and socialist views and those of the Secular Society, though there were other sources of tension. Along with a few of his supporters, he set up a small but enthusiastic Positivist Society which lasted for two years. In 1910 he returned to London to work as demonstrator for the Moral Education League.[113]

---

[109] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.92-93.
[110] *Ethical World*, 20 October 1900, *Leicester Guardian*, 27 October 1900, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902; *Ethical World*, 15 February 1910, p.23.
[111] Leicester School Board (henceforward LSB) Minutes, 4 March 1901, 19D59/VI/10, RLLR.
[112] He stood as an independent candidate in 1903 but was not elected, while in 1907 he fell victim to a Liberal smear campaign. Gould, *Life Story*, pp.101, 104-07. See LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1906-08, 10D68/11 and LSS Scrapbook of Printed Material issued by the Society 1843-1908 10D68/6, RLLR, for newspaper cuttings and printed material related to Gould's election campaigns.
[113] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.108-13.

Conclusion

This chapter has described the local contexts in Birmingham and Leicester which underlay the introduction of moral instruction lessons by the two School Boards, local debates, and the ways in which moral education was practised in schools. Our understanding of moral education in Birmingham and Leicester is enhanced by knowledge of the social, economic, political, religious and educational contexts. George Dixon and FJ Gould have been located within these local worlds, and the organisational resources on which they were able to draw have been identified. However, while important, these contexts do not explain everything. It is the interaction between the contexts and the motivations and personalities of the individuals concerned (both on the School Boards and in individual schools) that shaped the provision for moral instruction in particular, and moral education more generally, in Leicester and Birmingham schools. This interaction of contexts and individuals on Birmingham and Leicester School Boards in relation to moral instruction lessons will be the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE:
GEORGE DIXON, FJ GOULD AND MORAL INSTRUCTION IN BIRMINGHAM AND LEICESTER

This thesis will now examine moral instruction in Birmingham and Leicester, having examined the local context and introduced the key protagonists. I will discuss the ways in which Dixon and Gould promoted moral instruction lessons, and the local debates around the introduction of these lessons by Birmingham and Leicester School Boards. I will also assess evidence on implementation, and the impact of moral instruction lessons in Birmingham and Leicester, and on their impact beyond these localities. This chapter therefore revisits issues of policy, activism and reception discussed in relation to the Moral Instruction League in Chapter Two, but played out at the local level.

These studies of Birmingham and Leicester highlight the various educational (and other) arguments raised in connection with moral education. Local debates reflect, and translate through specific local contexts, arguments already noted at the national level. In addition, these studies provide a valuable insight into the organisations and personalities engaged in educational policy and curriculum development at the local level, and into the different forms which activism in this arena could take.

Reasons for introducing moral lessons

As the previous chapters have indicated, many were concerned about urban problems, along with perceived shortcomings in the educational system, but did not propose moral instruction lessons. What did Dixon and Gould offer as a rationale for their particular solution? George Dixon's reasons for promoting moral instruction lessons are difficult to establish. His views were set out in his introduction to his resolution,[1] but few other sources on his opinions exist. He did not write educational books and did not contribute regularly to the local or national press. As chairman of the Board he gave a number of speeches and lectures on educational matters, but few except his annual addresses have survived in written

[1] See pp.158-59 below.

form. Dixon's obituaries, and later histories of Birmingham School Board, emphasise his contributions to technical education, Higher Grade schools, scholarships, and, to a lesser extent, religious instruction by voluntary agency and Bible reading in schools.[2] Moral instruction lessons have not been noted in the same way, receiving only a brief mention in one unpublished dissertation.[3]

By contrast, Gould was such a prolific writer and speaker that the historian has to select which of many sources to analyse. By the time he introduced his resolution to Leicester School Board in October 1901 his educational suggestions had been developed in a number of publications – *A Plan of Moral Instruction* (for the Moral Instruction League) in 1897, the first series of his four-volume *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* developed from that plan in 1899, and a chapter *The Moral Instruction of Children* in Stanton Coit's edited volume *Ethical Democracy* in 1900.[4] Within Leicester he outlined his programme in his numerous speeches and contributions to the local press.[5]

The circular to head teachers in Birmingham issued after the Birmingham School Board meeting held 3 July 1879 linked the introduction of moral lessons to Article 19A of the Code and the instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors by the Committee of Council in January 1878. "It is evident [from these requirements] that the Department expects that moral lessons will be given in the Schools," stated the circular. Nonetheless, as RW Dale pointed out at the July 1879 meeting, these regulations said nothing "about the necessity of making special provision in the timetable for definite moral instruction."[6]

---

[2] For example see Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.106-08; Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.43-44, 57-58, 64-66. A number of obituaries in the local, national and educational press fail to mention moral instruction. See, for example, *Birmingham Weekly Post*, 29 January 1898, *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 24 January 1898, *The Times*, 25 January 1898, p.6; *Ethical World*, 29 January 1898, p.67; *The Schoolmaster*, 29 January 1898, p.189.

[3] Taylor, *History of Birmingham School Board*, pp.176-77.

[4] Gould, *Children's Book of Moral Lessons I*; Gould, *A Plan of Moral Instruction*; Gould, *Moral Instruction of Children*.

[5] Gould outlined his programme of moral instruction in his campaign meetings (*Midland Free* Press, 17 November 1900, LSB Press Cuttings Book 1892-1900, 19D59/VII/320, RLLR) and a letter to burgesses (*Leicester Daily Post*, 11 November 1900, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902, 10D68/8).

[6] Circular of General Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors, 16 January 1878, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix, 1877-78*, London: HMSO, 1878, 331-38, p.333 (see Chapter Two, pp.46-47); BSB, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished by the Board During the Year ended November 28th 1879*, SB/B/1/4/2, BCA; *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.

In Leicester, on the other hand, there is no indication that Gould's resolution in 1901 was pre-empted by government requirements or actions. Gould carried out his intention to campaign for moral instruction on the School Board, stated when he was elected in 1900. His prior interest in moral instruction has already been mentioned, and he was possibly also motivated, though he did not acknowledge this overtly, by his involvement in the Moral Instruction League. By contrast, when Gould and Labour colleagues introduced motions in favour of secular education on the Education Committee in 1905, 1907 and 1909, they referred to interdenominational conflict following the 1902 Education Act and the various education bills introduced from 1906.[7]

Dixon seems to have been responding to faults that he and others detected in the educational system of the time. In a lecture to the Birmingham Teachers' Association in October 1879, he bemoaned an inspection and funding system which led schools and teachers (and by extension School Boards) to focus on what was inspected and funded, particularly the annual examination in the '3 Rs', to the detriment of more important aspects of elementary education. In this argument he echoed the criticisms of the Revised Code common among educationalists and elements of the educational press in the 1870s.[8] He pointed out that although there were no grants for physical and moral training, "enormous advantages ... will accrue to the children, and through them to the State, from a due attention to such training." "Our object should be to prepare our scholars for their future work in life, for becoming good and useful citizens," he argued.[9] Dixon outlined a number of elements of physical and moral training, including moral instruction, which could promote these potential benefits. A logical extension of this argument, though Dixon did not state this directly, would be that systematising moral training would help ensure that these potential benefits were realised.

Dixon also offered urban poverty and conditions in the working-class home as a reason for improving moral training in schools. "In the present condition of the working classes,"

---

[7] See for example the debates around the resolution introduced in 1905. *Leicester Daily Post*, 27 June 1905, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06, 10D68/10.
[8] G. Dixon, *Lecture on Elementary Education in the Birmingham Board Schools Delivered to the Birmingham Teachers' Association*, 7 October 1879, pp.16-23, LP48.06, BLSL. For an example of negative comments on payment by results in the educational press see *The Schoolmaster*, 25 October 1879, pp.453-54.
[9] Dixon, *Lecture*, p.17.

Dixon argued, "the father sees but little of his family, and the mother's occupations are such that she finds it convenient to permit, if not to encourage, her young ones to live in the streets." He suggested that, by contrast, the hours the schoolmaster spends with the child provided valuable opportunities for moral training. Schools and teachers were thus called on to remedy perceived deficiencies in the home background of working-class pupils. Moreover, even where the "moral atmosphere" of the home was deemed suitable, "the efforts of the schoolmaster should second those of the parent."[10]

Like Dixon, Gould detected faults in the educational system. He criticised the focus on knowledge and intellect at the expense of moral development, the overcrowded curriculum, and the division between secular and religious instruction. He urged instead that education "should be treated as a unity, and its chief aim should be the making of character".[11] He directed particular criticism at religious instruction, which, as will be seen below, he deemed inadequate from an ethical point of view.[12]

Gould said little about urban poverty in connection with moral instruction, though he bemoaned the demoralised condition of Leicester's inhabitants in a number of his contributions to the local press.[13] His aims were international: he wanted the "same humanist ideas ... inculcated in all schools, whether in Britain or Ceylon, Europe, America, or China" and in 1901 was already cultivating overseas links.[14] Henry Major, however, linked moral lessons with urban poverty when he introduced his moral instruction syllabus to Leicester elementary school teachers in March 1902. Major described the conduct of the inhabitants of the central slums and courts walking on London Road on a Sunday night as "an object-lesson, showing that there were some deficiencies which they should boldly face." He commented on problems in children's home-life and the dangers of early marriage. Better moral training in schools, he argued, could help: "The teachers might help by teaching the child in the first years of school life to understand a little better some of the duties and

---

[10] Dixon, *Lecture*, pp.17-19.
[11] Gould, *Moral Instruction of Children*, pp.171-75; Gould's School Board election address 1900 cited in Gould, *Life Story*, p.93.
[12] See also his "farewell letter" to London School Board cited in Gould, *Life Story*, p.71.
[13] See F.J. Gould, The Betting-Ring and Three Visions, *Leicester Pioneer*, 19 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902, 10D68/8.
[14] *Leicester Reasoner*, November 1901, p.3.

relations of family life, its genesis and evolution, leading to the subject of the State, loyalty and patriotism."[15]

Dixon may have drawn on a tradition of secular moral training as part of an unsectarian system of education which was emphasised in the National Education League's propaganda. A common theme in the NEL's publications was that universal access to elementary education would enhance the moral condition of the nation. Education, the NEL argued in one pamphlet, would "elevate the character of the people ... teach them that they are under moral obligations ... teach the people how to make the best use of their faculties, and to know and perform their duties to society and the state." More specifically, a pamphlet arguing for an unsectarian education system referred to the call by the primate, bishops and members of the clergy among others for a secular education system in Ireland which included the "training of the child ... in the general principles of justice, truth, and honesty, as well as in habits of obedience to parents."[16] This was not a call for timetabled moral instruction lessons, but as a precedent of systematic moral training as part of an unsectarian education system it may have informed Dixon's thinking a decade later on Birmingham School Board.[17]

Gould, as is evident from the biographical details in the previous chapter, was informed by a different, secularist tradition, and particularly by developments within the ethical movement.[18] Within this tradition, moral instruction was associated not only with what was possible in the context of the "religious difficulty" but also with what was in the ethical movement's view the desirable decline of organised Christianity in the country at large. Moreover, as noted earlier, his advocacy of moral education was underpinned increasingly by positivism.

---

[15] Source not identified, March 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03, 10D68/9. Reporting on moral lessons to the Education Committee in 1905, Major similarly suggested that teachers in the poorest schools act as "missionaries" through their interest in the subject. *Ethical World*, 2 December 1905, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06, 10D68/10.

[16] NEL, *A Brief Statement of the Object and Means of the League*, c.1869/70, pp.2-3; *National Education League*, c.1869/70, p.2. National Education League Printed Material, A370.8 D/15, Birmingham Central Library.

[17] See also Chapter Two, pp.49-50.

[18] See Chapter One, pp.33-35, 40 and Chapter Two, pp.52-56 for more on the ethical movement and moral instruction.

Moral instruction lessons in Birmingham and Leicester

In 1879 Birmingham became the second School Board in England to introduce moral instruction lessons into the elementary school curriculum, following Burton-on-Trent in 1878. At the Board meeting held on 1 May 1879 George Dixon, Chair of the Board, moved "that in the opinion of this Board it is desirable that systematic Moral Instruction be given in all the Birmingham Board Schools." Dixon was seconded by fellow Liberal member RW Dale. The rider moved by Church Party member Mr Greening – "that for this purpose the Bible is used in the Schools" – was lost (by seven votes to five), as was Dr Langford's suggested amendment "that the Education Committee be instructed to consider and report on the question whether it is desirable that these moral instruction lessons be given" (by nine votes to four). The original motion was carried, with ten members of the Board voting for, none against, and four declining to vote. The two main parties were divided on the issue.[19]

It was decided that the Elementary Education Committee should "consider and report as to the best means for giving effect to the foregoing resolution."[20] On 10 June 1879, Dixon presented a draft circular to the Education Committee instructing head teachers to give systematic moral instruction lessons. The Education Committee agreed the circular and reported back to the full Board on 3 July 1879. It was decided that a copy of this circular would be sent to head teachers. The amendment suggested by Mr Greening – "and it shall not be an offence if the teachers endeavour to enforce these duties by illustration drawn from the Bible" – was lost by nine votes to four.[21]

The circular to Birmingham head teachers instructed them to make provision for two moral lessons a week of thirty minutes each, to be given in the "ordinary school hours" and entered on to the timetable. These lessons were to be "of a conversational character, and ... largely enforced by illustrations drawn from daily life." Subjects to be covered included "obedience to parents, honesty, truthfulness, industry, temperance, courage, kindness, perseverance, frugality, and thrift, government of temper, courtesy, unselfishness and kindred moral

---

[19] BSB Minutes, 1 May 1879, SB/B/1/1/3; editorial in *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[20] BSB Minutes, 1 May 1879.
[21] BSB Education Committee Minutes, 10 June 1879, SB/B/2/2/1/1, BCA; BSB Minutes, 3 July 1879, SB/B/1/1/3.

duties." The list of moral duties here was an extension of the examples that Dixon listed in May 1879.[22]

Birmingham School Board did not draw up a syllabus of moral instruction. However, after some initial prevarication a set of 'Notes of Moral Lessons' was prepared by FW Hackwood (then headmaster of Dudley Road school) for use in board schools during 1882. These notes were, almost certainly, published in Hackwood's *Notes of Lessons of Moral Subjects* in 1883.[23]

Twenty-two years later, in Leicester, FJ Gould introduced a resolution at a meeting of Leicester School Board on Monday 7 October 1901. Gould moved:

> That an enquiry be held into the present scope and method of the moral instruction given in the schools under the Board in connection with the Bible reading, and that a scheme be prepared with the object of 1) rendering the moral instruction more systematic and 2) strengthening the moral element in the school training generally.

He was seconded by Mr Chitham, member of the Church Party and wine merchant. Alexander Baines, Chair of the Board, moved an amendment: "That no alteration be made in the present scheme of Bible reading, but that the School Management Committee be instructed to consider as to the advisability of including a course of moral lessons in the curriculum of secular teaching, and to act." Gould accepted the amendment, and the Board voted eight for the amendment, and four against (one member, Father Hawkins, did not vote).[24]

The School Management Committee instructed Henry Major, chief inspector for Leicester School Board, to develop a scheme of moral instruction. Major had produced "all sorts of "schemes" for reforming and remodelling the instruction given in the schools" since he

---

[22] The original draft of the circular said that lessons should be enforced by illustrations from 'history' and 'daily life' but at the Education Committee meeting on 10 June 1879 it was resolved that 'history' should be deleted from the circular. Mr Greening stated at the July School Board meeting that the word history was "deliberately excluded on purpose to exclude the Bible from the teachers". BSB Education Committee Minutes, 10 June 1879; *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879. The circular was reproduced in BSB, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished by the Board During the Year ended November 28th 1879*, pp.48-51, SB/B/1/4/2.

[23] BSB Education Committee Minutes, 10 May 1881, 9 May 1882, 6 June 1882, SB/B/2/2/1/1. See Chapter Three for discussion of the content of Hackwood's *Notes*.

[24] LSB Minutes, 7 October 1901, 19D59/VI/10.

started as inspector in 1877.[25] A sub-committee consisting of Arthur Rendell and Mrs Evans of the Church Party, Alexander Baines and FJ Gould approved Major's scheme on 24 February 1902, and the sections for Standards IV to VII were printed by November that year.[26] A commentator in the local press noted that "the scheme carries out Mr Gould's idea of a graduated and scientific course of instruction in morals and ethics, growing from standard to standard."[27]

Moral instruction in Birmingham and Leicester: local debates

Moral instruction lessons proved controversial in both Birmingham and Leicester, though they were introduced at different times and within different local contexts. A detailed examination of the debates on both School Boards and responses in the local press illuminates, and enables a comparison of, the strategies and arguments used by Gould and Dixon, and the way the School Board and wider educational debates developed in the two cities.

In introducing his resolution to the School Board on 1 May 1879, Dixon presented his proposals in a moderate light, not as a radical departure from the Board's current policy but as an extension of the moral instruction already given in schools through reading books and the "Kindness to Animals" scheme. He then set out the benefits of systematising moral instruction, with regular timetabled moral lessons to be enforced by illustrations from daily life. He argued that positive instruction in the "moral laws which governed society" would "give ... children a very wide, definite, and complete knowledge of those laws which they wished them to obey." This instruction would bring before children's minds "ideas which otherwise they might be ignorant of, and which would become impressed upon them in a way that could not be other than extremely useful to them in after life."[28] Regular and systematic moral instruction was preferable to the present incidental method, he suggested,

---

[25] *Leicester Guardian*, 27 June 1903, LEC Press Cuttings Book 1903-08, 19D59/VII/322, RLLR; LSB School Management Committee Minutes, 14 October 1901, 19D59/VI/20, RLLR.
[26] LSB School Management Committee Minutes, 27 January 1902, 10 February 1902, 24 February 1902, 7 July 1902, 21 July 1902, 13 October 1902, 10 November 1902.
[27] *Leicester Daily Post*, 17 March 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03.
[28] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879. Details of the discussions on Birmingham School Board are based primarily on the full reports of the May and July School Board meetings in the *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879, *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 2 May 1879, and *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879. The reports of the May meeting in the *Daily Post* and *Daily Gazette* are very similar, though not identical word-for-word. The *Daily Post* will be used here. No legible copy of the July meeting in the *Daily Post* was found.

which "might be given very well at one time and by one master, and very imperfectly at another time and by another master."[29]

He argued further that moral instruction would be beneficial to teachers: "If they had to teach truthfulness, punctuality, and kindness ... it was probable that they would themselves be more punctual, and kind, and truthful." And, cognisant of the system of payment by results, he argued that teachers "would not find that their time was wasted, even as regarded intellectual instruction or as regarded earning the Government grants." He also reassured his listeners that the morality to be taught would not be "subversive or contrary to the spirit of the religion of the country." Dixon concluded his introduction: "They would find that the children when they left school would be better prepared for acting as good citizens, and also better prepared for receiving those religious influences which all of them by no means undervalued."[30]

Dixon added little to his argument in his response at the end of the debate in May or at the July meeting, at which the main speakers in favour of the proposals were the Reverend EFM MacCarthy and RW Dale. He merely reiterated the benefits of systematising moral instruction compared with the current system and noted that some head teachers had expressed their approval of the scheme.[31]

In introducing his motion in Leicester, Gould stated at the outset that moral teaching was the main issue he was concerned with, and Bible reading was of secondary importance. He hoped that those who disagreed with some of his suggestions would agree "that the end of education was, or should be, the training of character, and the production of the spirit and practice of good citizenship." Like Dixon, he wanted to systematise the moral training given in schools. Other areas of teaching, he argued, had been systematised to very good effect. Moral teaching had not been systematised "and yet it had to do with the most delicate

---

[29] Dixon and other contributors to the discussion use the terms 'schoolmaster' or 'master' when they appear to be referring to all teachers, male and female. *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879, *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 2 May 1879.
[30] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[31] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.

question of all – the function of the human conscience in discerning between right and wrong."[32]

He then reported on his exploratory visits to each of the twenty-nine board schools in Leicester to hear teachers give Bible lessons. He found that many of the lessons were "marked by a want of uniformity and interest," were often not systematic, and in some cases were "inferior in tone and quality" from an ethical point of view. He suggested that if the Board consented to introduce a moral scheme they should include a list of "fundamental and moral ideas" which expanded on the list he had produced during his election campaign the previous year: "self-respect, self-control, truth and truthfulness, kindness, duty and honour, industry, mutual dependence of various orders of society, the nature of the social organism, the general idea of justice, the work of the State, citizenship, co-operation, international peace, and the relation of nature and art to morality."[33]

Finally, Gould outlined other changes he wanted to see in the elementary schools: the removal of the Bible as a text-book, more emphasis in history teaching upon "the social life of the people, their moral progress, their industrial history", and more excursions to places of social and historical interest. He concluded with the following claim:

> An education conducted on these methods and with these aims would help to raise up a generation that would show more truthfulness in its business dealings, more self-respect in its amusements, more generosity in its conduct towards the poor and the overburdened and the unemployed, and more justice in its economics and in its international relations.[34]

When Dixon introduced his resolution in May 1879 with only very brief mention of religion he presumably wished to establish the parameters of the ensuing debate. Similarly, at the July School Board meeting the Reverend EFM MacCarthy made no reference to religion when he proposed that the circular be adopted. However, the religious issue dominated the debate at

---

[32] The discussion at the School Board meeting of 7 October 1901 was reported in detail in the local press. Report of School Board Meeting, most likely *Leicester Daily Post* but source not identified, 8 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[33] *Report*, 8 October 1901. Gould's visits to board schools were also reported in F.J. Gould, An Agnostic's Tour through the Leicester Board schools, *Agnostic Annual*, 1902, pp.37-42.
[34] *Report*, 8 October 1901.

both meetings.[35] The fact that 1879 was to have been a School Board election year might partly explain why the discussions followed the course they did, but in Birmingham the religious issue dominated proceedings throughout the life of the School Board, not only at election times.[36]

Gould also tried to get the Board on side, emphasising the possibility of agreement over character-formation as an educational aim, before he moved on to the more controversial part of his speech. His criticisms of the Bible lessons were framed in ethical and educational rather than religious terms. He also finished on a positive and constructive note, connecting his views on teaching and Bible lessons with suggestions of other ways in which elementary school teaching could be altered to the moral benefit of the rising generation. Yet religious issues were precisely what other members of the School Board and commentators in the local press referred to in their responses to Gould's plans.[37]

Despite these similarities in the way in which Dixon and Gould introduced their resolutions, the debates were quite different in tone. The arguments on Birmingham School Board were heated – perhaps a reflection of what Dennis Smith describes as the "turbulence" of the early years of the Board.[38] The July meeting was particularly lively. The Reverend Burges and Mr Greening initiated hostilities, claiming that it was a "scandal", "outrage", "a calamity, a disaster, and even a disgrace to the town" to introduce a scheme asking teachers to give moral instruction without using the Bible. The Reverend Henry Crosskey was angry at the opposition's use of "words of so burning and offensive a character" which "cast a shadow on the work of the Board." Dixon had to act as peacemaker.[39] In Leicester, although similar issues came up in the discussion and Gould was a somewhat controversial figure, the tone of the whole debate was calmer. This suggests an important difference in the atmosphere on the two Boards. As noted in Chapter Four, the 'religious issue' was very much alive in Birmingham in 1879, and, even after a compromise on Bible reading "without comment"

---

[35] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879; *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 2 May 1879; *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.
[36] Smith, *Comparative Study*, pp.366-69; Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.144-48, 155-56.
[37] *Report*, 8 October 1901; *Leicester Daily Post*, 8 October 1901, *Leicester Advertiser*, 12 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[38] Smith, *Comparative Study*, pp.366-67.
[39] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.

was introduced into board schools later that year, remained so for the rest of the life of the Board. In Leicester on the other hand discord over religion appears to have died down, except perhaps at Board election times, after 1874.

Though Dixon and Gould's resolutions were eventually carried, their proposals were criticised. There was support for their general aim of improving the moral education in board schools. Dixon's Church Party opponent Mr Greening conceded: "They all felt that it was of the highest importance that children should have morality taught them in the most systematic and perfect manner." Similarly, in a letter to the *Leicester Pioneer* in October 1901 AL Stanley wrote "We are all more or less in sympathy with the desire to impart moral instruction to budding youth".[40] Yet other aspects of their programmes were criticised.

There was heated debate on Birmingham School Board over the moral condition of board schools. The Reverend Burges of the Church Party claimed that the moral condition of board schools was poor, with the system of payment by results leading managers and teachers to look at schools "from the point of view of what they were worth." He looked back with nostalgia to the social relationships between teacher and pupil and teacher and parents before the Revised Code: "The schoolmaster used to be looked on as the friend of all parents and almost the father of all the children ... and there was a good deal beyond the mere teaching them to read and write." He argued that "the old lines of giving religious teaching" would "restore the relations existing between teachers and the children, and afford an inestimable benefit to the scholars." Miss Kenrick – the sole female Liberal member at that time – disagreed, arguing that teachers did not "[carry] on their work simply from mercenary motives." Dr Langford was unconvinced that the moral condition of board schools required "any systematic method of moral teaching beyond what was already taught," while the Reverend MacCarthy felt that any defects in individual schools would be better dealt with in Committee.[41]

A parallel argument took place in Leicester, with School Board members suggesting that moral teaching was already well catered for in Leicester's elementary schools (where, unlike

---

[40] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879; *Leicester Pioneer*, 12 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[41] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.

Birmingham, Bible reading already took place). Baines, for instance, argued that teachers already gave moral instruction during Bible reading.[42] Indeed, a correspondent in the *Leicester Free Press* "[believed] that when the present regulations were agreed on the subject of Bible readings and moral lessons the impression was that the ideas Mr Gould holds would be included in the teaching."[43] Mr Waddington stated that teachers "took every chance of inculcating little moral precepts in the general routine of their work".[44] The *Leicester Chronicle* similarly argued that "provided a teacher is a right-minded man or woman, [moral teaching] is being given at all times, by example as well as by precept, and often almost unconsciously."[45] Mr Chitham of the Church Party, who seconded Gould's resolution, instead suggested that despite teachers' best efforts "there was not that definite moral teaching that one would like to see."[46]

Religious issues dominated the debates in both Birmingham and Leicester. In Birmingham, School Board members disagreed over whether it was possible to give moral lessons on a secular basis. Some Liberal members argued that it was. Henry Crosskey was the first to suggest morality could be distinguished from religion for the purposes of teaching in elementary schools. Though he "devoutly believed every natural law was entirely dependent upon the power of the living God" he argued that "children could be taught the ordinary natural laws in the schools, and could have the higher motive power brought before them when they were associated together for worship."[47] RW Dale elaborated extensively on this issue in July, arguing that morality and religion could and should be separated, to the benefit of both. "The great outlines of moral duty had been the same in all civilised countries" he said. Though "an appeal to revelation added tremendous sanctions to the ordinary moral duties," these duties "were discoverable by the natural reason and conscience ... [and] ... could be illustrated and enforced apart from an appeal to the revelation God had given." He argued further that while ratepayers of the borough and teachers differed on religious

---

[42] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[43] *Leicester Free Press*, c.October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902. When the Board amended its religious instruction regulations in 1874 head teachers were recommended "to select [Bible] passages of a simple nature having direct reference to practical life and common morality." However, the provision for definite "explanations and instruction in the principles of religion and morality" in the 1872 religious instruction regulations was removed in 1874. LSB Minutes, 16 February 1874, 2 March 1874, 19D59/VI/2.
[44] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[45] *Leicester Chronicle*, c.October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[46] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[47] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.

matters, they agreed on the moral obligations "temperance, courtesy, courage, and good temper". Irreconcilable differences in religious opinion, he suggested, should not get in the way of moral teaching.[48]

Church Party members did not share this view and wanted moral instruction on a religious basis. In May 1879 Mr Greening stated that religion and morality could not be separated: "morality derived its highest authority from the Word of God, and religion and morality could not be divorced ... the teaching of morality must be gauged by the rule which God had given, and their conduct must be regulated by that standard." Some Liberal members also took this position. JS Wright, for instance, who dissented from other Liberals in his advocacy of Bible reading in schools, argued that "they could [not] fully and properly teach the children without important regard for and reference to religion."[49]

There were also arguments over whether or not moral instruction should be based on the Bible. Predictably, Mr Greening and the Reverend Milward of the Church Party thought the Bible should form the basis of moral teaching as it was in their view both the best source of illustration and the best form of sanction. Mr Greening spoke on this issue at length during the May meeting: "If [teachers] would enforce [moral teaching] by examples and precepts ... these examples and precepts were to be found nowhere as they were in the Bible ... the Bible lay at the foundation of moral duty as well as religious duty, and contained the highest incentives to proper moral conduct."[50] The Reverend Crosskey opposed this using the classic Unitarian (and National Education League)[51] argument that the Bible could not be used as a source of illustration because it would be impossible to agree on what to teach from it: "If they struck out that upon which they disagreed, what was there left?"[52]

Interestingly, no one at the Leicester School Board meeting in October 1901 argued explicitly for a secular basis for morality. There was opposition to the idea of moral instruction

---

[48] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879. The Moral Instruction League used similar arguments some twenty years later (see Chapter Two, p.58).
[49] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[50] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[51] Several key figures involved in the NEL – including Joseph Chamberlain – were Unitarian. Editorial comment in *The National Schoolmaster* also sees Birmingham School Board's position on moral instruction and religious instruction linked to the relative numbers and prominence of Unitarians in the town. *The National Schoolmaster*, August 1879, pp.184-87.
[52] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.

without a Christian basis. The Roman Catholic member Father Hawkins argued that "Mr Gould's desire, either expressed or implied, to abolish any reference almost to Almighty God, was equally as objectionable as the farcical system which at present prevailed." For Miss Gimson, Church Party member, "moral teaching sprang so ... naturally out of the Bible".[53] Nevertheless, there was less debate on this issue during and after the meeting than there was in Birmingham in 1879. School Board members and Leicester's citizens, it appears, had little to add to what had been said in the run up to the 1900 School Board Election.[54]

More energy was devoted to Gould's review of religious lessons in Leicester's elementary schools during and after the October 1901 Board meeting. Criticisms of Gould's secular approach to morality were framed in this way. Dr Bennett felt that teachers should not be judged on the strength of one visit to each school, while Mr Waddington, previously a teacher himself, argued that differences of opinion among parents and managers made it very hard for teachers to give good scripture lessons. These differences of opinion were exactly the reason that secularists gave for abolishing religious instruction.[55] Correspondents in the local press agreed that it was very difficult for teachers to give good lessons, and that Gould's test was unfair. 'One among the million', for instance, suggested that Gould found that Bible lessons were of poor quality because he went in looking for defects in the religious teaching.[56]

An issue raised in both Birmingham and Leicester was that proposals for moral instruction lessons threatened to stir up religious controversy. Liberal members of Birmingham School Board were concerned that Dixon's proposals challenged the Board's policy of secular education and opened the "religious difficulty". JS Wright argued at the May meeting that the Board was elected to carry out a secular system of instruction during their term of office, and that Dixon's proposal threatened to violate the "implied contract under which they were elected."[57] This argument was extended in an editorial in the Liberal *Daily Post*:

---

[53] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[54] See LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902 for discussions in the local press prior to the 1900 School Board election.
[55] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[56] *Leicester Free Press*, 19 October 1901. See also *Leicester Chronicle*, c. October 1901; *The Pioneer*, 12 October 1901; *Leicester Mercury*, 8 October 1901. LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[57] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.

> The teachers may well feel themselves at liberty to impart at least some touch of theology into their explanations of a systematic moral scheme; and this brings the Board face to face, in a most practical way, with the religious difficulty itself ... The resolution adopted yesterday necessarily leads to a serious change in the system of teaching hitherto pursued in the Board Schools ... a most important alteration of method has been proposed and carried with undue haste.[58]

The conservative *Daily Gazette* also perceived a change of policy, which it saw as a "step in the right direction": "We cannot but think that in due time the conviction will gain ground that religious instruction is the best and most solid basis for moral teaching and training."[59] Dixon's attempt to keep the religious issue out of the debate failed, with both the Church Party opposition and with his Liberal colleagues and supporters.

In Leicester, on the other hand, a compromise on Bible reading had been in place for twenty-seven years. Here the concern was about upsetting the status quo. Alexander Baines argued that "it would be most unwise that the present scheme [of Bible reading] should be altered or upset in any way."[60] This was also the dominant view in the local press, the *Leicester Daily Post*, for instance, favouring a policy that did not "reopen the floodgates of religious controversy".[61]

Pedagogical issues did not receive the attention accorded to religious issues, but were discussed in both Birmingham and Leicester. Interestingly, in Birmingham, pedagogical issues were raised only by Liberal members and by the Liberal press.[62] RW Dale supported Dixon in celebrating the pedagogical benefits of moral instruction lessons. He argued that the incidental instruction given on occasions which arose during the normal life of the school would not ensure full coverage of all moral duties, as some might not be raised by what happened within the school walls.[63] For the Reverend MacCarthy, on the other hand, the best moral instruction came from "the moral tone and character of the teachers of the schools." He argued further, citing his own experience as a teacher, that "to systematise so

---

[58] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879. See also the editorial in *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 2 May 1879 for a similar view.
[59] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 2 May 1879. See *The National Schoolmaster*, August 1879, pp.184-87 for a similar argument.
[60] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[61] *Leicester Daily Post*, 8 October 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[62] However, the Church Party's position is implied in Mr Greening's assertion during the July School Board meeting that training pupils in moral virtues was "not necessary" in denominational schools. *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.
[63] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.

subtle a thing would in very many cases lead to prudishness on the part of the children, and to a blunting of moral sentiment and feeling on the part of the teachers."[64] A *Daily Post* editorial elaborated on this point: "[reducing moral instruction] to a set of aphorisms ... [treating] it as a special subject, and [relegating] it to a particular time, will inevitably convert the moral lesson from a living, quickening influence, into a merely perfunctory exercise, which both teachers and children will be glad to get through."[65] Discussion of pedagogy in Leicester was limited to John Potter of the Secular Society claiming that moral lessons should be systematised because they were "given in a haphazard sort of way."[66]

These discussions indicate that many of the issues highlighted already in relation to the Moral Instruction League were echoed in local debates. The ideological and intellectual challenges to the League's position were thus replicated, and mediated, through the different contexts of Birmingham and Leicester School Boards.

Dixon and Gould: getting unpopular measures adopted

Both Dixon and Gould faced opposition to their proposals. How, then, were they able to achieve what they did? Dixon appears to have acted on his own initiative when he introduced his resolution before the School Board. At the May meeting of the School Board, he expressed regret that "several of those with whom he was in the habit of acting regretted that he had brought forward his resolution. He had not done so in concert with anyone else; he took all the responsibility upon himself."[67] As an editorial in the *Daily Post* noted, "the resolution was not acceptable to exactly half the Liberal members of the Board who were present; and it was ultimately carried by the assistance of those members with whom the chairman and Liberal members who supported him are not accustomed to act."[68]

---

[64] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[65] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879 (The editorial in *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 2 May 1879 similarly commented on the potentially "evil effects of a mechanical system for the teaching of morals".) An editorial article in 1901 (source not identified, not dated but from position in scrapbook likely to be 29 or 30 March 1901) commented on the 'manual' used for moral lessons: "The lessons deduced [on vices and virtues] ... were chiefly abstract sentiments, which the children were not likely to favour and practise simply because the teacher said it." BSB Newspaper Cuttings Scrap Book, SB/B/1/11/12.
[66] Nevertheless, probably out of loyalty for fellow-Liberal Baines, Potter voted for the amendment. *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[67] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.
[68] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.

By the time of the July School Board meeting Dixon's Liberal colleagues appeared to be on side. For example, Dr Langford, who had spoken against the resolution at the May meeting, proposed in July that the circular to head teachers be adopted, and argued for the "very moderate resolution .... [which] ... fully met the necessities of the case." He suggested that positive instructions from the Board would alleviate any previous "shyness on the part of teachers" which had led some to "[shrink] from what was, and always had been, understood, both by the Board and the Education Department, to be the want of their most obvious and prominent duties." For Langford to change his position in this way there were almost certainly discussions among Liberal members. Crosskey's implication during the July meeting that certain initial misunderstandings about the resolution among Liberals had by then been cleared up suggests that internal party talks took place.[69] We could speculate that the efficient machinery of the Birmingham Liberal party, used to marshal the selection of candidates and voting in elections, was also used to encourage other Liberals to support the chair.[70]

Even if he did not use all of his usual networks, Dixon could rely on the support of some allies from the start. Dixon's motion in May was seconded by his long-term friend, RW Dale, Congregationalist minister of Carr's Lane Chapel and preacher of the civic gospel. Dale had worked with Dixon for a number of years, on Birmingham School Board and on the executive committee of the NEL.[71] Over the years Dale had supported Dixon on a number of occasions. He condemned Chamberlain for forcing Dixon's hand over his resignation as MP in 1876.[72] Yet Dale and Dixon did not always agree, and differed over the 'compromise' with the Church Party on Bible reading later in 1879.[73]

Dale's comments at the May meeting give no indication that he was acquainted with Dixon's ideas in advance. His only direct reference to the resolution was that he felt it was consistent

---

[69] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.
[70] See Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.167-74 and Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, pp.189-91 on Birmingham Liberal Association.
[71] Briggs, *History of Birmingham*, pp.68-69, 101-03; Dale, *Life of R.W. Dale*, pp.263-64.
[72] Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp.110-11.
[73] Dale, *Life of R.W. Dale*, pp.482-83. Dixon wanted to accept the Church Party's offer of no election contest if provision was made for Bible reading in schools, but Dale wanted to stick to the policy of no religion whatsoever in board schools (the National Education League position and policy of Birmingham School Board since the Liberals gained a majority in 1874).

with the current Board's secular policy.[74] All the same, Dixon's propositions chime with Dale's long-standing view that ethical principles could be independent of particular religious commitments, which, as already noted, he outlined at the School Board meeting in July 1879.[75] Even if Dixon's plans for moral instruction were not discussed prior to the May meeting, Dixon was able to draw on the intellectual support of a trusted collaborator whose views on morality were in tune with his proposals.

Further, Dixon drew on his personal strengths in order to persuade others on the Board. His reputation and standing in Birmingham, and also his personality and style of leadership on the Board, may well have enabled him to rally support. Contemporaries emphasised his reputation for fairness, moderation, and his ability to win confidence and respect both from members of bodies such as the School Board and the general public.[76] He was not charismatic or – as is clear from the primary sources examined – a powerful orator. He was also not single-minded or belligerent in the manner of other Liberal colleagues like Chamberlain and Jesse Collings. Nonetheless, he was able, possibly because of his moderation, to persuade others to go along with his plans. This ability, undoubtedly, stretched to the introduction of moral lessons.

For Gould too, the outcome of the Leicester School Board meeting on 7 October 1901 was a remarkable achievement, though not a complete victory. Gould described it as a U-turn on the part of the majority: "Though the Liberals had made out at the time of the election that the Bible and morality must go together, yet they had agreed that some moral lessons could be given without the Bible!"[77] Moreover, by October 1901 Gould had annoyed School Board members with his criticisms of Board practice and procedures, and others through his many

---

[74] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879. Dale felt that religious teaching in board schools would have to be limited to what all could agree on and would therefore lack conviction and be ineffective. See R.W. Dale, *Religious Teaching by School Boards Perilous to the Religious Faith and Life of the Nation*, Birmingham: Hudson and Son, c.1872, Lp.48.21, BLSL.

[75] Thompson, *op cit.*, pp.102-04.

[76] J.H. Lloyd, for instance, wrote to Dixon concerning his retirement as Chair of the School Board that his successor would not "possess the confidence of the Committee to the extent which you have," while in 1879 the author of a eulogistic piece in the *Biograph and Review* wrote "in the discharge of all his duties [he] has won the respect and esteem of all classes." J.H. Lloyd to G Dixon, 2 May 1896, J.H. Lloyd Letters, Leaflets, Cuttings 1867-1902, Birmingham Institutions J/1, BLSL; George Dixon, *The Biograph and the Review*, p.304. See also Dixon's obituary in *The Times*, 25 January 1898, p.6.

[77] A Year on the School Board, c. December 1901, *Pioneer*, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.

outspoken contributions in the local press. How then was Gould able to obtain the degree of consent he did for such a controversial measure?

An obvious answer is that as the only independent member he held the casting vote on a School Board on which neither of the main parties held a majority. He used it at the inaugural meeting of the new Board in December 1900 to re-appoint Alexander Baines and Dr Bennett as chair and vice chair. He used it two months later against the Liberals to allow Father Hawkins, the Roman Catholic member, to sit on the Industrial School Committee.[78] Gould thus indicated that he could employ his casting vote unpredictably, and in favour of different parties and causes. All Board members had good reason to concede to at least part of his request.

Moreover, in some respects the School Board and public opinion in Leicester were ready for Gould's suggestions. Gould's proposal was not the first time moral lessons had come before the notice of the Board and Leicester's burgesses. Replacing religious instruction with secular moral instruction lessons was part of the ILP candidate Henry Payne's election platform in the 1897 School Board election.[79] The similarity between this platform and the original aims of the Moral Instruction League, whose inaugural meeting took place two days after the Leicester School Board election on 8 December, is striking and – given the early links between labour organisations and the League[80] – possibly not coincidental. Also, Baines noted when he moved his amendment that some years earlier he had proposed "that the Board should incorporate into the curriculum of secular teaching certain moral lessons from Hackwood's text book." However, at a time of examinations of individual classes and individual children "there was no time to be given to it."[81]

---

[78] Gould, *Life Story*, p.94.
[79] Flyer for Henry Payne, 1897 School Board election, LSB Press Cuttings Book 1892-1900. Payne served on the School Board for three years. There is no evidence that Payne took any action on this issue in the School Board minutes. Indeed, Payne argued at the end of his term of office that without other ILP members to support him he had not been able to achieve what he set out to do. *Leicester Daily Post*, 17 November 1900, LSB Press Cuttings Book 1892-1900.
[80] See discussion of the formation of the Moral Instruction League Chapter Two, pp.54-56.
[81] *Report*, 8 October 1901. Baines does not state when he suggested using Hackwood's book but the reference to examinations of classes and individuals dates it no later than 1895 when the inspection regime changed.

Indeed, moral instruction, though perhaps of a different nature from the all-encompassing moral schemes envisaged by Gould and the Moral Instruction League, was discussed at the School Management Committee on 12 and 26 November 1900, shortly before Gould was elected to the School Board. The Committee discussed how best to teach children about "the question of proper behaviour in the streets." It was decided, on Henry Major's recommendation, not to introduce a textbook into schools but to call teachers' attention to the matter by raising the question at managers' meetings.[82] Furthermore, several other candidates in the 1900 School Board election stated an interest in moral education. They may have been stimulated into action by Gould's campaign, as suggested by John Potter's statement that "the desire that moral training should be made a feature of our school life is not confined to one candidate alone." Yet none proposed Gould's particular solution of moral lessons.[83]

Gould's ideas also chimed with concerns about the moral condition of young people expressed in the local press. For example, JH Wooley wrote to the *Leicester Daily Post* in November 1900 about the condition of Leicester's youth, calling for Leicester School Board to pay more attention to the "moral training of our scholars". "I don't expect our teachers to turn their charges into angels," he argued, "but an attempt ought to be made to impress upon the plastic mind of the child the importance of paying due respect to old age, kindness to animals and the absolute necessity of clean language."[84] Wooley's suggestions appear closer to the issues of good behaviour and courtesy discussed by the School Management Committee at this time than to Gould's plan. Still, his letter indicates that there was public pressure for the Board to be seen to be doing something, and Gould's resolution provided them with an opportunity to act. Gould's specific suggestions differed from what had been discussed previously, but the idea of moral education was familiar to the School Board and the local population.

Gould also benefited from his ability as a publicist. When he stood for election in 1900, copies of his address to burgesses were distributed around the town by a band of helpers "to make the plan of Secular Moral Education plain to the understanding of everybody who

---

[82] LSB School Management Committee Minutes, 12 November 1900, 26 November 1900, 19D59/VI/19.
[83] *Leicester Free Press*, 1 December 1900, LSB Press Cuttings Book 19D59/VII/320.
[84] *Leicester Daily Post*, 19 November 1900, LSB Press Cuttings Book 19D59/VII/320.

cared to read it."[85] He held a series of public meetings and wrote a public letter that was published in the local press.[86] Gould was skilful in tapping into mainstream networks within the town, and drawing on the reputation of famous national figures, utilising the contacts he had made in London. He publicised "benedictions" from Frederic Harrison (famous positivist), John Page Hopps (local Unitarian) and Leicester MP J Allanson Picton.[87] In these ways he ensured that others were made aware of his activities and beliefs.

Leicester Secular Society was a strong organisational base from which Gould could launch into local educational politics. He received support and backing from members of the Society during the School Board election in 1900, and on subsequent occasions when he stood for election to the Education Committee.[88] This support was significant. As noted in the previous chapter, Secularists in Leicester achieved an ongoing institutional existence and respectability in the town denied to their colleagues elsewhere.

Someone with Gould's organisational background and with his personal qualities was, in many ways, well placed to campaign for the introduction of moral lessons. He was determined, and able to publicise himself and to work the local political system to his advantage. As an independent member till 1903, he was unfettered by party ties, and had space to manoeuvre on the School Board, but he was also able to cultivate allies and use established local networks to bolster his position. Moreover, moral instruction was Gould's main concern. He devoted more time and energy to the issue than, for example, George Dixon and Alexander Baines, who had many other pressing and possibly more urgent concerns, and whose scope for action was limited by their party loyalties and their positions as chairs of Birmingham and Leicester School Board respectively. Gould was also better placed than Henry Payne who, it appears, lacked allies on the Board and was operating from

---

[85] *Leicester Reasoner*, December 1901, p.6.
[86] *Leicester Free Press*, 17 November 1900, LSB Press Cuttings Book 1892-1900; *Leicester Daily Post*, 11 November 1900, *Leicester Daily Post*, 15 November 1900, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[87] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.93-94. See also *Leicester Guardian*, 27 October 1900 and *Leicester Guardian*, 17 November 1900, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[88] Gould, *Life Story*, pp.92-93; *Freethinker*, 28 October 1900, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902; LSS leaflet requesting subscriptions to support Gould's municipal election campaign, 26 October 1903, LSS Scrapbook of Printed Material 1843-1908.

what in 1897 was the weak organisational base of the Leicester ILP branch only three years into its existence.[89]

Convincing the public: publicising moral instruction

Dixon attempted to persuade the public of his views beyond the confines of the School Board. He tried to influence teachers in his speech to the Birmingham Teachers' Association in October 1879. (If there were other attempts to reach this audience no records survive). Dixon also brought moral instruction to the attention of the general public in three of his chairman's annual addresses, in November 1879, January 1881 and January 1885. Local citizens were thus made aware of moral lessons from time to time.[90] There is no surviving evidence that Dixon publicised Birmingham's moral instruction lessons after 1885.

Dixon did not write or speak regularly about moral education. His position as chair of the School Board and after 1885 as MP would have left him with little time to engage with this sort of activity. Moreover, moral instruction was one among many issues he was concerned with. It was only one aspect of his vision of an effective elementary education system for Birmingham. Educating a competitive workforce through good quality elementary education for all and through specialised technical education, and designing an interconnected system of educational institutions from elementary school to university, were emphasised in more of his public pronouncements.[91]

Gould, by contrast, promoted moral instruction tirelessly in a number of ways. He was a prolific writer. During his time in Leicester he produced a number of volumes on moral lessons; including his four part *Children's Book of Moral Lessons* between 1899 and 1907, *The Children's Plutarch* and *Life and Manners* in 1906.[92] Some of his output was directed specifically at a Leicester audience, such as his regular column – 'For the Children' – in the *Leicester*

---

[89] Cox, *op cit*, pp.198-200.
[90] Dixon, *Lecture*, pp.16-23; *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 6 November 1879, p.12; *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 20 January 1881, pp.19-20; *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 15 January 1885, pp.9-10. Lp.48.21, BLSL.
[91] This is evident both from records of School Board discussions and the content of Dixon's annual chair's addresses.
[92] F.J. Gould, *The Children's Plutarch*, London: Watts & Co., 1906; F.J. Gould, *Life and Manners*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1906.

Reasoner which featured moral lessons.[93] He arranged for postcards to be distributed to teachers alerting them to this column as a source of illustration they could use in their moral lessons.[94] This was classic Gould: a genuine desire to help teachers and to promote a cause and skilful self-publicity were combined in a single act.

Gould also promoted moral instruction through his work on the Education Committee. Moral lessons remained a key aspect of his platform in election campaigns. For the 1903 election, his letter to the burgesses of Newton Ward and campaign fliers emphasised his success in promoting moral instruction and his intention to promote purely secular education in council schools. His election flier for the 1904 municipal election contained a three-page moral lesson. And in a letter to the electors of Castle Ward in October 1907 he cited "sound training in manners and civic duties" as part of a good secular education.[95]

On the Education Committee itself, Gould did not introduce any more motions on moral instruction. However, moral instruction was contained within his three unsuccessful motions in favour of purely secular education in elementary schools, on 26 June 1905, 22 July 1907, and 22 February 1909. For instance, on 26 June 1905, Gould argued that the system of religious instruction drew "a sinister line ... between the two sets of schools." Instead he advocated "adequate provision for the moral training of the children, daily and systematically," drawing attention to the preface of the 1904 Code and noting that "many educational authorities were giving increased attention to this subject."[96] He also, as he had done on the School Board, brought morality into discussions on other issues, such as the provision of meals and evening continuation classes.[97]

Gould spoke publicly in favour of moral instruction on a number of occasions. For instance, at the first annual meeting of the Civic Education League in 1908 Gould outlined his policy

---

[93] Gould helped set up the *Leicester Reasoner*, a 'newsletter' for the Secular Society, which ran from 1901 to 1903.
[94] Gould was reprimanded for this action at the School Management Committee. LSB School Management Committee Minutes, 27 October 1902, 19D59/VI/20.
[95] LSS Scrapbook of Printed Material issued by the Society 1843-1908; LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[96] The content of the Education Committee discussions is gleaned from a report dated 27 June 1905 on the meeting, source not identified, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06. It is probably not coincidental that Gould's strategy here mirrored the Moral Instruction League's campaign to get moral instruction included as part of a secular system of education. See Chapter Two, p.69.
[97] *School Government Chronicle*, 14 September 1907, pp.219-21, 5 October 1907, pp.276-77.

of "a complete series of moral lessons from the bottom to the top of the school, the teacher being free to cull his examples and precepts from every available source."[98] Gould also used the local press to promote moral instruction and keep the issue in the public mind. He wrote letters and articles about his secular education resolutions in the local press.[99] He wrote a letter drawing readers' attention to the provisions for moral instruction in the 1904 Code. In 1907 he wrote another letter reporting that Henry Major had published a volume of moral instruction lessons and encouraging readers to join the Moral Instruction League. (Gould wrote that Major had produced this volume "for the League", but no evidence was found in League sources that this was the case). And in one of many letters on 'the education difficulty' in which Gould goaded passive resisters and pressed his claims for secular education, he also emphasised the importance of moral instruction and Leicester's actions in this field.[100]

Local opinion on Gould as a person and on his actions was mixed. He irritated other School Board and Education Committee members with his impatience and objections to established policies and procedures. In the satirical style he reserved for his contributions to the secularist and socialist press, Gould reported that Dr Bennett "had become utterly sick of hearing my speeches on various subjects, which I simply brought up in order to attract the public."[101] He alienated members of the Secular Society through his occasionally authoritarian behaviour – for instance over the sale of alcohol – and also through the amount of time and attention he spent in municipal work (which he justified to the Society on the grounds that his work meant there was a prominent secularist voice in municipal affairs).[102] In the local press he was described as a "crank" and a "faddist", and criticised for not

---

[98] Educational Notes by Alpha, *Leicester Daily Post*, 1 April 1908, LEC Press Cuttings Book 1903-08. The Civic Education League, which first met in January 1907, was founded "to influence public opinion and the Government with a view to limiting public instruction in all state-aided schools to secular subjects (including moral teaching) authorised by the Code of the Board of Education, and strengthening the sense of citizenship in the children of the nation." Civic Education League Poster, April 1907; letter by Henry Hancock, 15 January 1907, source not identified, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1906-08.

[99] See *Leicester Daily Post*, 11 January 1904; letter by F.J. Gould, source not identified, 30 May 1904, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06; letter by F.J. Gould, source not identified, 25 September 1906, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1906-08.

[100] Letter by F.J. Gould, source and date not identified, c. January/February 1907, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1906-08; Letter by F.J. Gould, 7 April 1905, source not identified, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06.

[101] F.J. Gould, Our School Board, *Leicester Pioneer*, July 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.

[102] Nash, *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, pp.67-68; LSS Minute Book, 16 November 1904, 1902-43, 10D68/4.

"trimming his sails to the breath of public opinion".[103] One contributor crowed at his defeat in the 1907 election, describing him as "out of touch with the majority of electors, enabled to invest his own distinctive and unpopular views on religion, education and other subjects with a weight out of proportion to his representative significance."[104] Others believed that Gould played a useful role in generating debate and interest in educational matters, through "the stirring up that he occasions now and then, and ... the bringing-out of some very interesting information, and the elucidation of both popular and unpopular views."[105] Yet even those who respected his views felt that his belligerent tactics could be counterproductive.[106] The contrast with George Dixon's prominent position in Birmingham life and reputation for persuading others through his own moderation is clear.

Implementation and impact in Birmingham and Leicester

Having discussed the introduction and promotion of moral instruction lessons in Birmingham and Leicester I will now turn to implementation. Unfortunately, there is little evidence as to how the regulations concerning moral instruction were interpreted in schools. As the next chapter will discuss further, there is only a handful of references to moral lessons in the log books and inspection reports examined. It is hard to tell how schools interpreted the regulations. In Birmingham, the evidence available suggests that most schools more or less complied with the Board's regulations, but the timing and frequency of lessons could vary. Pupil teachers' responses to an examination question on moral instruction (cited in the Chair's annual address of 1885) reveal that moral lessons were given twice a week in one school, once a week in another, and once a fortnight to pupils assembled in the gallery in a third. In 1893 the Board's regulations were amended stipulating that teachers were not obliged to give more than one moral lesson a week. The list of moral duties to be covered in lessons, however, was identical to that in the original circular to head teachers in 1879.[107] It is also unclear exactly how long moral lessons were continued. There is no reference to their being phased out in the Education Committee minutes. The latest definite reference to moral

---

[103] *Leicester Advertiser*, 1 July 1905, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06; *Leicester Guardian*, 7 March 1903, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03.
[104] *Leicester Daily Post*, 2 November 1907, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1906-08.
[105] *Leicester Free Press*, 8 February 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[106] For instance see the comments on Gould's actions on behalf of a Republican teacher suspended for insubordination in the *Leicester Guardian*, 12 July 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03.
[107] BSB Minutes, 2 December 1893, SB/B/1/1/11; *Address delivered to Birmingham School Board*, 15 January 1885, pp.9-10.

lessons found in Birmingham City Archives is in a trainee teacher's Record Book of Practical Teaching which refers to moral lessons taking place in 1916.[108]

For Leicester, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we can assume that as in Birmingham the Board's directive was usually followed but with some variation in the timing and frequency of lessons. Again it is unclear how long moral instruction lessons remained part of the elementary school curriculum. The latest definite reference to the lessons found is in the *Report on the Work of the Education Committee* of 1912 which states that "Moral Instruction is given in all Council Schools on the lines of the Syllabus adopted some years ago by the School Board". There is no mention of moral instruction lessons being stopped in the full Education Committee and Elementary Education Sub-Committee minutes up to 1919. However, Gould wrote in 1929 that "the plan was carried out for several years,"[109] suggesting that lessons had been dropped by this date, but unfortunately he does not state exactly when.

There is also little evidence on how lessons were given in schools or on lesson quality. For Birmingham there are the chairman's annual addresses. In his 1881 annual address, Dixon reported on head teachers' views on moral instruction in their schools. "Nearly all the Teachers believe that they are productive of good results," he claimed. One teacher spoke of "a greater abstention from copying; an increasing number of apologies for wrong-doing ... a more frequent interference in the prevention of quarrels amongst the junior scholars", while another noted that "the bigger boys ... acquire a more thoughtful and considerate tone". Three head teachers, Dixon reported, had voiced doubts over the usefulness of moral lessons, with one stating that the children profited more from "reference to different morals as circumstances arise." (Here Dixon commented that "the moral lessons were not intended to be in lieu of, but in addition to, comments on the events of School life.")[110] Dixon expressed satisfaction with these results: "it was to be expected that these lessons, which are the most difficult of all for the young teachers, would be but imperfectly given at first. I look

---

[108] *George H. Keen's Culham College Record Book of Practical Teaching 1914-16*, MS 1378, BCA.
[109] LEC, *Report on the Work of the Education Committee from the Appointed Day*, p.12; Gould, *Moral Education*, p.6.
[110] The Moral Instruction League later used the same argument (see Chapter Two, p.57).

forward with confidence to a gradual improvement in the character of the lessons."[111] This comment suggests initial problems with implementation. There is no later comparable report from which we can assess whether Dixon's confidence about an improvement in quality was justified.

Nevertheless, there are some indications in Dixon's chairman's address of 15 January 1885. "Systematic moral instruction continues to be successfully given in the Board schools," he said. On this occasion he reported on pupil teachers' responses to examination questions on moral instruction in their schools. The responses again suggest an impact on pupils' behaviour in school, and the use of moral lessons to assist general school discipline. One pupil teacher wrote: "If the lesson is 'obedience' they seem to see more clearly why they should be obedient, and how wrong to be disobedient, and are in future more obedient when you refer to the Moral Lesson when anyone is disobedient." Another noted that moral lessons on, for instance, gentleness and kindness, reduced rough behaviour in the playground. It was also observed that pupils enjoyed the moral lessons. "They listen with careful interest and attention" said one pupil teacher, while another noted that "the children seem to enjoy the lessons as if it did not belong to learning; they look upon them as a pleasure."[112]

The next time moral instruction was mentioned in a chairman's annual report was by the Reverend EFM MacCarthy in 1899. He did not discuss the quality of moral lessons, but his comments indicate problematic implementation in one respect: teachers were confused as to whether or not they could use the Bible as an illustration for moral instruction lessons. The Reverend MacCarthy clarified the Board's position: "beyond forbidding a sectarian use of the Bible, the Board considers the teachers to be at liberty to use the Bible as a source of illustration in connection with moral instruction."[113]

There is further evidence on implementation in Birmingham in FH Hayward's *Reform of Moral and Biblical Education*, published in 1902. This evidence is similarly mixed. Hayward cited a teacher who said that moral lessons were sometimes given in a perfunctory and listless

---

[111] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 20 January 1881, pp.19-20.
[112] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 15 January 1885, pp.9-10.
[113] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 28 November 1899, p.13.

manner, and were even omitted when "more pressing" work demanded attention. He also quoted an inspector from the district who argued that the benefit derived from moral lessons "permeated every phase of school life."[114] There is no equivalent evidence from Birmingham Education Committee after 1903, but its attitude to moral instruction can be surmised from other sources. Nevertheless, in keeping with the high degree of continuity in personnel and in educational focus between the School Board and Education Committee,[115] moral instruction appears to have continued much as before under the new regime.

Evidence from Leicester is also limited. Leicester Education Committee's inspectors were instructed in 1905 to "deal with the subject of Moral Instruction when reporting on the individual schools."[116] These reports have not survived, but Henry Major's reports to the Elementary Education Committee in November 1905 and December 1906 were summarised in other sources. Major's reports echoed to a remarkable degree evidence from Birmingham 20 years earlier. On the one hand, Major reported that moral lessons were "much liked by the pupils" who often selected them when given a choice of activity, and that teachers appreciated the break in their routine. On the other hand, some head teachers felt that moral lessons had been of no benefit. Also, Major noted that moral instruction was often difficult for young teachers and particularly pupil teachers, requiring substantial "powers of expression and larger outlook on human conduct", and a departure from their usual methods of teaching other subjects. Major offered suggestions to assist teachers: illustrations should come before the didactic portion in lessons, and lessons should be conversational in style (in schools where they already were, he argued, moral instruction was found to be "an auxiliary to maintenance of school discipline"). He concluded that, despite these difficulties, the introduction of lessons had generally been valuable, but warned that habits could take a long time to form and lessons might be counteracted by "antagonistic home influence".[117]

---

[114] Hayward, *Reform*, pp.85-86.
[115] Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.422-25; Upton, *op cit.*, p.162.
[116] LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 3 April 1905, 19D59/VII/35, RLLR.
[117] Henry Major was requested to report to the Elementary Education Committee on moral instruction in Leicester's schools in November 1905, December 1906, and December 1908. LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 16 October 1905, 20 November 1905, 23 November 1908, 7 December 1908, 1905-07, 1907-09, 19D59/VII/35-36. The content of these reports was not included in the minutes, but the 1905 and 1906 reports were summarised in *Ethical World*, 2 December 1905, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1903-06 and Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.28-29 respectively.

The gravest concerns about the effectiveness of moral lessons in Leicester's elementary schools were expressed by Gould himself. Gould was having doubts as early as November 1902. Having heard four moral lessons given in board schools, he suggested that one lesson a week was enough under present conditions: "To give a good moral lesson entails more thought and care than giving a Bible lesson; and we must allow considerable time to pass before attempting to enlarge the system now in force, in order that the teachers may become familiar with the method of reasoning on conduct without appeals to theological sanctions."[118] In 1910 he acknowledged that Leicester's teachers were unenthusiastic: "truth compels me to state that the teachers did not receive [moral instruction] cordially, the main reason being that it seemed to be an intrusive addition to an overcrowded time-table."[119]

Perhaps Gould's comment was inspired by the local head teachers' request that the Board's regulations on moral instruction be rescinded on 15 February 1909. Ironically, Gould and his Labour colleagues had campaigned to establish the annual conference with the Board at which this request was made. The head teachers' arguments echoed some of the criticisms of Gould's resolution in 1901 and also the stance on moral instruction in some educational periodicals:

> The daily moral training in school, based as far as possible on the incidents of school life, is productive of more benefit than the weekly formal lessons at present required to be given. So much depends on the character and conduct of the teachers, who ask that they might be allowed to treat the subject in their own way.

The Board decided not to alter the regulations but stated its willingness "to consider any further definite statement which the head teachers may desire to make on the subject".[120] There is no evidence of further action by the head teachers. Nonetheless, the issue being raised in this forum seven years after moral instruction lessons had been introduced indicates that there was still entrenched opposition to moral lessons, and a perception that incidental approaches to moral training were more effective.

---

[118] *Leicester Reasoner*, November 1902, p.2.
[119] *Ethical World*, 15 February 1910, p.23.
[120] LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, Report of Annual Conference between Elementary Schools Sub-Committee and representative Head teachers, 15 February 1909, 19D59/VII/36; LEC Minutes, 24 May 1909, 19D59/VII/31, RLLR. For an example of views in the educational press see *The Head Teacher*, 17 July 1906, p.58.

What impact, then, did the introduction of moral lessons have, in Birmingham and Leicester and elsewhere? The sources examined do not allow us to make strong causal claims. Still, they highlight three possible dimensions of impact: influence on local attitudes about moral education; influence on pupils' behaviour; and how far moral education permeated local debates.

First I will turn to local opinion. In both Birmingham and Leicester, the debates around the introduction of moral lessons indicate clearly that many within and beyond the School Board had reservations about Dixon and Gould's proposals, although these proposals were in the end carried. These initial reservations about a purely secular approach to moral training persisted. In Birmingham, the Church Party argued consistently that in order to improve the moral training offered by board schools it was necessary to introduce 'definite' religious instruction.[121] Church Party members argued in 1886, as they had argued in 1879, that the Bible should be used to support and to illustrate moral teaching.[122] Morality was also prominent in the debates in 1901 around the introduction of 'unsectarian' Bible teaching into Birmingham's elementary schools, as indicated in an editorial in the conservative *Daily Gazette*:

> The slum child is never under a higher influence except during school hours, and while the Bible is shunned in these schools thousands of little ones grow up in heathen ignorance. They never hear a hymn or a prayer, or the name of God except in oaths. Why marvel that their conduct in dark alleys is too foul for description, and that the language they use in the streets is a horror to decent ears?

Religious teaching, according to the *Gazette*, was therefore necessary for the 'slum child'.[123] Supporters of voluntary schools in the late 1890s similarly argued that "a purely Secular Education can never produce the highest type of character."[124] A substantial body of opinion in Birmingham remained convinced that moral instruction was only possible on a religious basis, and twenty years of moral lessons failed to persuade otherwise. Given the deep clefts

---

[121] The Church Party's efforts to reintroduce religious instruction were unsuccessful when they were in a minority in 1885, but they succeeded, after protracted debate, when they had an effective majority in 1901.
[122] *School Board Chronicle*, 23 January 1886, pp.83-85, 13 February 1886, pp.174-75.
[123] *Daily Gazette*, 30 March 1901, BSB Newspaper Cuttings Scrapbook December 1900-May 1901, SB/B/1/11/12.
[124] Voluntary Schools Defence Agency, *Why Should We Support Voluntary Schools?*, Pamphlet 4, 7 December 1895, J.H. Lloyd Letters, Leaflets, Cuttings 1867-1902.

over religion in the city and the way these were reflected in School Board politics, this was probably inevitable.

In Leicester, too, after Gould's third resolution in favour of purely secular elementary education was rejected in 1909, a correspondent in the local press argued that there was no point his pursuing the matter further: "Jews, Roman Catholics, Anglicans, the majority of Nonconformists, and many who belong to none of the great orders, desire that the moral code on which they desire their children's education to be based is that found in the Bible."[125] By 1910 Gould himself was ambivalent about the value of campaigning for compulsory moral lessons: "unless the heart and imagination of parents and teachers are quickened by the idea of ethical education, no amount of official directions will avail."[126]

A second possible dimension of impact is the effect on pupil behaviour. Negative comments on pupil behaviour outside the school persisted many years after moral lessons were introduced in Birmingham and Leicester. The *Daily Gazette's* comments in 1901 about the foul conduct and bad language of children in Birmingham slums have already been noted. In Leicester, too, the Elementary Education Sub-Committee received a number of communications from teachers and from local organisations and individual citizens complaining about immoral behaviour among young people in the town. In June 1914, for instance, the "conference of Clergy, Ministers, and Citizens of Leicester" complained about the "conduct of many young people of both sexes in our streets" and urged upon the education authority "the need of further specialised teaching in our schools on morals and citizenship to counteract the present laxity, intemperance and bad language of many of our young people soon after reaching the age of leaving school."[127]

If pupil behaviour is deemed an indicator of the value of moral training, these comments might indicate that moral lessons had little effect. Yet Gould and Major, along with other advocates of moral instruction lessons, saw these lessons as necessary but not sufficient for

---

[125] Education Notes by Alpha, *Leicester Daily Post*, 24 February 1909, LEC Press Cuttings Book 1908-09, 19D59/VII/323.
[126] *Ethical World*, 15 February 1910, p.23.
[127] LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 15 June 1914, 19D59/VII/38. See also LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 19 February 1912, 17 March 1913, 19D59/VII/37-38 for similar complaints.

an effective moral education.[128] A criticism of Gould's resolution in 1901 had been that moral lessons in school would not work if children were brought up in "an atmosphere of immorality" at home.[129] It might be unfair to dismiss moral lessons as ineffective if they were never expected to work on their own. More positively, the evidence on implementation suggests that moral instruction led to improved discipline and pupil behaviour inside school.[130] Evidence from Birmingham and Leicester, then, suggests that moral instruction lessons appeared more effective if judged by criteria internal to the elementary school than if judged by external criteria.

A third possible dimension is the prominence of moral instruction in local educational debates. In Birmingham, moral instruction was mentioned infrequently in School Board meetings and publications. It appeared only twice in the annual reports of the work of the Board (in 1879 and in 1906). Its omission from nearly all summaries of the Board's work and from later histories has already been noted. Dixon mentioned moral instruction in three of his annual addresses.[131] There was relatively little debate on the issue in the local press, except directly after the School Board meeting in May 1879.[132]

There was also little debate on moral instruction on Birmingham Education Committee after 1903. The Education Committee's attitude to moral instruction was ambivalent. It announced proudly in 1906 that Birmingham had provided for systematic moral instruction many years before the Board of Education. Yet it decided not to send a representative to the International Moral Education Congress in 1908, and decided not to invite FJ Gould to give a demonstration lesson.[133]

---

[128] See also Chapter Two, p.57.
[129] Moral Education, c.October 1901, source not identified, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902.
[130] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board*, 20 January 1881, pp.19-20, 15 January 1885, pp.9-10; *Ethical World*, 2 December 1905; Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.28-29.
[131] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board*, 6 November 1879, p.13, 20 January 1881, pp.19-20, 15 January 1885, pp.9-10.
[132] See editorial comments in *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879; *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 2 May 1879; *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 2 May 1879.
[133] BEC, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished by the Committee During the Year ended November 9th 1906*, p.17, BCC/BH/1/1/5/4, BCA; BEC Elementary Education Committee Minutes, 17 September 1908, BCC/BH/2/1/1/2, 18 February 1915, BCC/BH/2/1/1/7, BCA.

Still, moral lessons were given from 1879 to an unspecified date sometime after 1916. Some benefits must have been perceived for the scheme to continue this long, and to survive the "hostile majority" on the School Board of 1900 to 1903.[134] Indeed, a report in the *Daily Gazette* argued: "If education is given throughout the schools of the country on the lines adopted by Birmingham, the tone of moral life should be appreciably advanced."[135] Also, as the next chapter suggests, silence in the sources might not mean lack of impact, but might instead mean unproblematic implementation and shared understanding that did not require discussion. Silence could therefore indicate impact rather than lack of it.

In Leicester, moral instruction was frequently raised as an issue in the School Board and in the local press. Much of this debate and press coverage was generated by Gould's tireless efforts at promoting moral instruction. His actions on the School Board and Education Committee and his numerous letters and articles in the local press ensured that the local authorities and the general population were aware of moral instruction as an issue, even if they did not support his favoured methods. This assessment may be skewed by the sources available. Gould assiduously collated cuttings from the local press. These have been deposited in the local record office. The collection of School Board newspaper cuttings in Birmingham is rather sparse by comparison. Still, even bearing this caveat in mind, moral instruction seems to have been debated more in Leicester while Gould was there than it was in Birmingham at any time.

Gould believed that public interest in, and debate about, municipal affairs were essential for a healthy democracy. His incessant and vocal contributions at School Board and Education Committee meetings, his many letters and articles in the local press, his frequent speeches at the Secular Hall (and other local platforms) were in part an attempt to generate this sort of interest and debate. These contributions also enabled Gould to ensure that people heard about his work in Leicester with the Secular Society and on the School Board and Town Council. Gould's time in Leicester was a launch-pad for his national and international career: his activities there enhanced his reputation as an educationalist and campaigner. Gould's

---

[134] Hayward, *Reform*, pp.85-86.
[135] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 14 July 1908.

Leicester experiences undoubtedly also informed his later ideas and activities, and had a definite impact on his later career.

Once Gould left Leicester moral instruction appears to have been less prominent in local educational debates. Moral lessons were not mentioned by any of the individuals or organisations drawing attention to young people's bad behaviour between 1912 and 1914 or indeed in the minutes of the Elementary Schools Sub-Committee meetings at which these concerns were discussed.[136] This lack of discussion might be related to changes in personnel: only four members of the Education Committee in 1912 were also members when moral instruction lessons were introduced in 1901-02.[137] The silence does not necessarily mean that the correspondents or Committee members were not aware of moral lessons, and could, arguably, reflect acceptance rather than resistance. However, it does suggest that moral lessons were not in the forefront of the minds of the Education Committee, or the wider public, at this time. Just as it needed someone with Gould's drive and determination to push the local educational authorities beyond general discussion of the importance of moral instruction and the possibility of moral lessons to a definite regulation, it also needed Gould's persistence to keep moral instruction in the public mind. Apparently, no one else in Leicester took on this role after Gould left.

Impact beyond Birmingham and Leicester

The introduction of moral lessons by Birmingham School Board in 1879 was the subject of a question in the House of Commons and was reported in the national papers and educational periodicals.[138] Moreover, the reference to the actions of Birmingham School Board being the subject of discussion in the "drawing room" in an editorial in the *National Schoolmaster* implies debate in middle-class circles beyond that in the press.[139] Dixon's lecture in 1879 and

---

[136] Note that the minutes of Leicester Elementary Schools Sub-Committee do not record full discussions.
[137] Gill, *op cit.*, p.159 lists candidates in 1900; LEC, *Report of the Work of the Education Committee from the Appointed Day*, pp.38-41 lists members between 1903 and 1912.
[138] Hansard, 3, CCLXVI, 12 May 1879, cols.125-27; *The Times*, 5 May 1879, p.11, 13 May 1879, p.9, 4 July 1879, p.9; *The Schoolmaster*, 17 May 1879, p.541, 2 August 1879, pp.115-16; *The National Schoolmaster*, June 1879, pp.121-22, 137-38, August 1879, pp.184-87.
[139] *The National Schoolmaster*, August 1879, p.184.

chairman's addresses were also disseminated through the educational press.[140] There was, therefore, the possibility of influencing a wider audience.

Much of the comment was negative. "There are only two courses to be followed on the question – religious instruction, or the absence of religious instruction", stated the *National Schoolmaster*. "This bastard system of some unknown "Code of Moral Ethics" will satisfy nobody."[141] The President of the Committee of Council, Lord Hamilton, responded sarcastically to questions in the House of Commons. He claimed to know nothing about the proposed scheme except that older children would be put "through a slight course of the Acts of Parliament", and stated further that "if the moral condition of the children in the Birmingham schools be thoroughly satisfactory, I cannot understand why the chairman made the motion which he did."[142] The Reverend HW Crosskey commented on the "misunderstandings" evident in these responses to Birmingham's action, which he felt were rooted in "the antagonism that was felt throughout the country to the policy of the Birmingham Board."[143]

It is not clear whether Birmingham's actions led directly to activity on the part of other School Boards. On the one hand, Huddersfield and Leicester School Boards did not acknowledge Birmingham as a precedent for their introducing moral lessons in 1889 and 1901 respectively, and no other Boards in Harrold Johnson's *Return* stated that they took their lead from Birmingham.[144] On the other hand, Hackwood's *Notes of Lessons*, the moral instruction text adopted for use in Birmingham schools, was one of the books adopted by Huddersfield School Board in 1889 so there may be an indirect link here. Hackwood's *Notes* were also used by a number of other Boards, and considered but in the end not used by Smethwick and Leicester School Boards (and possibly others we do not know of).[145] There

---

[140] For instance, Dixon's lecture to the Birmingham Teacher's Association in October 1879 was the subject of a leading article – 'Some Truths from Birmingham' – in *The Schoolmaster*, 25 October 1879, pp.453-54 while the chair's annual addresses in which he mentioned moral instruction were summarised in the *School Board Chronicle* (29 January 1881, pp.106-07, 24 January 1885, pp.90-91 and 14 November 1891, pp.583-84).
[141] *National Schoolmaster*, June 1879, p.138.
[142] Hansard, 3, CCLXVI, 12 May 1879, cols.126-27.
[143] *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 4 July 1879.
[144] Dewsbury, *op cit.*, pp.25-27; *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[145] Johnson indicates that Hackwood's *Notes* were used by at least four education authorities – Birmingham, Cheshire County, Gosport and Alverstoke, and Huddersfield – as late as 1908. Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.8, 13, 21, 26. Hayward wrote that "Hackwood morality" was debated on Smethwick School Board in 1883,

was nothing in the reviews in the educational press examined or in the printed version of Hackwood's *Notes* itself which linked the book to Birmingham School Board, so it is possible that other Boards used the book but were unaware of its origin. In this way, Birmingham's 'code of moral ethics' may have influenced more provision in practice than is at first apparent.

Birmingham's efforts were either forgotten or ignored by the emerging moral instruction movement of the late 1890s and 1900s. The Moral Instruction League, as noted already, did not initially acknowledge the actions of Birmingham, Burton-on-Trent or Huddersfield School Boards, taking its inspiration from Felix Adler and the ethical culture movement in America.[146] It is telling that the obituary of George Dixon in *Ethical World* discussed his work campaigning for a secular education system but failed to mention moral instruction.[147]

The introduction of moral instruction lessons in Leicester received limited press coverage outside the city. There were no reports in the national papers or parliamentary questions. In the educational press there was only the report in the *School Board Chronicle* which commented in a fairly neutral manner on a "scheme of considerable interest."[148]

Moral instruction in Leicester was noted by secularists, perhaps unsurprisingly with Gould's connections. Gould's efforts in Leicester had an impact on the ethical movement generally and on the Moral Instruction League in particular. The Moral Instruction League, as noted in Chapter Two, were encouraged by Gould's election success.[149] However, HH Quilter, another member of the ethical movement, was less positive. Although he commended Gould's "tactful" efforts, he feared that the compromise reached could "[play] into the hands of our opponents." Quilter saw events in Birmingham as a warning: "When ... our forces are scattered, then the clerical party (as in Birmingham) will, at a moment when we are off our guard, quietly stop "all that nonsense about morals" and revert to the previous state of

---

and attracted the notice of high profile critics (like the "episcopal dignitaries" at the Folkestone Church Congress in 1892) and high profile supporters (like Cardinal Manning). Hayward, *Reform*, p.124.

[146] See Chapter Two, p.56.

[147] *Ethical World*, 29 January 1898, p.67.

[148] *School Board Chronicle*, 19 April 1902, p.388.

[149] *Ethical World*, 2 February 1901, p.70.

affairs." He argued that the League should not follow Gould's lead, but, as indicated in Chapter Two, his pleas were not heard.[150]

Moreover, Leicester's lead appears to have been followed by more authorities than Birmingham. This was Gould's intention: he published the debate on moral instruction at the School Board in pamphlet form for distribution outside the city in the hope that it would influence School Boards and teachers elsewhere.[151] The Moral Instruction League also promoted Leicester as a model for other School Boards and Education Committees. Three other local authorities had adopted the Leicester syllabus by the time Johnson compiled his *Return* in 1908: Bradford in 1903, Bexhill on Sea in 1904 and Margate in 1905.[152] Although Johnson might have overstated the extent to which Leicester directly influenced these other authorities, a combination of Gould's own campaigning, the Moral Instruction League's propaganda, and press reports undoubtedly influenced developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

How, then, are we to assess the introduction of moral lessons in Birmingham in 1879 and Leicester in 1901? This examination highlights the significance of both local contexts and individual personalities. One would expect that Dixon, with his power base in local Liberal politics and his influence as chair of the School Board, would have had an easier time than Gould, independent candidate, secularist, newly resident in Leicester, in introducing moral instruction. However, in the 1870s Dixon was working as a pioneer in relative isolation, whereas by 1901 Gould could build on previous local exposure to questions of moral education and on the coordinating efforts of the Moral Instruction League. Both struggled, but succeeded, in getting a controversial measure introduced.

---

[150] *Ethical World*, 19 October 1901, p.561. Quilter seems to have thought, erroneously, that moral instruction lessons were stopped in Birmingham when religious instruction was introduced. Quilter, an active member of the Moral Instruction League, wrote moral instruction columns for the *Ethical World*, wrote at least one moral instruction book – H.H. Quilter, *Onward and Upward. A Book for Boys and Girls*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1902 – and helped organise the Moral Instruction Circle (*Ethical World*, 15 October 1898, p.670).

[151] *Leicester Reasoner*, December 1901, p.6.

[152] Johnson, *Moral Instruction*, pp.xii, 8-9, 30. Bradford School Board's adoption of the Leicester syllabus (by seven votes to three) was reported in *Leicester Mercury*, 1 May 1903, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03.

The broader local contexts outlined in the previous chapter illuminate some of the factors which led to a concern over the moral condition of school pupils, and also some of the political and organisational features which facilitated the introduction of moral instruction on the elementary school curriculum (perhaps a Liberal-dominated School Board). However, the broader contexts do not explain everything. This investigation shows clearly that the particular individuals involved, their personalities, their local standing and status, and the strategies they adopted to promote and publicise moral instruction are highly significant in understanding local educational policy on moral instruction as it was enacted in Birmingham and Leicester School Boards and Education Committees. The networks on which Gould and Dixon were able to draw were part of the local context, but the way in which these networks were used depended on Gould and Dixon as individuals.

Moreover, although the immediate local contexts may have given local responses in Birmingham and Leicester a particular complexion, local responses echoed the arguments outlined in Chapter Two that were prevalent at the national level at the height of the Moral Instruction League's activity. There are also striking similarities in the evidence, limited as it is, on implementation in schools in Birmingham and Leicester, with the same good points and bad points indicated in both. Ideological questions and pedagogical issues associated with moral instruction were rooted in local concerns and educational systems, but also transcended time and place.

These local studies reveal more about the nature of the 'struggle' for moral education than is evident from national sources alone. They indicate the strategies that underpinned the introduction of moral instruction lessons at the local level. They reveal that the introduction of moral lessons at the local level met with resistance, and required individuals with energy, and the ability both to manoeuvre through School Board and Education Committee politics and mobilise local opinion. These studies also indicate not only initial opposition, but continued resistance over the years, suggesting that the concerns voiced went beyond the initial difficulties of implementing a new subject. All the same, though evidence on effectiveness in schools was mixed, local educationalists in Birmingham and Leicester must have noted at least some benefits for moral instruction lessons to have continued as long as they did.

Yet the sources examined for this chapter – focused at the level of the School Board and Education Committee – reveal relatively little about what happened in individual schools, or about how moral instruction was associated with other forms of moral education. This requires different sources focused on the individual school, which will be analysed in the final chapter.

CHAPTER SIX:
MORAL EDUCATION IN BIRMINGHAM AND LEICESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS 1879-1918

Using log books and inspection reports from a sample of fourteen schools in Birmingham and Leicester, this chapter will investigate how far evidence from schools matches, or does not match, the intentions and expectations of pressure groups and policy makers, locally and nationally.[1] The sample aims to reflect the range of elementary education provision in the two cities, by including board and voluntary schools, schools located in central slum areas and wealthier suburbs, schools founded in the early nineteenth century and newer ones built in the 1880s and 1890s in areas of urban expansion.[2] These main sources are supplemented by additional sources from the local archives in Birmingham and Leicester and material from teachers' and pupils' autobiographies. The focus so far has been on moral instruction lessons. However, as noted already, moral instruction was only one, and by no means the most popular, approach to moral education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is fitting therefore to examine in this final chapter the ways in which a concern for moral education – broadly defined – was more generally manifested, and in particular through which aspects of schooling and through which activities it was worked out in practice.

This chapter starts with a broad exploration of school log books and inspection reports as evidence. Next, it examines what these sources reveal about attitudes to moral education, and the various activities and occasions (lessons, disciplinary systems, extra-curricular activities, special events) which were utilised for purposes of moral education. It concludes with a discussion of patterns of moral education provision in the sample of schools.

---

[1] See Barry Franklin's distinction between the *rhetorical curriculum* (recommendations and suggestions for what should be taught) and the *actual curriculum* (what was actually taught). Franklin, *op cit.*, pp.463, 475.
[2] See Appendix.

The sources: log books and inspection reports

School log books and inspection reports in this period were administrative documents, completed according to the requirements of the central education department. This is important, as their content was heavily influenced (though not dictated) by the purposes for which they were established.

Within the Education Code, the Committee of Council on Education issued instructions for filling in the school log book. The head teacher (or principal teacher) was required to make an entry at least once a week, with details on ordinary progress, staffing (appointments and terminations of appointments, staff absence), any deviations from the normal school timetable, any test marks, and any other issues or events deemed "worthy of comment". Teachers were also instructed not to enter "reflections or opinions of a general character".[3] These instructions explain the prominence of attendance and punctuality and examinations in reading, writing and arithmetic in the log books examined. They also explain the emphasis given to deviations from the normal timetable – outings, concerts, celebrations of special occasions, lessons which took place outside the school – while regular timetabled lessons including moral instruction were rarely mentioned, except in connection with inspection and examination, or test results. Similarly, such instructions limited lengthy discussion of the curriculum or educational ideas, which could presumably have counted as comments of a "general character."

Despite the existence of a set of guidelines, in the log books examined, head teachers interpreted their instructions in very different ways. While some made only very short factual entries, others were more effusive and descriptive, coming close to "reflections or opinions of a general character". Some teachers wrote long and elaborate entries – sometimes, it seems, simply to let off steam, sometimes to explain their actions when they had been criticised or thought they might be subject to criticism. This individualist approach meant that a change of head teacher could transform the nature of the log book entries for a particular school.

---

[3] These instructions on the completion of the log book were incorporated in the code of regulations for elementary schools from 1862. The appropriate extract from the Code was printed in the frontispiece of log books for Leicester School Board (for example, Medway Street School Log Book 1886-1903, DE3063/1, RLLR).

The content of inspection reports was similarly defined by their administrative purpose (i.e. their connection with a system of examination or, after 1895, with inspection and funding tied to examination or inspection). Inspectors were encouraged to keep their written reports brief, providing more detailed comments and feedback to the teaching staff and school managers in person during their visit to the school.[4] Head teachers were required to copy in summaries of inspection reports in their log books.[5]

As noted in Chapter Two, moral training was part of the inspectorate's remit. In 1878 the Committee of Council instructed inspectors to "lose no suitable opportunity of impressing upon both managers and teachers the great responsibility which rests upon them, over and above the intellectual teaching, in regard to the moral training of the children committed to their charge." Similarly, inspectors were required to take the quality of moral training into account when deciding whether to award the merit grant from 1882, and, when the funding system was altered in 1890, in their decisions as to whether to award the additional grant for discipline and organisation.[6]

However, the term moral training was mentioned explicitly only very rarely in the inspection reports examined. Of the school records in my sample there was only one comment on moral training: the 1892 inspection report for one Leicester board school noting that "the moral training and discipline are excellent".[7] Specific elements of moral training were noted, for instance training in cleanliness and considerate behaviour or good manners was commented on as a specific feature of three Leicester schools.[8] More often, comment was

---

[4] Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors under the Code of 1882, Circular No. 212, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1882-83*, London: HMSO, 1883, 150-68, p.159; Revised Instructions Issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors, and Applicable to the Code of 1897, 16 February 1897, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, 1896-97*, London: HMSO, 1897, 483-516, p.484.

[5] Most of the references to inspection reports in this chapter are taken from the summaries copied into school log books.

[6] *Circular of General Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors, 16 January 1878*, p.333; *Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors under the Code of 1882*, pp.157-59; Revised Instructions Issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors, and Applicable to the Code of 1890, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix, 1889-90*, London: HMSO, 1890, 171-86, pp.171, 180-81.

[7] Report on Medway Street Mixed School, 16 March 1892, LSB, *HMI Reports on Schools 1891-94*, 19D59/VI/95.

[8] St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, HMI Report 1914, DE3893/24, RLLR; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-1928, Report after the visit of HMI Mr Lott October 1908, 19D59/VII/438; Slater Street School Log Book (Girls) 1899-1924, HMI Report January 1909, DE4467/5, RLLR.

restricted to the funding category organisation and discipline, or the elusive concept of 'tone'. As will be discussed further, there may have been shared assumptions about morality and moral training behind this common language of good behaviour and the school environment.

Log books and inspection reports from fourteen schools in Leicester and Birmingham were examined, for as much of the period 1879-1918 as the sources allowed (some schools opened later than 1879; for others a complete run of log books or reports was not available). The aim was to examine different types of schools – board and voluntary, large and small, established at different times, and located in a range of socio-economic environments.[9] The type of school and socio-economic environment clearly had an impact on the education – including moral education – offered. These factors influenced the curriculum. In general, schools in better-off localities were able to offer a more varied curriculum compared to those in deprived areas struggling with issues such as irregular attendance. Regular lessons in religious knowledge and church services were common in voluntary but not in board schools. In addition, the socio-economic environment influenced the content of inspection reports, with inspectors noting the additional difficulties faced in schools located in deprived areas and making allowance for these conditions in their assessment of academic achievement.[10]

Beyond and within these wider environmental factors, individual head teachers could make a significant difference. This is clear both from log books and inspection reports. Sometimes the head teacher appeared to make more of an impact on the sort of education offered in schools than the type of school or socio-economic environment. There are several examples, for instance, of new head teachers rescuing struggling schools from failure. The contribution of other teachers is probably underplayed in log books and inspection reports which focused on the head teacher and their management of the school, but there are indications that other individual teachers could make important contributions to the life of individual schools.

---

[9] See Appendix for more details.

[10] In 1882 inspectors were instructed to make "reasonable allowance" for "special circumstances", including "a shifting, scattered, very poor or ignorant population; any circumstance which makes regular attendance exceptionally difficult; failure of health, or unforeseen changes among the teaching staff." *Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors under the Code of 1882*, p.157.

Nonetheless, teachers who did well in poor environments were apparently the exception rather than the rule.

Compared with other aspects of elementary schooling, moral education was not prominent in the log books or inspection reports examined. In most log books moral aspects of elementary schooling were explicitly discussed very rarely, if at all. The '3Rs' and regular testing were dominant concerns, particularly during the payment by results era. Attendance and punctuality were always issues – they affected a school's grant, both directly as a funding category and indirectly through their impact on pupils' ability to learn and pass the examination – but particularly so in the lead up to the annual examination. An exception was the headmaster of St Saviour's School, Leicester, who was interested in the broader educational implications (including the implications for his pupils' moral development) of almost every pedagogical innovation, change to the regular timetable, lecture or educational visit which he mentioned in his log book. Inspection reports usually addressed the funding category of discipline and organisation briefly, often using the concept of 'tone', but focused considerably more attention on academic attainment (and from the 1890s, more broadly, on teaching methods).

This relative silence on moral education could be a consequence of some of the attitudes to moral education already noted in this thesis: that it is best done informally through a process of osmosis and to formalise it would remove any subtlety or emotive power,[11] that it is something automatic and even natural for 'good' teachers.[12] Also, shared assumptions may not have been mentioned explicitly. This may explain why moral aspects of education do not feature more explicitly in the sources used. Moreover, these sources were chiefly administrative in nature, established for limited and clearly defined purposes. They offered little space for detailed reflection on educational ideas, on the relationship between the school and the outside world, or on the influence of the school on the future life of its pupils, the community and the country. Alternatively, this silence may also have been a function of what was actually important in the day to day running of the school, with moral education receiving less attention than what was funded and inspected.

---

[11] For example, see *The Head Teacher*, 17 July 1906, pp.57-58.
[12] See Chapters Two and Five on these issues.

Approaches to moral education in Birmingham and Leicester elementary schools

Despite this lack of explicit discussion, it is possible to reconstruct practices and activities which contributed to the moral education offered in elementary schools. I have identified practices and elements of elementary schooling which the education department in London, members of Birmingham and Leicester School Boards and Education Committees, and other educationalists, saw as significant for pupils' moral training and development. Occasionally these practices were discussed explicitly as moral education in the sources examined, though often they were not labelled as such. This was, perhaps, inevitable if these practices were seen as part of the 'natural' process of osmosis described above. There is a risk inherent in this approach of making incorrect assumptions about the intentions and attitudes of teachers and inspectors. Nevertheless, my assumptions are based on the ideas of educational professionals at the time.

Moral education was approached in various ways, most of which were instituted during the School Board era: through elements of the timetabled curriculum (including moral instruction lessons and drill); and through extra-curricular or occasional activities (such as organised games, penny banks, temperance lectures, outings to the countryside, exhibitions, or other places of educational interest, and patriotic celebrations). Some of these approaches were made compulsory by the Leicester and Birmingham School Boards (including moral instruction lessons and drill), while others (including organised games and outings) were left to the initiative of the school. Leicester and Birmingham School Boards also instituted prize schemes for attendance and punctuality in all schools, while schools established their own systems of reward and punishment. Some of these strategies were aimed primarily at the maintenance of school discipline, whereas others were intended to develop the qualities deemed necessary in the good citizen of the future, though of course the two aims overlapped.

The school environment and community: 'Tone' and the character of the teacher

The tone of the school and the character of the teacher are extremely common motifs in discussions of moral education in this period; so common that it seems imperative to

investigate how they may have operated within the school. Tone will be addressed first. It is an elusive concept, often used but rarely defined in the sources examined. Contemporary educationalists offer some guidance. Phillip Boswood Ballard (Inspector of Schools for London County Council 1906-30) considered what tone meant in his autobiography. "How many an older inspector has talked glibly about tone and discipline and yet has failed to distinguish between the two" he wrote. He cited Sir Marchant Williams (Inspector for London School Board) on this issue:

> The prominent outward result of a harsh and repressive system of discipline is an unhealthy *tone*. This term is not easy to define, although, to the practised observer, it is easy to detect. It bears the same relation to discipline that *timbre*, in musical language, does to pitch. It is something that pervades the whole atmosphere of the school, and is felt almost as readily as seen. The usual accompaniments of a bad tone are an unnatural nervousness on the part of the scholars in the presence of the teacher (which, in his absence, is invariably replaced by excessive rudeness and misconduct), a want of readiness and elasticity in yielding obedience to the rules of the school, a want of loyalty to the teachers, and an absence of sympathy with one another.

Ballard also described a school he came across while an inspector, "ruled entirely by fear," which had received uniformly excellent reports and was admired by a number of other inspectors for its quiet and orderliness, high academic standards in mechanical arithmetic, exceptional neatness in handwriting, but which he believed "had lost its own soul."[13] In Ballard's view, then, tone was associated with the atmosphere of the school, of which discipline was a necessary but not sufficient condition.

How was tone used in the inspection reports and log books examined? In some inspection reports tone was linked specifically with discipline or order (suggesting that inspectors did indeed compound or elide these concepts), for example: "the tone and discipline are as good as ever"; "the tone and order of this school are highly praiseworthy"; "discipline and tone are good except in the lowest class where there was some copying."[14] Similarly, tone in log books could be associated with the disciplinary ability of individual teachers, as in the following

---

[13] P. Boswood Ballard, *Things I Cannot Forget*, London: University of London Press, 1937, pp.158-59, 170-71. See also the views of Mr Capel, HMI for Coventry, outlined in *East Central Division: General Report for the Year 1887, by the Rev. D.J. Stewart*, London: HMSO, 1888, p.24 and discussions in the educational press (e.g. *The School Guardian*, 28 February 1903, p.173).

[14] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, Report for Year ended 31 August 1894, DE4467/2; Slater Street School Log Book (Girls)1899-1924, HMI Report 1909; BSB, *Inspector of School's Report 1900-03*, Report for Severn Street School (Girls), 30 April 1902, SB/B/3/5/1/2, BCA.

entry for St Mark's School, Leicester, in 1899: "I fear the III Standards are beyond her management, the discipline and the order and the general tone of the class is very unsatisfactory, she appears to be afraid of the boys and lets them see it." Teachers' actions were also associated with tone in a positive way. The headmaster of Cowper Street School, Birmingham, was "extremely gratified at the improved tone" among 'VI Girls' which he attributed to the influence of the teacher over the girls.[15]

At other times tone referred in a general sense to the atmosphere or 'spirit' in a school. HMI Lott's inspection report for Willow Street School, Leicester, in 1908 is illuminating:

> A cheerful and healthy tone pervades the school, and there is an excellent spirit of industry in each class. The children are keen and alert, and desirous of making progress. They are also well trained in habits of cleanliness and consideration for each other ... The teachers are earnest and painstaking and take great interest, both in and out of school hours, in the welfare of the scholars, many of whom come from somewhat poor homes and surroundings.[16]

Key aspects of atmosphere here are the attitudes of pupils and teachers, and how they relate to one another. Interactions between members of the school community appear central to this reading of tone.

Sources related to Floodgate Street School in Birmingham furnish further insights into what 'good tone' might consist of, even though the word 'tone' is not used. For this school, evidence from log books and inspection reports can be supplemented by pupils' views found in oral histories. Floodgate Street School was located in an extremely disadvantaged area of Birmingham.[17] Discipline in the school was evidently very strict: contrary to usual School Board regulations assistant teachers were allowed to inflict corporal punishment owing to the particular difficulties in that school.[18] Yet inspection reports refer to good relations between pupils and teachers, concern on the part of teachers for their pupils' welfare, and acts of kindness towards individual pupils. The school log books show that teachers themselves provided food and clothing to relieve the impoverished pupils during the winter months, and

---

[15] St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 15 May 1899, DE3893/23; Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 10 February 1914, S215/1/1, BCA.
[16] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, Report after the visit of HMI Mr Lott October 1908.
[17] See, for example, the discussion of problems in the Floodgate Street area in H.B. Wilson and G.B. Wilson, *"Drawn unto Death." A Statement of Facts for the Citizens of Birmingham*, Birmingham: Birmingham News and Printing, 1903, Birmingham History D/12, BLSL.
[18] BSB, *Inspector of School's Report 1896-98*, Report for Floodgate Street School, 14 October 1896, SB/B/3/5/1.

appealed for donations and relief, with one headmaster appealing for donations through the local press and to the Board of Guardians for relief.[19] Oral history interviews similarly reveal positive memories of teachers and their kindness to pupils, and tact in dealing with poverty. One ex-pupil recalled: "my father's friend happened to be headmaster at Floodgate Street. He said "George, let him come here, we'll look after him"." Another ex-pupil remembered "they were nice teachers ... they wouldn't embarrass you because you were poor, they'd be discrete. They'd leave maybe a sandwich, a bit of pudding."[20] These, I believe, are tantalising hints of what created a 'good tone'. The evidence seems to point to a positive atmosphere or an ethos which staff deliberately promoted and maintained, which was evident to those who visited or were part of the school, but was very difficult to put into words and therefore elusive in the sources examined.

What of the character of the teacher as an instrument of moral education? I have already noted both the ubiquity of character in the culture of the period, and, more particularly, how widespread was the perception that the character of the teacher was central to the effectiveness of moral training in elementary schools.[21] The Reverend MacCarthy's argument on Birmingham School Board in 1879, noted in Chapter Five, that the best moral instruction came from "the moral tone and character of the teachers" is typical.[22] Other historians have noted the importance of moral qualities in the teaching profession, both in teacher training and in the criteria set for applicants for teaching posts.[23] However, in the sources examined there is only one direct reference to a teacher's character. The headmaster of Slater Street School, Leicester, described one of his pupil-teachers who was soon to leave the school:

---

[19] For example, Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 9 March 1894, 15 February 1895, 15 March 1895, 30 October 1896, 18 January 1901, 31 January 1901, 1 February 1907, 8 March 1907, 19 January 1909, 15 November 1912, S68/2/1, BCA.

[20] Interview with Mr Lance Tudor, 5 November 1986, MS 1497/10/2; Interview with Mrs France, 2 February 1987, MS 1497/12/2, Digbeth and Deritend Local History Project MS1497, BCA.

[21] See the majority and especially the minority reports of the Cross Commission. *Final Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Elementary Education Acts*, London: HMSO, 1888, pp.126, 244-45; *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix, 1896-97*, London: HMSO, 1897, pp.v-vi; Sadler, *Introduction*, pp.xxxi-xxxiii.

[22] *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 May 1879.

[23] Horn, *Victorian and Edwardian Schoolchild*, pp.169-72; P. Gordon, *The Victorian School Manager*, London: Woburn Press, 1974, pp.45-48. See also Chapter Two, pp.47-48 for the emphasis on the teachers' character in government regulations on teacher training and pupil teachers and in instructions to inspectors.

'[Hills] is a useful teacher, and though at first he gave me a good deal of trouble, he has been on the whole a well behaved obedient boy. Industrious, he always was, and painstaking.'[24]

Nonetheless, the significance attached to character in the job application and appointment process is evident in the application form and references for one teacher kept in Birmingham City archives. A reference from one school where she had formerly worked described her as a "bright, energetic, painstaking teacher, a good disciplinarian", who "takes a real interest in the work of her own class and in that of the whole school". The head teacher at another school she taught at wrote that "her moral character is without blemish."[25] 'Moral character', it appears, referred not only to a teacher's demeanour within the classroom but also to their behaviour outside the school.[26]

These sources also allow us to explore how the teacher's character may have influenced pupils in practice. Log books and inspection reports suggest that this influence operated, at least in part, through the way the teacher was deemed to have affected the 'tone' in a particular class or throughout the school as a whole. The following comments from inspection reports are illustrative of many others: "There is an admirable tone throughout the school, and great credit is due to all the teachers"; "The Head Teacher has worked thoroughly to maintain a good tone in the school and to influence for good the character of the children. He has been well seconded by the other teachers." One is particularly illuminating: "The Head Master's influence dominates, as it should do, the whole school, in a highly beneficial way, and he successfully aims at developing the character and intelligence of his scholars."[27] There are fewer references to pupils influencing the tone of the school,

---

[24] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874-93, 5 February 1879, DE4467/1. In order to comply with data protection regulations teachers have been given a pseudonym (for consistency this has been done in each case although it is not required for entries prior to 1905).
[25] Miss Constance Rowland, Application for position of head teacher at Steward Street School, Birmingham, 12 November 1922, Papers of Constance C. Rowland, MS 1866/9, BCA. Hard work and interest in pupils were also praised in inspection reports.
[26] References of good character were required for pupil teachers. Chapter Two, p.47. Peter Gordon similarly found that teachers could be dismissed for their behaviour outside school, particularly in rural areas. Gordon, *Victorian School Manager*, pp.45-48.
[27] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, Religious Instruction Report of July 1906; Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, HMI Report for 1903; Medway Street School Log Book 1903-1938, 29 March 1909, DE3063/2.

though the headmaster of Floodgate Street wrote of a few truants who "exercise a very evil influence over others".[28]

The influence of the character of the teacher on pupils' moral development was predicated on the notion that teachers were role models and should set a good example. Log books reveal that headteachers disapproved of unpunctuality and poor attendance on the part of teachers. A troublesome teacher at Willow Street School was "called before Managers' committee for unpunctuality and cautioned". The headmaster of Severn Street School noted that the pupil teacher was "again absent today being "ill" from the effects of a "party" at which he had been present all night" and proposed "[recommending] him to sign the Temperance pledge."[29] It is likely that such concerns affected staffing decisions.

Autobiographies provide more detail on the ways in which teachers could influence their pupils. For example, Daisy Cowper wrote about Miss Jones, her teacher, emphasising not the content of the lessons but Miss Jones' ability to influence, or 'hold', a class:

> Her clear voice carried well, there was no faltering in her delivery; she had such skill as a narrator, and those screwed up eyes took in everyone of that large company ... whatever [the theme] ... she held her audience spell-bound, and as her closed book on her knee indicated the end of the lesson, a soft sigh would be heard.

Daisy Cowper suggested further that the example of Miss Jones influenced the development of particular qualities in her own character: "From Miss Jones, in nearly twenty years' contact, came any moral thoroughness and discipline, and awareness of duty". There are also shades of Miss Jones in Daisy's description of her own skills as a teacher: "I loved teaching, and felt no nervousness at all. I loved to feel that I held the children in my power – as it were – to influence them and mould them, and I felt I could mould them, and thrilled to do it."[30] This description of teaching provides a useful insight into the power dynamics of the teacher/pupil relationship through which the character of the teacher could have influenced the pupil.

---

[28] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 18 September 1903.
[29] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 10 December 1906; Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1864-86, 3 April 1878, S178/1/1.
[30] D. Cowper, *De Nobis*, c.1964, pp 74, 81, 96, 1:182, Working Class Autobiographical Archive (WCAA), Brunel University Library.

Practices of moral education

Having considered some of the general aspects of the ethos of the fourteen selected schools, it seems appropriate now to examine the evidence for more specific and practical approaches to moral education.

Rewards and punishments

Desirable behaviours and values were encouraged, and undesirable ones discouraged, through the systems of reward and punishment developed in elementary schools. Many of these rewards and punishments, most notably to around 1890 but also in later years, aimed to encourage regular attendance and maintain discipline within the school. Both Leicester and Birmingham School Boards set up prize schemes for attendance and punctuality in the 1870s.[31] Evidence from log books similarly indicates that ensuring attendance and punctuality were issues of great concern, particularly in the 1880s. Most schools in the sample, in keeping with national trends, achieved more regular attendance by the 1890s.[32] The attendance prize schemes were superseded in 1903 in Birmingham and 1909 in Leicester by schemes which emphasised "proficiency", or "continuous and satisfactory endeavour" in the words of Birmingham's 1903 scheme.[33] Improvements in attendance, changes in funding and inspection regimes (particularly the end the end of the system of payment by results), and perhaps also broader shifts in educational thinking which highlighted the individual child, all encouraged a focus on each pupil's effort and progress.

Other priorities revealed in punishment books throughout the period examined were maintaining discipline, and particularly orderly behaviour and industry in the classroom.[34] Rewards were also issued for cleanliness (for instance in the "system of badges for cleanliness and merit" adopted at Slater Street School), for Scripture in voluntary schools,

---

[31] See BSB, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished b the Board during the Six Years ended November 28th, 1876*, pp.81, 106-07; BSB, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished by the Board During the Year ended November 28th 1878*, pp.42-43; LSB Minutes, 25 October 1875, 19D59/VI/3.

[32] N. Sheldon, Policing Truancy: Town versus Countryside – Oxfordshire 1871-1903, *History of Education Researcher*, 77, 2006, 15-24, p.15. Moreover, the end of individual examinations in 1891, and changes to the funding system in 1892 may have made schools less dependent on the regular attendance of individual pupils to secure their funding.

[33] BEC Elementary Education Committee Minutes, 21 May 1903, BCC/BH/2/1/1/1; BEC, *Prize Scheme for Day Schools May 1903*, Correspondence and Circulars relating to Edgbaston Parochial CofE Schools, DRO53A/122/25, BCA; LEC Minutes, 24 May 1909, 19D59/VII/31.

[34] Tindal Street School Punishment Book (Girls) 1894-1938, S198/1/2, BCA; Cowper Street School Punishment Book, S215/3/7; St Saviour's School Punishment Book 1907-29, 18D68/5.

and for sporting achievement (as in the presentation of team photographs to the prize drill squad at Holy Cross School).[35]

Because attendance and punctuality are mentioned so often in log books, the system of rewards (prizes and other incentives) and punishments for attendance and punctuality will be analysed in detail. The first headmaster of Floodgate Street School, for instance, took children who had made a certain number of attendances to see the skeleton of a whale at Curzon Hall. He also "promised to take all the regular children" to the Grand Pantomime in 1896. This strategy had an immediate impact: "the improvement in attendance this week is most marked." Similarly, at Holy Cross School a library was provided "as a reward for punctual and regular attendance and attention to lessons".[36] Other approaches included tickets or marks for punctuality and attendance,[37] extra break-time or an early end to the school day for punctual and regular attenders,[38] and timetabling popular lessons or activities for times when attendance was generally low, particularly Friday afternoons.[39] Severn Street School in Birmingham also sent letters to parents in the run-up to the annual examination asking that they make sure their children attend regularly and punctually.[40]

Rewards operated alongside a system of punishments. The headmaster of St Saviour's School was convinced that the threat of compulsion through the actions of the Board's attendance officers and visitors rather than any promise of reward improved attendance.[41] Another technique was for schools themselves to "send after" absentees, either by personal visit or

---

[35] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874-93, 12 November 1886; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 2 April 1903, DE2735/1, RLLR.

[36] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 11 December 1892, 21 February 1896; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 19 January 1883. Similar techniques were used elsewhere: see St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 23 September 1903; Slater Street School Log Book (Girls) 1874-1899, 24 February 1891, DE4467/4; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 23 June 1905.

[37] For example see St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 9-13 July 1883 (refers to Girls' Department only); Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1862-97, 15 January 1889, S113/1/1, BCA. Birmingham School Board discontinued its attendance ticket scheme in 1880, replacing it with a scheme of attendance prizes. BSB School Management Committee Minutes, 8 January 1880, SB/B/2/1/1/5, BCA.

[38] For example, Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 14 July 1902; Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 10 November 1899, S178/1/2, BCA; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 18 September 1903, 13 September 1912; Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, 20 February 1903, 30 October 1903, 15 October 1915.

[39] For example, Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 10 November 1899; St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 11 March 1892 (refer to Girls' Department only); St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 6 October 1890.

[40] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1864-86, 3 June 1881, 24 May 1882.

[41] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 16 December 1887, 11 January 1889, 9 September 1891, 5 June 1893. Other schools also worked with Board visitors or attendance officers. see Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 11 November 1887; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 18 September 1903.

through notes. The headmaster of Severn Street School noted in 1882 that, despite the Board visitor's efforts, the only way to lessen the number of occasional absences was "personal remonstrance with the parents."[42] The first headmaster of Floodgate Street School went himself to the truants' favourite haunts himself to round them up, a method that Birmingham School Board did not favour.[43] Corporal punishment was used against truants in several schools in my sample, most frequently Floodgate Street.[44] It was also used, though less frequently, for unpunctuality: the headmaster of St Mark's School saw lateness as a lesser offence than truancy and kept pupils in after play as his first line of punishment.[45] An apparently unique strategy against truancy, playing on pupils' desire not to be shamed before their peers, was adopted at Slater Street School, where the headmaster made truants wear "a card with the word "Truant" written upon it in large letters". "I find the boys dread this more than any amount of corporal punishment," he wrote.[46]

Incentives and disincentives of this kind are noticeably more common at schools in poorer areas of Leicester and Birmingham than those in wealthier localities, presumably because attendance and punctuality were less of a problem in the latter. Moreover, for most schools, these sorts of strategies were used less after the mid-1890s, presumably because attendance was becoming less of a problem by then.[47] Floodgate Street and St Mark's Schools were exceptions. For Floodgate Street School (opened in 1891) attendance remained a major problem for over fifteen years. For St Mark's School attendance became a problem in the late 1890s as it was confronted by what has been termed "urban decay", and an increasingly poor local population, near its city centre location.[48]

---

[42] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1864-86, 8 September 1882. See also St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 24 February 1896, 14 December 1896; Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 25 January 1886; Highfield Road School Log Book (Boys) 1879-1941, 20 November 1885, S97/2/1, BCA.
[43] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 29 March 1895, 26 March 1897, 1 October 1897, 15 October 1897, 4 March 1898, 23 September 1898, 21 October 1898.
[44] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 9 September 1892, 11 November 1892, 15 March 1895, 22 March 1895, 21 October 1898; Cowper Street School Punishment Book; Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1862-97, 31 October 1888; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 4 September 1903, 29 September 1903.
[45] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 25 November 1892; St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 15 May 1899; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 17 September 1903, 29 September 1903.
[46] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874-93, 4 February 1887
[47] Sheldon, *op cit.*, p.15.
[48] Nancy Ball notes that "urban decay" was a problem for many voluntary schools located in town or city centres by the last decades of the nineteenth century. Ball, *op cit.*, p.237. Financial problems partly related to the increased poverty of the local population also appear to have led to the transfer of Severn Street School to Birmingham School Board in 1901.

There were also prizes: certificates, books, occasionally other objects (a writing desk for regular attendance and cricket bats for good play in the Docker Shield competition at Edgbaston CofE School in Birmingham; dolls for sewing and boxes of paints for drawing at Willow Street are among those mentioned).[49] Systems were established whereby prizes rewarding one virtue also encouraged others. For instance, Birmingham School Board's prize scheme of 1903 also stipulated that the reward of any prize was conditional on general good behaviour.[50] The potential moral benefits of prize-giving went beyond the virtues rewarded directly, or even indirectly, within prize schemes. Prize distribution was turned into a ceremonial occasion. This accorded with the Birmingham School Board's suggestion that public distributions of prizes would "add to the value of the certificates and prizes and increase the interest of the parents in the Schools."[51] Sometimes parents were invited to attend, and pupils put on displays of exercises and work. Often a school manager (who was usually the vicar in voluntary schools), or another local lady or gentleman, would distribute the prizes; sometimes they would give a speech. "All girls and some parents were present" when Miss Dale, a member of the city's Liberal elite, distributed the prizes at Tindal Street Girls' School in Birmingham in 1901. At Severn Street Boys' Department in 1906 attendance and class prizes were distributed to the scholars by Alderman Martineau. "The attendance prizes were given away ... by the Vicar [and] a "side" of six girls danced a number of Morris Dances" at Ladypool CofE School, Birmingham, in 1913, while at Holy Cross School the school managers attended the annual distribution of prizes at which there was singing by pupils from Standards IV to VII.[52]

Edgbaston School arranged perhaps the most elaborate prize giving ceremonies with managers, parents and a number of wealthy visitors attending:

> Annual distribution of prizes this afternoon. Present: Vicar and Mrs Strange, Rev Edwards and E Handley Esq. The Vicar and Mr Handley addressed the boys, especially pointing out the importance of punctuality and regularity of

---

[49] For example, Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, Week Ending (WE) 19 December 1884, WE 20 December 1895, S62/1/1, BCA; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 10 September 1906, 1 October 1913.
[50] BEC, *Prize Scheme for Day Schools.*
[51] BSB Minutes, 15 January 1875, SB/B/1/1/2.
[52] Tindal Street School Log Book (Girls) 1901-41, 22 November 1901, S198/1/1; Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 6 December 1906; Ladypool Road CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 7 November 1913, S113/3/1; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 28 October 1909. Miss Dale was elected to the Education Committee in 1903.

> attendance. Sixty Book Prizes were given to those scholars who obtained 2/3rds of the total marks in the Examination last week.
>
> Annual distribution of prizes, many visitors including Rev and Mrs Strange, Rev Edwards, Mr and Mrs Houghton, Mrs Bailey, Miss Dixon, Miss Millward &c. Vicar addressed boys, Mrs Strange presented books. Cricket bat presented by Mr Tinley to Thompson senior, vicar promised bat to Temple for his good all round play in connection with the Docker Shield competition. Songs and carol sung, school closed for Christmas.[53]

Similarly, the log book for Medway Street School (another school with a prestigious reputation and located in a well-to-do suburb, this time in Leicester) contains the following entry: "The distribution of prizes, and an entertainment took place this evening. The hall was crowded with parents and friends."[54] These prize distribution ceremonies were intended to have multiple moral benefits – interesting parents in the work of the school, exposing pupils (and parents) to adults of superior social status – over and above encouraging the qualities which the prizes were awarded for.

In addition, some of the illuminated certificates and books would have been intended to have a moral influence.[55] My main evidence here is not from Birmingham or Leicester, but from London. My grandfather, born in 1910, received London County Council certificates for "good conduct and meritorious work" in lieu of prizes during the First World War. The illustrations on these certificates were chosen carefully: figures of Britannia and soldiers and sailors, the Union Jack, and school classroom objects were obviously intended to instil patriotism and encourage support for British troops at war, while encouraging further hard work at school. Furthermore, my grandfather's family framed these school certificates and hung them on the wall. The material artefacts of a system of prizes thus added to the benefits of the prize-giving ceremony.

---

[53] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book 1881-1906, WE 19 December 1890, WE 20 December 1895. Prize giving was also recorded in: WE 19 December 1884, WE 18 December 1885, WE 22 December 1893, WE 23 December 1898, WE 22 December 1899, WE 26 December 1902, WE 25 December 1903.

[54] Medway Street School Log Book 1886-1903, 27 May 1887. See n.96 below on the school's annual 'visitor's day'.

[55] See Laqueur, *op cit.*, pp.203-14 for a discussion of the moral content of books selected as prizes in Sunday schools.

Moral instruction lessons

Moral instruction lessons were mentioned only three times in total in the log books and inspection reports in my sample. They would not have been recorded in log books as a deviation from the normal timetable, and since they were not part of the examined curriculum did not feature in most HMI reports. The earliest reference to moral instruction lessons is in the log book for Slater Street School in 1902, noting a change in the school timetable following the introduction of moral lessons by Leicester School Board (presumably other schools also altered their timetables but simply did not mention it in their log books). The second reference is in HMI Mr Lott's report on the same school after his visit in January 1909, in which he bemoaned the variable quality of the 'oral lessons' he observed:

> In one lesson in "Moral Instruction" it was evident that the Teacher had both thought and felt about the subject, and he appeared to present what he had to say with a sympathetic understanding of the young boys' minds. On the other hand some oral lessons were given which appeared to be, not unprepared, but taken from the syllabus with little lively interest.[56]

Interestingly, the latest reference to moral instruction, found in Severn Street Boys' School log book, is a specific instance of the common theoretical argument that the example of the teacher is more useful than definite lessons. The headmaster noted when two of his teachers enlisted in the early months of the First World War: "The practical patriotism of Messrs King and Price cannot but make a lasting impression on the scholars, and is worth many moral lessons."[57]

The small number of explicit references to moral instruction could, arguably, be seen as an indication of unremarkable and unproblematic implementation. Moral lessons appear to have become part of the unremarkable routine of school life which received little comment in log books and inspection reports.[58] Overall, the school-specific sources examined tell us very little about moral lessons in practice. However, as the previous chapter indicated, there is

---

[56] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, September 1902, Report by HMI Mr Lott after visit 25-27 January 1909.
[57] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 22 December 1914.
[58] This echoes Dewsbury's assessment of the introduction of moral instruction lessons by Huddersfield School Board. Dewsbury, *op cit.*, p.27.

evidence in the Chairman's annual addresses for Birmingham and Henry Major's reports for Leicester which points to significant differences between schools and between teachers.[59]

Instruction based on incidents in school life

The debates on moral instruction reported in Chapter Five suggest that the use of incidents in school life for purposes of moral instruction was commonplace. As noted in the previous chapter, Mr Waddington of Leicester School Board argued that teachers "took every chance of inculcating little moral precepts in the general routine of their work".[60] Presumably this sort of instruction is what was being referred to in, for instance, the log book entry for Slater Street School that mentions "the care [the teachers] are taking to secure neatness and cleanliness among their boys", and the reference in an inspection report for St Mark's School to training "in habits of cleanliness and good manners."[61]

Nevertheless, there are few explicit references to this sort of moral instruction in the log books examined. At St Saviour's School, the vicar, having received a complaint from a parent that a pupil teacher had struck his son, "warned the children collectively against striking in consequence of the complaint against Elton".[62] At Elbow Lane Special Department, Leicester, the teacher used a "practical housewifery" lesson as an opportunity to talk to the pupils and mothers who had been invited to attend the lesson: "Advantage was taken of the occasion to speak about cleanliness. Think it bore a little good fruit."[63]

Physical exercise

That physical exercise had significant moral benefits was a common view in educational writing and discussions of the late nineteenth century. In 1879 George Dixon noted the ubiquity of this view particularly with reference to public schools: "the advantages of games, gymnastics, drill in the promotion of health and the formation of character are so fully acknowledged and understood in our higher schools that I need not dwell upon them

---

[59] Individual schools are not named in these sources.
[60] *Report*, 8 October 1901.
[61] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874-93, 7 November 1879; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, HMI Report 1914.
[62] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 11 June 1886, 29 June 1886.
[63] Elbow Lane Special Department Log Book 1900-24, 22 February 1915, 19D59/VII/339, RLLR.

here."[64] Two years later Dixon reported on progress in this area in Birmingham. Games, he argued, "[cemented] a bond of sympathy between the scholars and their teachers, and [tended] to produce a spirit of good fellowship amongst the lads themselves." Also, by making school more enjoyable, games attached children to their schools, and led to improved attendance.[65] These arguments were echoed in the educational press more than twenty years later and also by the Board of Education when it made provision for organised games in the 1906 Code.[66]

Birmingham and Leicester were quicker than most School Boards to make formal provision for physical exercise in elementary schools. A superintendent of drill was appointed in Birmingham in 1886.[67] Henry Major's first report as Board inspector to Leicester School Board indicates that a drill sergeant was operating in Leicester as early as 1877. In this report Major commented on the moral benefits of drill:

> [Discipline] is on the whole very satisfactory indeed, and a part of the success is doubtless due to the drill sergeant; the habits of obedience, promptness, self-control, and silence of the drill being carried into the actual school work. I wish I could see all the teachers taking that *personal* interest in the drill which is specially manifested in a few instances. This is very interesting work if attention be given to it, and well worth the labour it entails, from the comfort it brings into the school.

Six years later, in a manual on school management, Major argued further that drill was the best way of securing "prompt and cheerful" obedience from pupils, as it required obedience "without thought or reflection on the part of the drilled."[68]

---

[64] Dixon, *Lecture*, p.20.
[65] *An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman*, 20 January 1881, p.10.
[66] See Reverend E.B. Hugh Jones, Moral Aspects of Athletics, *Journal of Education*, 1 June 1900, pp.352-54; Board of Education, *Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1905-1906*, pp.24-25.
[67] Taylor, *Developing Elementary School Curriculum*, pp.214-21; BSB, *Educational Work in Birmingham for the Three Years 1885-1888. An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Vice Chairman Rev E.F.M MacCarthy, November 1st 1888*, p.18, L48.21, BLSL.
[68] H. Major, *Report on the Leicester Board Schools May 1 to July 31 1877*, p.7, Pamphlets Vol. 50, RLLR; Major, *How to Earn the Merit Grant. Part II*, p.325. For a discussion of ideas about the disciplinary and moral, and also physical, benefits of drill in elementary schools see J.S. Hurt, Drill, Discipline and the Elementary School Ethos, in P. McCann (ed.) *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1979, 167-90.

PAGE/PAGES EXCLUDED UNDER INSTRUCTION FROM THE UNIVERSITY

These photographs taken in unidentified Birmingham elementary schools give us an insight into what Major might have intended. In order to appear as they did in the photographs pupils would have had to be self-disciplined, orderly, to respond uniformly and in unison to commands: something close to Major's vision. It is, however, possible that these photographs were of drill displays rather than of regular lessons.[69] Major's comment about some teachers not taking enough interest in drill suggests that his ideal of orderliness and ready obedience may not have been achieved in every drill lesson.

Swimming was, on the whole, introduced some years later. George Dixon, however, extolled what he saw as the multiple benefits of swimming before an audience of Birmingham teachers as early as 1879:

> It is one of those natural exercises which best develop the physical powers and increase personal grace and beauty. But intimately connected with swimming is the appreciation of the use of the bath ... If the School Boards will teach the value of water, and the Town Council will supply the apparatus necessary for its full use ... the self-respect and dignity of our people will be increased.[70]

Swimming was mentioned in the log books of all the schools in my sample except Floodgate Street. Some introduced it earlier than others (the earliest references to swimming in school log books were from 1898 – for Medway Street and Willow Street schools) and it was generally introduced for boys before it was for girls. A number of schools made swimming a competitive sport.[71] The moral benefits of swimming that Dixon referred to were not widely discussed, though the headmaster of Willow Street Special School saw swimming not only as beneficial physical exercise but also as an opportunity to "[give time] to the subject of cleanliness."[72]

Provision for organised games varied substantially between schools. Games appeared first in schools located in wealthier areas: presumably it was easier for these schools than others to

---

[69] The following entries refer to drill displays: Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 2 June 1911; Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 10 July 1911; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 2 April 1903, 27/28 November 1903, 23 February 1905; Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 18 December 1901.

[70] Dixon, *Lecture*, p.20. In 1906 the Board of Education similarly commented on the "great incidental benefits" of swimming, and noted its popularity in schools in "densely populated neighbourhoods". *Report of the Board of Education for the year 1905-1906*, p.25.

[71] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, 30 November 1908; Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 6 October 1898, 29 July 1905; Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 4 October 1911.

[72] Willow Street School Upper Special Department Log Book, 4 April 1905, 19D59/VII/383.

find the necessary space and equipment. For instance, Edgbaston CofE and Tindal Street Schools in Birmingham were involved in local cricket competitions as early as 1893.[73] However, in Leicester the first school in the sample to introduce a football club (in 1898) and cricket (in 1899) was Willow Street School, where many pupils came from "somewhat poor homes and surroundings."[74] Teachers at Willow Street appear to have expended much effort to develop provision for games (along with other extra-curricular activities discussed further below). The football club was started "at the expense of the teachers" and equipment for cricket was purchased "out of the school fund."[75]

More schools engaged in organised games after 1906 when the Code for the first time counted organised games for the purposes of attendance (At St Mark's School, for instance, "organised games" of football were held in 1908).[76] In Floodgate Street, by contrast, the focus was clearly on drill.[77] We could conjecture that this was due to a lack of facilities, along with the distinctive moral rationale in this school discussed above – kindness on the part of teachers but an emphasis on obedience and strict discipline. Organised games for girls were less common. However, the log book for Tindal Street School referred to 'school sports' and an 'athletics festival', and to netball matches with other schools in 1916, while girls at Cowper Street played basketball from 1914.[78] Girls attending Tindal Street School also got regular physical exercise in the form of "school walks" from 1907 to 1917.

While the educational and moral benefits of exercise outlined by Dixon, Major and others were rarely discussed, the comments that can be found are revealing. In 1914, the headmaster of Cowper Street School praised the "spirit infused into the [school football] Team" which "has borne most gratifying results both on the field and also in the school". An inspection report for the same school in 1918 referred to "the pains taken to promote a feeling of esprit de corps" in the school (particularly through games and sports for both boys

---

[73] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 15 September 1893.
[74] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, HMI Report October 1908.
[75] Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 6 October 1898, 17 May 1899.
[76] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, 2 October 1908, 12 October 1908, 14 October 1908, 22 October 1908.
[77] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 20 November 1891, 30 June 1897, 2 June 1911. There is one reference (20 May 1909) to pupils playing cricket, supervised by the Sunday school attendant, after attending the Ascension Day service.
[78] Tindal Street School Log Book (Girls) 1901-41, 25 July 1907, 11 July 1910, 11 May 1916, 18 May 1916; Cowper Street School Log Book 1895-1924, 27 March 1914.

and girls).[79] The fullest discussion of the moral benefits of games is in the log book for St Saviour's School:

> I took the boys in "Organised Games" – rounders in the school yard; St I v II, III v IV, V, VI, VII in sides, explaining how the game should be played, with smartness, fairness, no wrangling, with vigour & with their "heads" & not in any haphazard way. Such demonstrations do them an immense amount of good. I wish the yard was larger & better paved so that other games could be taken.
>
> [Organised games do] the boys a great deal of good as if they are left to play the game by themselves they make it more of a "lark" than a real earnest game played on a proper scientific plan as it is under the supervision of a teacher.[80]

These entries indicate that at least some elementary school teachers, as well as School Board members and the public schooled educationalists of the period, perceived the potential moral benefits of games. They also highlight the issues of space and resources which, in practice, hindered a number of these schools, and others in crowded urban areas, in the provision of games.[81]

Outings to places of educational interest

When he introduced his motion in favour of moral instruction to Leicester School Board in October 1901, FJ Gould also identified other elements of the curriculum which wanted to reform in order to enhance the ways in which the school could train the future citizen. One of his proposals was to bring pupils "into contact with the life of the community" through "excursions to various places of historical and industrial and social interest ... with a view to impressing the children with the complex nature of the life of which they formed part, and of their duty towards that general life as citizens."[82] Gould wrote in his autobiography that when he was an elementary school teacher in London he took his pupils to places like the Tower of London, St Paul's Cathedral and various museums. In a similar vein, he suggested that in Leicester children could be taken to St Mary's Church, the Roman Wall, the Castle, the old and new Town Hall, the Workhouse, the Infirmary, the Fire Station, the Gasworks,

---

[79] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 30 March 1914, HM Inspector's Report 31 January 1918.
[80] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 23 April 1907, 24 July 1912.
[81] This was a common problem for schools in urban areas throughout the country, according to Board of Education reports. *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix, 1895-97*, London: HMSO, 1896, pp.vi-vii; *Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1905-1906*, p.25.
[82] *Report*, 8 October 1901. See also Gould, *Life and Manners*, p.19 and Gould, *Moral Instruction of Children*, p.176.

the Waterworks, the principal factories, railway stations, and newspaper offices. Such visits would, he argued, be opportunities for imparting "useful and inspiring civic instruction."[83]

Gould campaigned for Leicester Education Committee to develop a "scheme of systematic school visits to places of educational value and interest, in order 1) to exercise the children's powers of observation, 2) to give a more practical turn to their study of industrial subjects, and 3) to increase their intelligent appreciation of history and civic life."[84] In May 1906 a special committee on 'school journeys' conferred with head teachers on the issue. It was decided that no compulsory systematic scheme would be introduced, but a circular was issued emphasising the permission in the Code for visits to "places of educational value or interest" during school hours, and stating that such visits were sanctioned by the Committee.[85] I found no evidence of discussions of this sort in Birmingham, but such outings occurred at some of the schools in my sample.

The head teachers who spoke with the Leicester Education Committee in May 1906 argued that they were "alive to the educational benefits to be derived by the children from visits to the parks and lanes and places of historic or civic interest". Such visits, they said, were already carried out in some schools but that the time available for them was limited. The log books examined indicate that, as the Leicester head teachers suggested, practice varied between schools. Because these outings were breaks from the normal school timetable, they were often noted in school log books. Outings listed include trips to museums,[86] visits to galleries or exhibitions,[87] and visits to take in objects of geographical or historical interest.[88] The headmaster of St Saviour's School wrote most about the perceived educational benefits

---

[83] Gould, *Life Story*, p.47; A Year on the School Board, *Leicester Pioneer*, c.December 1901, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1902. These ideas appear to prefigure the school visits and pedagogy of active learning which emerged in secondary modern schools by the 1950s analysed in I. Grosvenor and M. Lawn, Days out of School: Secondary Education, Citizenship and Public Space in 1950s England, *History of Education*, 33:4, 2004, 377-89, pp.378-84.

[84] LEC Minutes, 23 October 1905, 19D59/VII/29.

[85] LEC Occasional Special Committees Minutes, 1 May 1906, 23 May 1906, 19D59/VII/100. RLLR.

[86] Elbow Lane Special Department Log Book 1900-24, 6 April 1900, 20 March 1911; St Mark's School Log Book 1901-49, 20 March 1906; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 22 December 1905, 29 January 1907; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 25 April 1912, 2 May 1913.

[87] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 18-19 May 1916; Ladypool Road CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 25 October 1901, 5 February 1909; Tindal Street School Log Book (Girls) 1860-1930, 7 February 1911, 12 February 1914, 11 February 1915; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 7 July 1909; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 26 October 1906.

[88] Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 29 April 1915; Slater Street School Log Book (Girls)1899-1924, 21 July 1908; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 17 August 1909.

of such outings, describing a visit to an exhibition of art and handicraft at held at a local secondary school as "very instructive." He also complained that a visit to Wombwells' menagerie was marred by poor organisation and overcrowding: "The children enjoyed it although I (& most of the other teachers to whom I spoke) was very disappointed from the result from an educational point of view."[89]

Most log book entries referred only to the destination of the outing, but a few offered more detail on the itinerary of the day. Willow Street School used Pearson's Fresh Air Fund money to pay for carefully organised and activity-packed outings, combining nature and wildlife with visits to sites of historical and civic interest:

> 13 July 1911 Fresh air outing to Thurstaston. 120. School closed in consequence. All the staff went and as prearranged gave chats on History, Roman Bridge, Hugh Latimer, and Botany – exhibition of botanical specimens and wild flower bouquets in the school. Party with Miss Burton to Bradgate. 25 Senior scholars with HT and 3 assistants to the Waterworks at Cropstone. A most profitable and enjoyable day. Very hot.[90]

It seems likely that the head teacher at a school where Gould was almost certainly one of the managers, and which put on so many other morally educative activities, was alive to the moral dimension of these outings even if this dimension was not explicitly discussed.[91]

Some schools in Birmingham organised visits to London. The log book entry for a visit from Ladypool CofE School indicates a carefully prepared and organised event:

> Head teacher and Mr [Wilson] took party of 25 children to London. New St to Euston, then to the Tower by Underground railway, Route via the Monument, the Bank, St Paul's, Victoria embankment, Trafalgar square, Whitehall, Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, Horse Guards' Parade, The Mall, Buckingham Palace, Hyde Park Corner, Regents' Park and spent rest of day till 6.15pm in zoo.[92]

Grosvenor and Lawn argue in relation to a similar visit from a Birmingham school to London in 1951 that such visits aimed to instil a sense of belonging to the nation and of

---

[89] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 3 April 1914, 13 March 1908.
[90] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 13 July 1911 (see also 7 July 1908, 9 July 1912, 8 July 1913, 2 July 1914, 1 July 1915). See also St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 20 March 1918, 16 June 1918 for detailed itineraries of outings to local places of historical and architectural interest designed to link up with what pupils had learned in school.
[91] Given the frequency of his visits (noted in the log book) it is likely that Gould was a manger of Willow Street School, though this is not stated explicitly.
[92] Ladypool Road CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 26 June 1913.

pupils' place within it, through directing pupils' attention to particular historical monuments and buildings which "made visible the dominant framework of values in the public realm."[93] One can imagine a similar process at work in the school visits noted here. In addition, these visits were intended to inculcate the habit of thrift, as indicated in the Cowper Street School log book entry about an "educational visit to London" in 1914: "This first venture was in every way a great success and it is hoped will stimulate children to save their pence for future visits of a like nature."[94]

Special or celebratory events

Moral education was also conducted through special events. To single out an occasion, or an institution, for celebration, either during the school day or by marking it with a holiday, was to signal – to teachers, to pupils, to parents and anyone connected with the life of the school – that this occasion or institution was important and valuable. There were both celebrations of events internal to the life of the school, and wider public celebrations.

Some celebrations related to the life of the school. Concerts and exhibitions of pupils' work were opportunities to display academic, artistic and musical achievements to parents, managers and other local dignitaries. The following log book entries (from Tindal Street School and Willow Street School respectively) are illuminating examples:

> Needlework Inspection, display of work, singing etc on Thursday aft: - many parents visited the school.

> Exhibition of scholars' work opened by the Mayor and Mayoress at 3 o'clock, supported by Managers and friends with a number of parents. The Mayor Ald Thos Smith accompanied by the mayoress visited each class, not omitting the special class, and saw the children at work. The flag was hoisted and the national hymn was sung (God bless our native land). The mayor took tea afterwards with the Managers and teachers. The visit of the mayor – a lesson in 'Civics'[95]

---

[93] Grosvenor and Lawn, *Days out of School*, p.387.
[94] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 20 July 1914. Similarly Ladypool Road School students saved for their outings to the seaside. Ladypool Road CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 28 April 1902, 20 June 1910.
[95] Tindal Street School Log Book (Girls) 1901-41, 15 July 1904 (see also 26 July 1905); Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 13 May 1908.

Medway Street School also held an annual 'visitor's day' which attracted the local great and good – managers, on one occasion the HMI, and several times the mayor and mayoress.[96]

Sporting achievement was also noted. For example, at Edgbaston CofE School half-holidays were given when the school cricket team played in the final of the Docker Shield Cricket competition,[97] while at Holy Cross School a photograph of the prize drill team was hung on the school wall.[98] In addition, exceptional academic achievement was marked by holidays. Birmingham School Board announced a holiday in 1897 on account of an ex-elementary school pupil going to Cambridge University, while at St Saviour's School pupils were given a half-day holiday in celebration of the school being awarded the prize for achieving the best at scripture examinations for the Archdeaconry of Leicester.[99]

Many of the special events recorded were of a patriotic nature. Log books record half-holidays, or special celebrations, in connection with coronations, royal visits, and royal weddings, and with British involvement in the South African and First World Wars:[100]

> WE 24 June 1887 Jubilee week ... Tues – Holiday. Boys attended a special service in the Parish Church at 3pm and were addressed by the Vicar. Afterwards entertained at the schools. The teachers were kindly assisted by the Rev and Mrs Strange, the Rev JR Broughton, Misses Dixon and other Ladies. Mrs Spooner sent a quantity of oranges and the Vicar gave some toys. Cricket and other games were played in a field near S. Ambrose Church. The National Anthem was sung before leaving the field.
>
> 2 June 1902 Children sang altogether in the school yard Doxology, God Bless our Native Land & National Anthem & cheered for victorious officers and soldiers.
>
> 4 July 1902 Registers not marked Weds as schools opened only for scholars to have tea to celebrate coronation festivities, special classes had games in school room and playground.

---

[96] Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 19 January 1906, 31 January 1906, 30 January 1908, 26 January 1909, 24 January 1910; Medway Street School Managers' Log Book 1913-24, 16 November 1913, DE3063/5.
[97] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 14 September 1894, WE 28 August 1903.
[98] Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 2 April 1903.
[99] Floodgate Street School Log Book (Infants) 1891-1940, 15 September 1897, S68 1/1; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 16 September 1898. St Saviour's School received exceptionally good reports from the diocesan inspector.
[100] These events were frequently recorded in log books because, like school outings, they were a departure from the normal school timetable.

> 23 June 1911 School closed at noon on 21st for rest of week owing to coronation of King George V, Coronation medals presented to the children by Cllr Pentland on 21st. Festival at Calthorpe Park on 22nd inst.
>
> 11 Nov 1918 At 11 am signal was given by maroon of the cessation of hostilities. Accordingly scholars were assembled, and, after a short address, the National Anthem was sung. To mark the greatness of the occasion they were given holiday until Wednesday morning.[101]

These log book entries reveal the sorts of activities which took place: sometimes attended by managers and other local dignitaries, often combining patriotic ceremonial (speeches, the national anthem, distribution of medals) and treats such as tea or sports or holidays. They also give an insight into the deeply patriotic attitudes of some teachers during this period.[102]

While such events were recorded by almost all schools sampled, log book entries suggest that some head teachers were particularly enthusiastic about reinforcing patriotism. Patriotic ceremonies were particularly frequent at Edgbaston CofE School where a flag-hoisting ceremony was introduced:

> WE 17 Jan 1913 Tu afternoon: Mr Anstruther Calthorpe, having presented a flagstaff and Union Jack, the ceremony of hoisting the flag for the first time was performed this afternoon in the presence of the donor, Archdeacon and Mrs Owen, Canon Reader Smith, Rev Harold Edmonds, Mr Bateson and others. The boys were drawn up in the playground and saluted, afterwards singing the National Anthem and Rule Britannia. Mr Calthorpe briefly addressed the boys on the duty of patriotism.[103]

The head teacher at Willow Street School was similarly committed to inculcating in his pupils a sense of patriotic duty, again with ceremonial use of the flag combined with speeches and other rituals:

> 23 April 1909 Special reference to St George. Flag hoisted and drawn by scholars. Patriotic hymn sung.

---

[101] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 24 June 1887; Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 2 June 1902 (the school was closed for the afternoon on account of the proclamation of peace); Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900-24, 4 July 1902; Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891-1920, 23 June 1911, 11 November 1918.

[102] This echoes the findings of other historians. For example see Horn, *English Elementary Education*, pp.44-45.

[103] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1906-31, 17 January 1913, S62/1/2.

> 24 May 1909 Empire Day. Flag hoisted and hymns of a national and patriotic character sung by the massed school in the ground. Address on true patriotism by Head Teacher to Senior classes.
>
> 18 June 1915 Flag hoisted for Waterloo Day Centenary. Upper classes had short lesson on the subject.[104]

The flag does not appear to have been used in this way in the other schools in my sample, and other researchers have shown that support for the use of the flag in schools was limited in this period, with criticisms that it promoted jingoism and militarism.[105] Nevertheless, these examples indicate that the enthusiasm of individual teachers could counter such general tendencies.

Empire Day is an example of this sort of event which can usefully be analysed in more detail, given the Earl of Meath's emphasis on inculcating ideals of good citizenship, and the moral qualities needed in imperial citizens if the well-being of the Empire was to be maintained. The qualities Meath wished to promote, as identified in his open letter to the press (first issued in 1905 and reissued in succeeding years), included imperial and national patriotism, loyalty to the monarch and obedience to authority.[106] Others have written about the Empire Day Movement, its organisation and philosophy, and its attempts to promote imperialist attitudes among school pupils.[107] The aim here is not to replicate this work but to investigate how Empire Day was celebrated in Leicester and Birmingham, and how practice varied between schools.

Birmingham Education Committee decided not to institute Empire Day celebrations.[108] In Leicester the Elementary Education Committee decided against observing Empire Day in

---

[104] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 23 April 1909, 24 May 1909, 18 June 1915. Instilling a militaristic version of patriotism was a long-term commitment for the headmaster of Willow Street School, who as early as 1899 gave pupils a lantern address on 'Our Navy'. Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 5 May 1899.

[105] R. Betts, A Campaign for Patriotism on the Elementary School Curriculum: Lord Meath 1892-1916, *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 46, 1990, 38-45; L. Simpson, Imperialism, National Efficiency and Education, 1900-1905, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 16:1, 1984, 28-36, p.35.

[106] Meath's open letters on Empire Day were reproduced in the educational press. See *School Guardian*, 19 May 1906, pp.476-77.

[107] For example see Horn, *English Elementary Education*, pp.48-51; Bloomfield, *op cit.*; Mackenzie, *op cit.*, pp.231-36; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.105-110.

[108] Birmingham Education Committee also decided in 1912 that Birmingham schools would not be permitted to take part in Lord Meath's Empire Day competition. BEC Elementary Education Committee Minutes, 21 November 1912, BCC/BH/2/1/1/4.

1908; this decision was reversed in 1913. The debates over the form of the observance in Leicester reflect the contested nature of imperialism as highlighted in Chapter Three. Where should the message of empire lie on the continuum between jingoism, an emphasis on British greatness, and international brotherhood, an emphasis on cooperation? In the end the Committee voted to accommodate the suggestions of socialist members by including 'The Hometown' and 'When will Thou save the people' as well as the national anthem in the Empire Day proceedings.[109]

Observance, however, varied between schools and was not wholly determined by the Education Committees' decisions. Three of the seven Birmingham schools, two of them board schools, observed Empire Day. Ladypool CofE School was the first to observe Empire day in 1905, followed by Cowper Street Board School in 1909, and Severn Street School in 1914. There are references to Empire Day in the log books for five of the seven schools in my sample. Willow Street School was the first to celebrate Empire Day in 1906, and at St Saviour's School Empire Day was observed every year from 1908 to 1918. These were joined by St Mark's School and Medway Street in 1913 and by Elbow Lane School Special Department in 1916. There are no references to Empire Day for Slater Street School, despite Leicester Education Committee's ruling. The same is true of Holy Cross School, though as a voluntary school it would not have been bound by the Committee's decision.

The debates over the detail of Empire Day observance on the Education Committees are not reflected in the log books examined. However, there were subtle differences between schools in the manner in which they celebrated the day. The earliest references reflect perfectly the Earl of Meath's suggestions in his open letter that teachers explain the meaning of Empire Day and sing suitable patriotic songs:

> On Wednesday May 24th, Empire Day, the ordinary work of the school ceased at 4pm. The whole school then assembled, while the Head Teacher explained the meaning of "Empire Day", and the children sang some patriotic songs.
>
> At the request of the Managers I spoke to the children about Empire Day soon after prayers this morning, explaining its meaning, the aims & objects of the

[109] LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 4 May 1908, 19D59/VII/36; 21 April 1913, 5 May 1913, 19D59/VII/38. The attempt by socialists on Leicester Education Committee to alter the manner of empire day observance contrasts with the strategies of the Social Democratic Foundation and socialists on other Education Committees, who objected to any form of Empire Day observance. Horn, *English Elementary Education*, pp.50-51; Springhall, *Lord Meath*, pp.109-10.

> society presided over by the Earl of Meath. I read to the children his letter & gave the children a few statistics concerning the British Empire & endeavoured to instil the lessons & spirit of Patriotism. Today (Friday) being the nearest day before the 24th "Empire Day."[110]

The manner of observance for most Leicester schools in my sample after 1913 followed that stipulated by the Leicester Education Committee: the songs noted above and an address by the head teacher. At St Saviour's School Meath's Empire Day letter continued to be read out every year.[111] In contrast, the boys' department at Severn Street School observed Empire Day for the first time in 1914, not with a ceremony but through "lessons ... given ... throughout the school, particular attention being paid to the personal qualities which are necessary if we are to maintain the conditions of our ancestors." However, by 1916, celebrations in this school followed the more common pattern of the "singing of patriotic songs, followed by an address by the [head teacher]."[112]

More elaborate ceremonies were recorded for Severn Street and St Saviour's Schools. The log book of Severn Street girls' department records a ceremony to which parents were invited, with girls performing a sketch and folk dances, and singing "suitable patriotic songs".[113] In 1912 St Saviour's School held a pageant as part of their Empire Day observance which aimed to "fix children's ideas on history and geography connected with empire – [the] main idea being Britannia receiving visits from persons from different British dominions, all dressed in the proper dress of the country, each bearing some particular production of the country, an address of greeting by each chief representative." Empire Day at Willow Street School had a more militaristic flavour than at any other school in my sample. Celebrations at this school were centred on the hoisting of the flag, and on occasion involved children marching:

---

[110] Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 26 May 1905 (see also 24 June 1906); St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 22 May 1908. See also Cowper Street School Log Book 1885-1924, 24 May 1909.
[111] For example, Slater Street School Log Book (Girls) 1899-1924, 22 May 1914; Medway Street School Managers' Log Book 1913-24, 23 May 1913; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 23 May 1913, 22 May 1914; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 24 May 1910, 24 May 1911, 24 May 1912, 23 May 1913, 22 May 1914, 21 May 1915, 24 May 1916, 23 May 1917, 28 May 1918.
[112] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 25 May 1914, 24 May 1916.
[113] Severn Street School Log Book (Girls) 1897-1932, 25 May 1917, S178/2/1.

> 24 May 1906 Empire Day. At play time children assembled in yard and sang 'God bless our Native Land' and after a short address by Head Master, marched round the yards and for a short distance in the street headed by the flag.[114]

It is impossible to tell how far pupils' beliefs and attitudes were influenced by the celebration of patriotism and imperialism through events like this. Evidence from unpublished autobiographies indicates that Empire Day and coronation celebrations could be remembered well into adult life. According to Molly Keen, "we all felt proud of being British and thought that England was the best country in the world", while for May Rainer the patriotic sentiment was "completely lost on us" as pupils wanted to get on with the sports arranged afterwards.[115] For some pupils it was evidently the ceremony, the break from the school routine, and (in some cases) the treat of a half-holiday which was remembered more than the imperial or patriotic message which the celebration aimed to instil.

Confessional forms of moral education

Though the board schools and voluntary schools in my sample shared many approaches to moral education, voluntary schools were distinctive in one respect. Voluntary schools adopted a confessional approach to moral instruction, utilising religious instruction lessons and church services to impact a denominationally-specific morality. It is clear from both the national context discussed in Chapter One and the local responses examined in Chapter Five that religious instruction – in the form of prayers and scripture lessons as well as visits to church – was intended to offer instruction in morality.[116] However, Gould's argument that many of the religious instruction lessons he witnessed were "from an ethical point of view ... inferior in tone and quality" suggests that such intentions were not always achieved in practice.[117]

What light do log books and inspection reports shed on this matter? The diocesan inspector's reports for Ladypool CofE School noted that there was not enough attention given to drawing out moral and scriptural lessons from illustrations, or to explaining the

---

[114] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 24 May 1912; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 24 May 1906 (see also 27 May 1908, 24 May 1909, 24 May 1910, 24 May 1911, 24 May 1916).
[115] M. Keen, *Childhood Memories 1903 to 1921*, n.d, p.9, 2-449, WCAA; M. Rainer, *Emma's Daughter*, n.d., p.31, 2-644, WCAA. See also Horn, *English Elementary Education*, p.50 for an account of mixed views in different autobiographical sources.
[116] See Chapters One and Five.
[117] *Report*, 8 October 1901.

meanings of parables.[118] On the other hand, in the midst of his list of criticisms of religious teaching in board schools, Gould did single out one or two examples of good practice, including a voluntary school – Aylestone St Mary's – which he praised for its systematic approach to Biblical teaching and emphasis on ethical elements. In a similar vein, in 1898 the diocesan inspector reported of St Mark's School that "the lessons drawn from the Scripture stories were full and apt."[119]

There is only limited detail in the sources of exactly how scripture lessons and visits to church were used for moral purposes. The log book for St Saviour's School contains the fullest examples. It is worth quoting the entry for 4 March 1908 at length:

> Ash Wednesday – Instead of the usual lessons in Religious Knowledge the Vicar gave an address to all the scholars above Stand I. Taking for his subject the beauty of the plant life in Spring, he showed how the new spring growth flushed aside the old growth, illustrating that new life & habits must flush away the old bad ones. He then went on to shew the dangers to which the new growth was subject & deduced lessons about the dangers & temptations that beset us. He then passed on to our Lord's Temptation & by illustration & lessons shewed that Temptations gave rise to sympathy, & that our Lord's Temptation was a pattern of encouragement to us. It was an excellent lesson & greatly enjoyed by all.

Again in 1916 the children were taken to church in lieu of their usual religious knowledge lesson to hear addresses from the Missioner on "A Christian's name and its significance", and the hymn "There's a friend for little children" with emphasis on its practical application.[120] These are illuminating examples of moral lessons on a specifically Christian basis which reveal processes of narrative and illustration similar to those outlined in the moral instruction handbooks examined in Chapter Three.

While there is no evidence for regular moral instruction lessons in the voluntary schools in my sample, the log books reveal interesting approaches to secular moral training. For instance, at Edgbaston CofE School the topics for composition essays included 'Duty to Parents', 'The friends of man', 'Slow and steady wins the race', and 'Punctuality' alongside

---

[118] Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1862-97, Diocesan Inspector's Report 17 October 1876; Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, Report on Religious Instruction 1906.
[119] St Mark's School Log Book 1874-1901, 14 December 1898.
[120] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 4 March 1908, 30 November 1916. See also 9 May 1907, 3 September 1912.

other geographical or scientific topics.[121] There is also the log book entry for St Saviour's School on 23 April 1918: "St George's Day – Shakespeare's Day – birthday and day of death, 1664. I spoke to the children on these two heads this morning instead of the usual instruction in Religious Knowledge – they are both splendid examples of what educationists call "Moral Instruction.""[122] This is one of the rare explicit references to moral instruction, from the pen of the head teacher who appears to have taken the greatest interest in educational developments.

There is no evidence of such in-house innovations in the other voluntary schools in my sample. However, there were moral lectures by visitors. For instance, on 22 April 1912 the mayor and mayoress visited St Saviour's School and "addressed to the children a few words of advice", and at Holy Cross School Father Lescher "announced the holidays, and spoke a few words to the Boys, advising them on their behaviour whilst away."[123] These examples indicate that, as suggested in Chapter One, forms of secular moral training could occur in voluntary as well as board schools.

Regular visits from the vicar of the church to which the school was attached (usually also one of the school managers) were also seen as part of the moral training received. In all the voluntary schools in my sample the vicar regularly gave scripture lessons which were believed to form the basis of a Christian moral training.[124] There are also examples of the vicar assisting with the teaching (as at St Saviour's and Ladypool Road Schools), and overseeing discipline (as at St Mark's School).[125] Moreover, the vicar played a ceremonial role in the life of the voluntary schools examined. Log book entries reveal that the clergy, like other school

---

[121] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 14 April 1893, WE 23 June 1893, WE 14 June 1895, WE 23 August 1895.

[122] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 23 April 1918. Celebrations at Willow Street School of Milton's Tercentenary in 1908, Samuel Johnson's Bicentenary in 1909 and Shakespeare's Tercentenary in 1916 similarly involved the headmaster outlining their lives and works but the label "moral instruction" was not applied. Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 9 December 1908, 17 August 1909, 3 May 1916.

[123] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 22 April 1912; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 25 July 1902.

[124] Scripture lessons by the vicar are recorded in the log books for all the voluntary schools in my sample.

[125] Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 25 October 1901; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 10 October 1884, 9 July 1886; St Mark's School Log Books 1874-1901, 8 May 1899. For similar findings on the role of the vicar in voluntary schools see J.T. Smith, The Real Milch Cow? The Work of Anglican, Catholic and Wesleyan Clergymen in Elementary Schools in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, *History of Education*, 31:2, 2002, 117-37.

managers, attended concerts or other special events,[126] and distributed prizes and other presents.[127]

Moral education and the First World War

The First World War, as the Moral Instruction League noted, presented opportunities for moral education which had not existed in peacetime.[128] It was also a time of a wider re-evaluation of the role of education, and of the contribution that elementary schooling could make to national well-being, with a more explicit emphasis on the needs of the wider community and nation than there had been before the war. New educational practices were introduced, or older practices or curricula were adapted for wartime purposes.[129] Leicester Education Committee, and the Leicester schools in my sample, appear to have engaged in more in the way of 'wartime' activities than Birmingham Education Committee, and the Birmingham schools in my sample. However, responsiveness to wartime conditions is evident in log books from both cities.

One notable development was a greater emphasis on explicitly patriotic teaching, a development encouraged in educational periodicals at the time.[130] Some school log books recorded teachers explaining the war, how it had come about, and England's role in the conflict. This was sometimes done through lectures given explicitly for that purpose, as in this log book entry for Severn Street School: "The present being a time of great national trial, lessons are being given on the share of our country in the war, and the simple reason for our engaging in it – duty ... God grant our arms success." In addition, during Navy Week in 1917

---

[126] For example Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 7 July 1893; St Mark's School Log Books 1901-49, 23 December 1908, 22 December 1909, 26 April 1912, 19 December 1913.

[127] For example Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881-1906, WE 22 December 1893, WE 20 December 1895, WE 27 June 1902, WE 21 December 1906; Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 7 November 1913; Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 4 December 1902, 14 December 1903; St Mark's School Log Books 1874-1901, 1901-49, 24 July 1901, 20 December 1901; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 22 March 1883, 27 May 1887, 12 April 1906, 18 September 1908, 30 September 1910, 3 October 1913.

[128] See Chapter Two, pp.76-77.

[129] See the leading article 'The New Gospel' in *Educational Times*, November 1916, pp.129-30 for an example of re-evaluations of elementary schooling in the educational press. For a broader discussion of education, and especially educational policy, during the war see G. Sherington, *English Education, Social Change and War 1911-20*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981, pp.44-125.

[130] For example, issues of *Teacher's World* from 1914 and 1915 contain hints for teachers on how to incorporate patriotic messages into school lessons. See also W.E. Marsden, 'Poisoned History': a Comparative Study of Nationalism, Propaganda, and the Treatment of War and Peace in the Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century School Curriculum, *History of Education*, 29:1, 2000, 29-47, pp.33-34, 38-40.

"special lessons" were "devoted to matters concerning [the] navy" at Willow Street School, while in St Saviour's School the headmaster "talked to the children on the navy, what it has done and what it is doing for us, and our total dependence on it as a protection against oppression."[131]

Patriotic celebrations were adapted to refer to the war. These were more common in the Leicester than the Birmingham schools in my sample (perhaps unsurprisingly given the different attitudes of the two Education Committees). In St Saviour's School, Empire Day celebrations took on militaristic overtones after 1914. For instance, celebrations in 1915 ended with "three cheers for the king and his soldiers and sailors", and in 1916 the headmaster emphasised, as the Education Committee had requested, "the part played by our colonies and fleet in the great war now waging & the duty of all people to spend as little as possible & to save as much as possible."[132] In 1915, Leicester Education Committee also decided that Trafalgar Day (21 October) should be celebrated in the town's elementary schools. Detailed arrangements of proceedings in schools were left to the discretion of head teachers.[133] Trafalgar Day was recorded in the log books of three of the Leicester schools in my sample: Slater Street (Boys' Department), Willow Street and Medway Street. Most log book entries on Trafalgar Day recorded the singing of patriotic songs and the national anthem, and an account of the Battle of Trafalgar by the head teacher supplemented by reference to the role of the navy in the present war. At Medway Street School in 1916 "nearly 900 children marched in single file and saluted the flag in passing."[134] Birmingham Education Committee decided against celebrating Trafalgar Day, but asked teachers to promote Tank Week, Dreadnought Week, and Big Gun Week, at the request of the mayor.[135]

Furthermore, log book entries indicate that enlisting in the army was celebrated and praised in schools. Medway Street School, for instance, compiled a "roll of honour" of old Medway Street boys who signed up. A revealing entry in the log book for Ladypool CofE School referred to the "growing feeling of estrangement" between one teacher and the rest of the

---

[131] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 27 August 1914; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 10-14 September 1917; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 20 September 1917.
[132] St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 21 May 1915, 24 May 1916.
[133] LEC Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes, 19 October 1914, 4 October 1915, 19D59/VII/38.
[134] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, 21 October 1915, 20 October 1916; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 20 October 1916; Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 20 October 1916.
[135] BEC Elementary Education Sub-Committee Minutes, 17 October 1918, BCC/BH/2/1/1/10.

staff "owing to his having taken no steps to enlist in the army." Support for joining the army was so strong among the staff at this school that a teacher who did not share this dominant view was, effectively, excluded. The teacher in question left the school, most likely because he did not fit in.[136]

The war also provided opportunities to engage pupils in community service and fundraising activities. There are some examples of this sort of active citizenship in schools before the war but they are fairly rare, mostly fund-raising by Leicester pupils for the local children's hospital and what was termed the children's effort for the blind.[137] During the war, community service and charitable activity became a regular feature of elementary school life in Leicester. Less so in Birmingham: only three Birmingham schools in my sample note this sort of activity. Boys from Edgbaston CofE School helped on farms during the school holidays in 1915, staff at Tindal Street Girls' School helped with food registration cards, and Severn Street collected for the "Fund for Sick and Wounded Horses".[138] Out of the Leicester Schools, Medway Street appears to have engaged most enthusiastically with the war effort. Pupils made garments for soldiers at the front, baked Christmas pudding and cake for wounded soldiers at the base hospital, raised funds for disabled soldiers and sailors and helped with national registration papers.[139] This sort of activity was generally most common in schools in wealthier areas of Leicester and Birmingham. However, efforts from schools in poorer areas of Leicester are also noted: pupils at Willow Street School also knitted garments for soldiers at the front and held a "rummage sale" in aid of the Mayor's Scheme for disabled soldiers and sailors, while Elbow Lane Special Department contributed shawls and money, and Slater Street Boys' School collected money for British prisoners of war.[140]

---

[136] Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 29 September 1914; Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 23 November 1915, 15 December 1915, 18 January 1916.
[137] Holy Cross School Log Book 1875-1910, 23 February 1905; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 16 February 1912; Willow Street School Private Log Book (Boys) 1886-1892, 11 July 1892, 19D59/VII/440; Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, 18 December 1903.
[138] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1906-31, 16 July 1915; Tindal Street School Log Book (Girls) 1901-41, 18 December 1917; Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 23 April 1918.
[139] Medway Street School Managers' Log Book 1913-24, Christmas 1914, 7 September 1915, 1 October 1915, Christmas 1917, 7 January 1918. Older pupils and staff at St Saviour's School also helped write out "sugar cards" and "meat cards" and assisted with voter registration. St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 28 September 1917, 22 March 1918, 25 April 1918.
[140] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 27 October 1914, 1 February 1915, 23 September 1916, 1 July 1918; Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900-24, 14 June 1917; Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1893-1918, 13 October 1915.

Similarly, the war provided new opportunities to teach pupils the value of saving and thrift. As early as 1879 George Dixon had outlined the benefits of teaching thrift – through penny banks – in elementary schools:

> The establishment of penny banks in connection with our elementary schools will cultivate the habit of saving, and I hope that the instruction given by the teachers in this branch of morals will open the minds of the rising generation to the great fact that riches are within the reach of every healthy, sober, and thrifty man in this country.[141]

Thrift for Dixon was associated with sobriety, hard work, and entrepreneurial endeavour on the part of individuals in a capitalist economy. Dixon noted that penny banks were not as widespread as he wished, as teachers were required to work outside school hours for "little honour and no grant." Still, by 1906 all the Birmingham schools in my sample except Edgbaston CofE School are recorded as having savings banks, though these were only mentioned in the log book of one school, Ladypool CofE.[142] Savings schemes were, by contrast, mentioned in the log books of four Leicester schools.[143] Wartime exigencies provided a new rationale for promoting thrift, namely the wellbeing of the country rather than just the individual, and War Savings schemes were set up in Edgbaston CofE School in Birmingham, and Medway Street, Willow Street and St Saviour's schools in Leicester.[144]

Schools in Leicester and Birmingham also took practical steps to combat the food shortages suffered by English cities in the later years of the war. A number of Leicester schools cultivated "war gardens" to assist food production in 1917.[145] Severn Street School and St

---

[141] Dixon, *Lecture*, p.21. Birmingham School Board School Management Committee decided to establish and oversee penny banks in board schools in 1875, and a Savings Banks Sub-Committee was appointed to undertake the management of banks in 1878. Bishop et al., *op cit.*, pp.5, 9. Dixon's views were echoed in the Committee of Council on Education's Circular Respecting School Savings Banks, Circular No. 196, 1 July 1881, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix, 1880-81*, London: HMSO, 1881, pp.146-49.

[142] BEC, *Report Showing the Work Accomplished by the Education Committee During the Year ended November 9th 1906*, pp.166-68; Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897-1932, 8 September 1913.

[143] Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900-24, 16 March 1908, 18 and 19 April 1916; Willow Street School Log Book 1880-1905, 12 August 1881, 22 December 1882; Medway Street School Log Book 1903-38, WE 8 January 1892, 20 November 1908, 17 November 1913; St Saviour's School Log Book 1883-1919, 17 July 1905.

[144] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1906-31, 8 February 1918; Medway Street School Managers' Log Book 1913-24, 5 July 1916; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 19 September 1916; Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 7 June 1916. These schemes were promoted by Birmingham Education Committee (BEC Elementary Education Committee Minutes, 17 May 1916, BCC/BH/2/1/1/8), and also presumably by Leicester Education Committee though no reference was found in the Education Committee minutes.

[145] Willow Street School Log Book 1905-28, 27 February 1917, 17 April 1917, 19 February 1918; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 15 March 1917.

Saviour's School took active steps to teach pupils "economy of food", "war food" cookery, and "gardening theory". The headmaster of St Saviour's School outlined the moral intent of such schemes, namely to promote good habits on the part of parents as well as pupils: "I thought the children would act as "Missioners" – the girls to the mothers re war cookery & the boys to the fathers – in the art of food production, at this strenuous time."[146] This indicates the ways in which activities in the school were intended, through the children, to have a beneficial impact on the home.

Conclusion

What can be said by way of conclusion about the ways in which moral education was achieved in Leicester and Birmingham's elementary schools, as evidenced by the sources examined?

As this chapter has revealed, log books and inspection reports enable us to piece together the various ways in which moral education was approached in elementary schools. They are also very useful in indicating what else was going on in school, specifically issues of staffing, pupil welfare, and attendance that schools had to deal with. This in turn facilitates an evaluation of how moral education, broadly defined, fitted in to life of the school in general. Most importantly, they offer a unique opportunity to access the voices of individual practitioners.

However, moral education is rarely discussed explicitly or extensively in the sources available. This is undoubtedly, as noted above, in part a consequence of the restrictions of the sources' intended use, but may also reflect a focus on the 3Rs, on administrative and grant-earning matters in the day to day life of schools, and on academic standards in the inspection regime.

One cannot generalise from a sample of this size to the whole elementary school population. Nevertheless, some clear patterns can be observed. Firstly, there is the wide range of morally educative practices and activities in most of the schools examined. Definite instruction (for instance moral instruction lessons, temperance lessons or lectures, scripture lessons) was in most cases combined with other forms of moral education, such as physical exercise and

---

[146] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 22 June 1917; Severn Street School Log Book (Girls) 1897-1932, 16 January 1918; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882-1919, 25 April 1917.

games or occasional extra-curricular activities. The range of activities varied between schools, but there is little evidence that the criticism voiced by Professor Findlay and others that timetabled lessons would lead to the moral world being compartmentalised from other aspects of school life was borne out in practice.[147] Direct and indirect, religious and secular approaches to moral education were practised side by side. Debates over moral education may have been polarised but this polarisation was not reflected in the schools examined. More valid was the criticism that provision for moral education varied between schools. Perhaps an awareness of this sort of variation, and the fact that it was schools in poorer areas which were liable to have a narrower locus, lay behind Henry Major's and FH Hayward's argument that systematic moral instruction was particularly important in poor areas.[148]

What values and behaviours were encouraged through the practices identified? How did they match the vision of Dixon, Gould, and other advocates of moral instruction? This is not a simple question to answer. The morally educative practices associated with regimes of reward and punishment, aimed primarily at developing values and behaviours required for the internal functioning of the school (punctuality, attendance, and cleanliness). Schools further aimed to influence pupils' home life and their parents through these disciplinary regimes, indirectly through interventions with individual pupils, and directly through inviting parents to school on occasions such as prize distribution. All the same, it was primarily the less frequent ceremonies and outings which looked explicitly to the community outside the school and pupils' future lives as adult citizens. Dixon and Gould would have approved of the general sentiment behind these activities, but they saw education for future citizenship as ideally something broader than the almost exclusively patriotic and royalist focus of most school celebrations.

What patterns can be identified in the practices of moral education described in this chapter? What differences can be observed between schools? Firstly there is the range of activities which may have functioned as moral education. Unsurprisingly, moral education in schools in poorer areas appears to have been focused primarily on minimum standards – of attaining the attendance and discipline needed for day to day running of the school (most notably in

---

[147] For example see Findlay, *Growth of Moral Ideas in Children*, p.27.
[148] Source not identified, March 1902, LSS Scrapbook of Newspaper Cuttings 1902-03 (Major); *Educational Times*, 1 July 1907, p.291 (Hayward).

Floodgate Street). This minimum was easier to attain in schools in wealthier areas, leaving more money, staff, time and space for extra-curricular activities such as penny banks and organised games which George Dixon deemed an important part of moral training and which were, more explicitly, preparation for later life. Individual teachers or individual schools (such as Willow Street School) could counter this trend but they were the exceptions to the general rule.

Contemporaries in Birmingham and Leicester noted that schools in poorer areas had problems with staffing and facilities. The headmaster of Severn Street felt that the "better class of school" could poach staff from a "poor class school" like his, while Gould commented that the "worst buildings" were found in the schools attended by the poorest children.[149] A 'good tone' and positive relations between pupils and teachers may have compensated to some extent for the lack of extra-curricular and cross-curricular morally educative activities, for instance at Floodgate Street. Nevertheless, from Dixon's and Gould's perspectives at least there would have been a gap which teachers' efforts in other areas, however important, could not fill.

Finally, this analysis points to a potential gap between the stated priorities of government and educationalists and what was prioritised in the daily life of schools. In log books and inspection reports we find little evidence even of a "parrot cry" of character-training being a central aspect of elementary schooling. Peter Cunningham's observation of a "yawning gap between official constructions of [the teacher's] role on the one hand and their lived experience on the other" seems pertinent here.[150] My argument is not that educationalists were being disingenuous, or that teachers were not concerned with the moral guidance of their pupils. It is, however, quite possible that there was a genuine commitment to moral aspects of elementary schooling, but that in practice the exigencies of everyday life in the school and curricular, inspection and funding regimes often led to other matters receiving more resources and attention.

---

[149] Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886-1921, 1 February 1905; *Leicester Reasoner*, March 1901, p.3.

[150] P. Cunningham, *Being a Primary Teacher in the Twentieth Century*, Coventry: University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Elementary and Primary Education, 1999, p.1. See also Cunningham and Gardner, *Becoming Teachers*, p.230.

The 'struggle' in the title of this thesis, then, refers not only to getting a particular form of moral education implemented and accepted, but also to the potential problems in ensuring that the significance attributed to moral education in the rhetoric of the time was realised in schools in practice. The evidence examined here provides glimpses of a reality which may differ from that portrayed in educationalists' ideals and in local and national policy.

CONCLUSION:
THE STRUGGLE FOR MORAL EDUCATION 1879-1918 AND BEYOND

When he wrote in 1908, Michael Sadler expressed a widespread conviction that the school had an explicit and important moralising function, and also that moral education was crucial to solving the social challenges of the time. What he did not express so firmly, at least in the passage quoted, was the contested nature of moral education, and the struggles over definition, pedagogy, moral code, and implementation that have been highlighted in this study.

This thesis offers new perspectives on the struggle for moral education in English elementary schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its combination of national and local elements, and investigation of sources hitherto not interrogated for this purpose, can offer, I believe, important insights into the ways in which moral education (and especially moral instruction) was recognised, promoted and developed, and implemented in schools, and into why these efforts failed to translate into widespread commitment to a particular programme. After 1918, the focus of debates moved to the allied but different areas of civics and citizenship, though there was still evidence of much moral concern. The post-World War One period is beyond the remit of this study but highlights the unresolved nature of debates over moral education.

From the late nineteenth century, moral educators seized on a wave of concern about the moral condition of the population, and stimulated interest in devising effective moral education in the elementary school. Their achievements were impressive. Pressure groups like the Moral Instruction League and individuals like FJ Gould and George Dixon were active nationally and locally in promoting new curricula and methods. They were ambitious, energetic, and skilled both at political manoeuvring and mobilising public opinion. The educational proposals they and other moral educators developed were innovative and an advance on much of what counted as moral education at the time.

Nevertheless, moral educators were ultimately unsuccessful in generating widespread support for their educational programmes. Interest in moralising the population through the elementary school was intense, but unfocused. Agreement on any particular approach to moral education, let alone the controversial solution of moral instruction on a secular basis, proved problematic. This was true even with Dixon and Gould's promotional efforts and skilful use of their networks in what were in many respects favourable local contexts in Birmingham and Leicester. With secular moral instruction in particular, political and attitudinal barriers impeded campaigners in their efforts to convince teachers, local and national educational authorities, and the general public.

Ultimately, it appears, the divisions between advocates of a Christian or a secular moral education, and between advocates of taught moral lessons or indirect approaches to moral training, proved too deep to overcome. In addition, the public impetus was not strong enough to compel agreement. The smaller group of moral instructors did not present a united front, but disagreed over focus and strategy. Moreover, the examination of moral instruction handbooks also suggests that teachers were faced with a potentially demanding pedagogy, and would have had to deal with subtly different treatments of the same moral qualities in the various handbooks. Other approaches to moral education not examined in such detail may well have appeared equally problematic if subjected to the same scrutiny. Yet what proved most difficult when it came to implementation in schools, it seems, was that moral education did not fit neatly into the prescribed curriculum or into the inspection and funding regime. Teachers faced practical difficulties in dealing with these additions to the curriculum. Thus genuine interest, as evidenced by the emphasis on character-training in educational debates, and also the unspoken assumptions and understandings about the role of the school and the teacher in log books and inspection reports, did not ultimately translate into widespread activity.

Part of the purpose of this study was to establish what the different sources analysed might reveal. Studying a range of sources has yielded insights into the ways in which the ideas and plans of politicians and educationalists may or may not have translated into practice in schools. An investigation of only policy documents, educational debates, and even the records of a pressure group, could potentially be misleading. Moreover, this research has revealed the considerable potential of local studies to help us understand the mechanisms by

which educational reforms are promoted and implemented. It has revealed the factors which led to varied levels of interest and activity across the country (some located in the local context, others related to individual activists). Similar studies in other areas would be required in order to establish how far these factors were echoed or replicated elsewhere.

This thesis does not claim to offer a definitive analysis of moral education in elementary schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As noted in the introduction, despite useful previous research relating to moral education, many other areas would merit further exploration, much more than can be accomplished here. The sources I have examined cannot reveal much of the views of ordinary teachers (other than head teachers), pupils, or parents. Analysis of a large sample of autobiographical sources could potentially yield useful results. Moreover, further local studies are needed, particularly in small towns, rural counties, heavy-industrial or Anglican-dominated cities. Another possibility would be a less detailed analysis of a larger sample of School Boards and Education Committees which introduced moral instruction to ascertain whether there were any similarities in the Boards' membership, and in the political and religious background of these different localities.

In addition, this study, in common with some other research projects, raises new questions as much as it offers answers to those questions it set out to address. We need to know more about the operation of networks of educationalists – nationally and internationally – who were interested in moral education. A starting point might be a detailed investigation of how the ethical movement operated as a conduit for facilitating activity and the transmission of ideas relating to moral education, both nationally and internationally. It would also be useful to explore the links between the promotion of moral education in schools and initiatives that aimed to moralise the population outside the school setting, possibly through an investigation of the individuals and networks involved. There is also considerable scope for further detailed content analysis of moral instruction handbooks. Nonetheless, this study has mapped the terrain and indicates sites for future exploration.

Such exploration could, in part, interact with contemporary debates. The issues addressed in this thesis transcend boundaries of time and space. In the last few months, we have seen debates about the teaching of right and wrong sparked by the Qualification and Curriculum Authority's review of 11-14 education, the education minister Bill Rammell's proposals for

the teaching of "core British values", and most recently about Ofsted's report on citizenship education. These debates testify to a continued belief in the importance of the school as an agent of moral education and moral change, but also to the seemingly inevitable ideological differences over what we want to accomplish by moral education, how to go about it, and the logistical difficulties of achieving it in practice.[1] This historical investigation could therefore, to use Benjamin Sacks's useful phrase, offer valuable insights into the "anatomy of the question" in the present day.[2]

Attempts to ensure more formal and effective teaching of moral values on a secular basis in schools have appeared periodically in the intervening years. The Association for Education in Citizenship in the 1930s campaigned for direct teaching of a liberal, democratic and secular version of English citizenship in schools.[3] Most recently we have seen Professor Crick's campaign, ultimately successful, to get citizenship – with its elements of social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy – incorporated into the National Curriculum.[4]

Yet there has been continued resistance to the teaching of secular moral values. Perhaps because of this resistance, successive central education departments have not prescribed a single educational approach. Even with the inclusion of citizenship in the national curriculum since September 2002 it has been left to schools to decide how they organised the designated 5% curriculum time. Those aiming to promote the teaching of secular moral values still face obstacles, including the power of religious bodies in educational policy-making, and what sociologists have termed a continued 'religiosity' on the part of non-practising Christians.[5] Despite the absence of an immediate 'religious difficulty' in educational politics, the relationship of morality to religion continues to be problematic.

---

[1] A. Smith, Anger Over Plans to Scrap Moral Guidance Teaching in Schools, *Education Guardian*, 31 July 2006; S. McCormack, Citizenship: Is this the Worst Taught Subject?, *The Independent Education*, 6 July 2006; Ofsted, *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools*, London: Ofsted, 2006.
[2] Sacks, *op cit.*, p.vii.
[3] R. Freathy, *Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-1944*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Exeter, 2005, pp.2, 277-79.
[4] Advisory Group on Citizenship, *op cit.*, pp.11-13, 40-41.
[5] G. Davie, *Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing Without Belonging*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Conclusion

The educational approaches discussed and introduced a century ago prefigure recent developments. In current debates about citizenship education, as a century ago about moral education, there is a division between those who propose timetabled lessons, and others who advocate working through the influence of the teacher, the life and organisation of the school, and a range of activities both in school and in the community.[6] The idea of using the school to counteract negative influences in the home and local surroundings, and at the same time to educate the family and community, is echoed in recent proposals for community schools. There are also marked similarities between some of the educational approaches in moral instruction lessons – a cycle of themes, developed and expanded according to the age of the pupil – and personal, social and health education, a curriculum area which can obviously be utilised for purposes of moral education. These could, arguably, be seen as indications of the diffuse, long-term influence – on educational debates, on curriculum development – of moral education in the country's elementary schools.

There are important differences. Now there is more emphasis on debate and pupil opinion, and, in a multicultural society, on teaching how to think morally rather than imparting the 'right' set of values (though certain values are, arguably, implicit in so-called value-neutral approaches). There is also now an emphasis on rights as well as duties. Yet many of the problems identified a century ago remain. Ofsted's recent overview of citizenship education reveals that schools continue to exhibit mixed attitudes to the value of devoting curriculum time to the subject, and that problems of lack of confidence and specialist training on the part of teachers, as well as practical timetabling issues, remain.[7]

Ultimately, the struggles of the earlier period suggest that effective moral education in the country's schools will not be assured just because people think it is important. Sustained effort and planning on the part of policy-makers, educational thinkers, and teachers, is required to negotiate the sticky issues of varied educational approaches, and different religious and philosophical value bases. The struggle over the nature of moral education, and the struggle to ensure that interest is translated into sustained and effective practice, continues still.

---

[6] McCormack, *op cit.*
[7] Ofsted, *op cit.*

APPENDIX:

BIRMINGHAM AND LEICESTER SCHOOL SAMPLES

Deciding on an appropriate sampling technique entailed weighing up the benefits of a limited analysis of the records of a large number of schools or a more detailed analysis with a smaller sample. A key purpose of this part of the thesis is to evaluate what happens when the suggestions of pressure groups and government policy are implemented on the ground. Other local studies of education suggest that extremely localised features of schooling – such as individual teachers, the local community and its relationship with school – are central to implementation. For this reason a detailed analysis of records from a small number of schools over the period covered by this thesis was chosen as the most appropriate way to answer this question. Log books and inspection reports are the most common surviving records. The inspection reports analysed were mostly those written within log books, as required by the successive education codes. These were supplemented by Leicester School Board's collection of inspection reports, and Birmingham School Board's reports by the Board Inspector.

A deliberate sampling methodology was used. Schools were selected to allow comparisons around a number of interconnected themes highlighted in late nineteenth and early twentieth century debates on moral education: 1) socio-economic status; 2) urban expansion; 3) distinctions between board and voluntary schools (in religion and in administration).

A sample of fourteen schools (seven in Leicester and seven in Birmingham) was selected around this theme. The sample included:

- Voluntary schools (four Church of England schools, one Nonconformist (British) school, one Roman Catholic school) and eight board schools. More board schools than voluntary schools were included in the sample to reflect the proportions of board schools and voluntary schools in Leicester and Birmingham for much of the period 1879 to 1918;
- Schools in impoverished central areas, 'respectable' areas of new housing, wealthy suburbs;

- Old and new schools (schools built in response to population expansion in the 1880s and 1890s in certain areas of Birmingham and Leicester, older schools built before 1870).

The sample was also designed to include different types of elementary school provision (mixed and single sex, large and small). The selection was, inevitably, influenced by the availability of sources. Infants departments were, for reasons of manageability, not included in the analysis.[1]

There are difficulties in constructing a sample of this sort. Any attempt to investigate the effect of socio-economic status on educational provision through school records will necessarily be imperfect. First, defining the socio-economic characteristics of an area is fraught with problems. The socio-economic characteristics of an area could change over time. For this and other reasons (such as facilities which were once good becoming overcrowded or lapsing into a poor condition, and changes in personnel) the fortunes of a school could change over time. Second, areas could be highly segregated, sometimes to the extent that one street may house skilled artisans, the next manual labourers, or even that there was a social mix on the same street.[2] This makes the identification of the socio-economic characteristics of a school's neighbourhood problematic. Data is available for indicators such as birth and death rates and incidence of illness at the level of the electoral ward, but is not detailed enough. Third, defining a 'catchment area' is difficult because parents were able to (and did) select which school they sent their children to, and this was not necessarily the nearest school.[3] For instance, from the schools in this sample, Holy Cross School was located in a gentile area of Leicester (New Walk) but drew its pupils from a predominantly poor Roman Catholic population, many of which lived at some distance from the school.

Table 7.1 gives details of the schools included in the sample:

---

[1] Floodgate Street School is the one exception.
[2] Skipp, *op cit.*, pp.84-87.
[3] Chinn, *op cit.*

Table 7.1 Sample of schools: *Birmingham and Leicester*

Birmingham	
Cowper Street School	Board school, opened 1885, located in poor area of Birmingham.
Edgbaston CofE School	Voluntary school (CofE), opened 1846. Girls department closed 1910, school shut 1934. Located in wealthy suburb.
Floodgate Street School	Board school opened 1891, located in one of the poorest areas of Birmingham.
Highfield Road School	Board school opened 1879 under Aston School Board, transferred to Birmingham School Board with the extension of the city boundaries in 1891. Area of rapid population expansion.
Ladypool Road CofE School	Voluntary school (CofE) opened 1857.
Severn Street School	Voluntary school (British School) opened 1809, transferred to Birmingham School Board in 1901. Located in an increasingly poor central area of Birmingham.
Tindal Street School	Board school opened 1880 in area of population expansion.
Leicester	
Elbow Lane School	Board school.[4] Log books for special department only.
Holy Cross School	Voluntary school (Roman Catholic) opened 1824. Located in wealthy area but poor student body, many Irish immigrants.
Medway Street School	Board school opened 1886. Located in respectable area of population expansion.
St Mark's School	Voluntary school (CofE), opened 1874. Located in increasingly impoverished central area.
St Saviour's School	Voluntary school (CofE) opened 1882. Spinney Hill, respectable suburb.
Slater Street School	Board school opened 1874. Poor central area.
Willow Street School	Board school opened 1880. Initially half-time, girls and boys departments, became mixed department. Poor central area.

[4] The information on file in RLLR does not indicate when this school opened.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Parliamentary Debates

Hansard Parliamentary Debates 1879-1918

Official Papers

Board of Education, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*, London; HMSO, 1905.

Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools 1875-1918.

East Central Division: General Report for the Year 1887, by the Rev. D.J. Stewart, London: HMSO, 1888.

Final Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales, London: HMSO, 1888.

Reports of the Committee of Council on Education, England and Wales, with Appendix 1875-1899.

Reports of the Board of Education 1900-1919.

Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. Statistical Report, London: HMSO, 1888.

Archives

Birmingham City Archive

Birmingham School Board and Birmingham City Council Education Committee

Birmingham Education Committee Elementary Education Sub-Committee Minutes 1903-1918 BCC/BH/2/1/1/1-21

Birmingham Education Committee Minutes 1903-1918 BCC/BH/1/1/1/1-17

Birmingham Education Committee Reports November 1903-June 1912 BCC/BH/1/1/5/1-12

Birmingham School Board Education Committee Minutes 1879-1903 SB/B/2/2/1/1-3

Birmingham School Board Education and School Management Committee Minutes 1873-1881 SB/B/2/1/1/1-5

Birmingham School Board Inspector of School Reports January 1896-July 1903 SB/B/3/5/1/1-2

Birmingham School Board Minutes 1870-1903 SB/B/1/1/1-21

Birmingham School Board Newspaper Cuttings Scrap Books 1871-1903 SB/B/1/11/1-20

Birmingham School Board Reports November 1870-November 1903 SB/B/1/4/1-25

Birmingham School Board School Management Committee Minutes 1881-1903 SB/B/3/1/1/1-9

School Records

Cowper Street School

Log Book 1885-1924 S215/1/1

Punishment Book S215/3/7

Dudley Road School

Log Book (Boys) 1878-1895 S194/1/1

Edgbaston CofE School

Log Books (Boys) 1881-1931 S62/1/1-2

Floodgate Street School

Log Book (Infants) 1891-1940 S68/1/1

Log Book 1891-1920 S68/2/1

Highfield Road School

Log Books (Girls) 1879-1897 S97/1/1-2

Log Book (Boys 1888-1897, Mixed 1897-1931) S97/2/1

Ladypool CofE School

Log Book 1862-1897 S113/1/1

Log Book 1897-1932 S113/3/1

Severn Street School

Log Books (Boys) 1864-1921 S178/1/1-2

Log Book (Girls) 1897-1933 S178/2/1

Tindal Street School

Log Book (Girls) 1880-1930 S198/1/1

Punishment Book 1894-1938 S98/1/2

Other files

Birmingham Education Committee, *Prize Scheme for Day Schools May 1903*, Correspondence and Circulars relating to Edgbaston Parochial CofE Schools DRO53A/122/25

George H. Keen's Culham College Record Book of Practical Teaching 1914-16 MS 1378

Interviews undertaken as part of the Digbeth and Deritend Local History Project *MS 1497*

Papers of Constance C. Rowland MS 1866/9

Birmingham Central Library

National Education League printed material A370.8 D/15

Birmingham Local Studies Library

Anon. *George Dixon, The Biograph and the Review*, September 1879, 302-04

Birmingham School Board Election Literature, 1900 LF.48.21

Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Chairman 1879-1899

Birmingham School Board, *Educational work in Birmingham for the Three Years 1885-1888. An Address Delivered to the Birmingham School Board by the Vice Chairman Rev EFM MacCarthy, November 1st 1888* LP.48.21

Dale, R.W. *Religious Teaching by School Boards Perilous to the Religious Faith and Life of the Nation*, Birmingham: Hudson and Son, c.1872 LP.48.21

Dixon, G. *Lecture on Elementary Education in the Birmingham Board Schools Delivered to the Birmingham Teachers' Association*, 7 October 1879 LP.48.06

Dolman, F. The Young Men of Birmingham, *The Young Man*, c.1895, pp.194-99 E.15 592746

J.H. Lloyd Letters, Leaflets, Cuttings 1867-1902, Birmingham Institutions J/1

Wilson, H.B. and Wilson, G.B. *"Drawn unto Death." A Statement of Facts for the Citizens of Birmingham*, Birmingham: Birmingham News and Printing, 1903, Birmingham History D/12

Warwickshire Photographic Survey, WK-B11

Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland

Leicester School Board and Leicester Town Council Education Committee

Leicester Education Committee Elementary Schools Sub-Committee Minutes 1903-1919 19D59/VII/34-40

Leicester Education Committee HMI Reports on Schools 1904-1918 19D59/VII/142-155

Leicester Education Committee Minutes 1903-1919 19D59/VII/28-33, 399-403

Leicester Education Committee Occasional Special Committees Minutes 1903-1912 19D59/VII/100-101

Leicester Education Committee Press Cuttings Books 1903-1919 19D59/VI/322-325

Leicester School Board HMI Reports on Schools 1873-1902 19D59/VI/91-101

Leicester School Board Minutes 1871-1903 19D59/VI/1-11

Leicester School Board Press Cuttings Books 1892-1903 19D59/VII/320-321

Leicester School Board School Management Committee Minutes 1875-1903 19D50/VI/12-20

Major, H. *Report on the Leicester Board Schools May 1 to July 31 1877*, Pamphlets Vol. 50

Report on the Work of the Education Committee from the Appointed Day 1st July 1903 to the 9th November 1912, 19D59/VII/472/i

School Records

Elbow Lane School

Special Department Log Book 1900-1924 19D59/VII/339

Holy Cross School

Log Books 1875-1930 DE2735/1-2

Medway Street School

Log Books 1882-1938 DE 3063/1-2

Managers' Log Book 1913-1924 DE3063/5

Managers' Minute Book 1912-1934 DE3063/3

St Mark's School

Log Books 1874-1941 DE3893/23-24

St Saviour's School

Log Book 1882-1919 18D68/1

Punishment Book 1907-1929 18D68/5

Slater Street School

Log Books (Boys) 1874-1918 DE4467/1-2

Log Books (Girls) 1874-1924 DE 4467/4-5

Willow Street School

Log Books 1880-1928 19D59/VII/437-438

Private Log Book (Boys) 1886-1892 19D59/VII/440

Upper Special Department Log Book 19D59/VII/383

Records of the Leicester Secular Society

Gimson, S. A. *Random Recollections of the Leicester Secular Society, with Digressions*, unpublished typescript, Part I (March 1932), Part II (1935) 10D68/15-16

Minute Books 1885-1943 10D68/3-4

Scrapbooks of Newspaper Cuttings 1899-1909 10D68/8-12

Scrapbook of Printed Material issued by the Society 1843-1908 10D68/6

British Library

Moral Education League Circulars and Pamphlets 1915-21 8289.cc.28

Moral Education League Quarterly, 24-38, 1911-1914 PP.1103.cgl

Moral Education League, *A Scheme for the Correlation of Certain Subjects of Instruction in Subordination to the Aim of Character Training (Signed F.J. Gould)*, c.1912, 1865. c.1(83)

Other Archives

British Library of Political and Economic Science, Pamphlet Collection – Special

Brunel University Library, Working Class Autobiographical Archive

Deansgate Library, Manchester, Social Pamphlets

Labour History Archive and Study Centre, Manchester, Labour History Archive, Labour Party General Correspondence

National Archives, Education Department Correspondence ED24/409

University of Strathclyde Archives, Sir Patrick Geddes Papers

Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Madison, Society for Ethical Culture Publications 1876-1972

Newspapers and Periodicals

Agnostic Annual

Birmingham Daily Gazette

Birmingham Daily Mail

Birmingham Daily Post

Birmingham Weekly Post

Education

Educational Times

Ethical World

The Head Teacher

International Journal of Ethics

Journal of Education

Leicester Reasoner

Moral Instruction League Quarterly/Moral Education League Quarterly

The National Schoolmaster

Positivist Review

School

School Board Chronicle/School Governor Chronicle

School Guardian

The Schoolmaster

South Place Magazine

The Teacher

Teachers World

The Times

Books and Pamphlets

Adler, F. *The Moral Instruction of Children*, London: Edward Arnold, 1892.

Adler, F. A Secular View of Moral Training, *North American Review*, May 1883, pp.446-54.

Arnold-Forster, H.O. *The Citizen Reader*, 8th edition, London: Cassell & Company, Ltd., 1887.

Baden-Powell, R. *Scouting for Boys. A Handbook for Instruction on Good Citizenship*, London: Horace Cox, 1908.

Baldwin, W.H. and Robson, W. *Lessons on Character-Building*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1913.

Ballard, P. Boswood, *Things I Cannot Forget*, London: University of London Press, 1937.

Barclay, T. *Memoirs and Medleys. The Autobiography of a Bottle-Washer*, Leicester: Edgar Backus, 1934.

Bates, L. *Story Lessons on Character-Building (Morals) and Manners*, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

Bikkers, A.V. and Hatton, J. *Ethics for Undenominational Schools*, London: Grant & Co., 1872.

Bray, Mrs. C. *Elements of Morality*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882.

Chesterton, A. *The Garden of Childhood*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd., 1905.

Chesterton, A. *The Magic Garden. Stories for Children at Home and at School*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c.1908.

Chesterton, A. *The Pansy Patch. Stories for Children at Home and at School*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c.1912.

Collar, G. and Crook, C.W. *School Management and Methods of Instruction*, London: Macmillan & Co. Limited, 1900.

Dale, A.W.W. *The Life of R.W. Dale of Birmingham*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898.

Ellis, I.C. *Records of Nineteenth Century Leicester*, Private printing, 1935.

Essays on Duty and Discipline, London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1911.

Gould, F.J. *British Education after the War*, London: Watts & Co., 1917.

Gould, F.J. *Childrens' Book of Moral Lessons. First Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1899.

Gould, F.J. *Children's Book of Moral Lessons. Fourth Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1907.

Gould, F.J. *Children's Book of Moral Lessons. Second Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1903.

Gould, F.J. *Children's Book of Moral Lessons. Third Series*, London: Watts & Co., 1904.

Gould, F.J. *The Children's Plutarch*, London: Watts & Co., 1906.

Gould, F.J. *Life and Manners*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1906.

Gould, F.J. *The Life Story of a Humanist*, London: Watts & Co., 1923.

Gould. F.J. *Moral Education. A Chapter from the Story of Schools in England and Wales, 1895-1925*, London: private printing, 1929.

Gould, F.J. *Moral Instruction. Its Theory and Practice*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913

Gould, F.J. The Moral Instruction of Children, in S. Coit (ed.) *Ethical Democracy: Essays in Social Dynamics*, London: Grant Richards, 1900, 163-93.

Gould, F.J. *A National Need. The Civic Spirit in Education*, London: Moral Education League, 1913.

Gould, F.J. *A Plan of Moral Instruction Adopted by the Moral Instruction League*, London: Moral Instruction League, c.1897.

Gould, F.J. *The Religion of Humanity*, London: Watts & Co., 1916.

Hackwood, F.W. *Notes of Lessons on Moral Subjects*, London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1883.

Hall, G. S. *Educational Problems. Volume I*, London: D. Appleton and Company, 1911.

Hayward, F.H. *An Educational Failure. A School Inspector's Story*, London: Duckworth, 1938.

Hayward, F.H. *Education and the Heredity Spectre*, London, Watts & Co., 1908.

Hayward, F.H. *The Reform of Moral and Biblical Education on the Lines of Herbartianism, Critical Thought, and the Ethical Needs of the Present Day*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1902.

Hayward, F.H. and White, E.M. *The Last Years of a Great Educationalist: A Record of the Work and Thought of F.J. Gould from 1923 to 1938*, Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay and Company, Ltd., c.1942.

Hollingworth, J. *Moral Instruction Essays*, London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1907.

Holmes, E.A. The Confessions and Hopes of an ex-Inspector of Schools, *Hibbert Journal*, 20:4, 1922, 721-39.

Johnson, H. *Moral Instruction in Elementary Schools in England and Wales. A Return Compiled from Official Documents*, London: David Nutt, 1908.

Joyce, P.W. *A Handbook of School Management and Methods of Teaching*, 12th edition, Dublin: Gill & Son, 1887.

Knox, E. *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian 1847-1934*, London: Hutchinson & Co., 1934.

London, J. *The People of the Abyss*, London: Isbister, 1903.

Major, H. *How to Earn the Merit Grant. Part II.* London: George Bell and Sons, 1883.

Major, H. *Moral Instruction. Junior Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1907.

Major, H. *Moral Instruction. Middle Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1907.

Major, H. *Moral Instruction. Senior Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1907.

Major, H. *Moral Instruction. Advanced Stage*, London: Blackie & Son, 1909.

Major, H. *Stories to Remember. Junior Book*, London; Blackie & Son, 1907.

Masterman, C.F.G. (ed.) *The Heart of the Empire*, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901.

Meath, Reginald, 12th Earl of, *Memories of the Nineteenth Century*, London: John Murray, 1923.

Moral Instruction League, *A Graduated Syllabus of Moral Instruction and Training in Citizenship for Elementary Schools*, London: MIL, 1902.

Moral Instruction League, *The Moral Instruction League*, London: Moral Instruction League, c.1904.

Moral Instruction League, *Moral Instruction. What it is not and What it is*, London: Moral Instruction League, n.d.

Moral Instruction League, *Our Future Citizens*, London: Moral Instruction League, 1900.

Moral Instruction League, *To All Interested in Moral and Civic Education in Schools*, London: Moral Instruction League, c.1907.

Morrison, A. *A Child of the Jago*, London: Methuen & Co., 1896.

Picton, J.A. *The Bible in Schools. A Question of Ethics*, London: Watts & Co., 1901.

Quilter, H.H. *Onward and Upward. A Book for Boys and Girls*, London: Swann Sonnenschein & Co., 1902.

Record of the Proceedings of the First International Moral Education Congress, London: David Nutt, 1908.

Reid, J. *A Manual of Moral Instruction*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1908.

Sadler, M.E. (ed.) *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools. Report of an International Inquiry. Volumes I and II*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908.

Smith, Rev. S.F. A Further Danger for our Schools, *The Month*, December 1906, 601-18.

Spiller, G. *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain. A Documentary History*, London: Farleigh Press, 1934.

Spiller, G. (ed.) *Papers on Moral Education Communicated to the First International Moral Education Congress*, 2nd edition, London: David Nutt, 1909.

Waldegrave, A.J. *Lessons in Citizenship*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1912.

Waldegrave, A.J. *A Teacher's Hand-book of Moral Lessons*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1904.

Wicksteed, J.H. *Conduct and Character*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, c.1913.

Secondary Sources

Books

Advisory Group on Citizenship, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools. Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September 1998*, London: DfES/QCA, 1998.

Aldrich, R. *Lessons from History of Education. The Selected Works of Richard Aldrich.* London: Routledge, 2006.

Aldrich, R. and Gordon, P. *Dictionary of British Educationists*, London: Woburn Press, 1989.

Anderson, B. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.

Bailey, V. *Delinquency and Citizenship. Reclaiming the Young Offender 1914-1948*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Ball, N. *Educating the People. A Documentary History of Elementary Schooling in England, 1840-1870*, London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1983.

Barnard, H.C. *A Short History of English Education from 1760 to 1944*, London: University of London Press, 1947.

Barnsby, G.J. *Birmingham Working People. A History of the Labour Movement in Birmingham 1650-1914*, Wolverhampton: Integrated Publishing Services, 1989.

Bartley, P. *Prostitution: Prevention and Reform in England, 1860-1914*, London, New York: Routledge, 2000.

Bebbington, D.W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain. A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Bebbington, D.W. *The Nonconformist Conscience. Chapel and Politics 1870-1914*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982.

Birchenough, C. *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day*, 2nd edition, London: University Tutorial Press, 1925.

Bishop, D., Gabbett, E., Grosvenor, I., Roberts, S., Stephens, M., Taylor, P., Winsor, B. *The City a Light and a Beacon: A Guide to Birmingham Education Archives*, Birmingham: Birmingham City Archives, 2001.

Blackham, H.J. *Stanton Coit 1857-1944: Selections from his Writings*, London: Favil Press, c.1949.

Bibliography

Bland, L. 'Cleansing the Portals of Life': the Venereal Disease Campaign in the Early Twentieth Century, in M. Langan and B. Schwarz (eds.) *Crises in the British State 1880-1930*, London: Hutchinson, 1985, 192-208.

Bloomfield, A. Drill and Dance as Symbols of Imperialism, in J.A. Mangan (ed.) *Making Imperial Mentalities. Socialisation and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990, 74-95.

Briggs, A. *History of Birmingham. Volume II: Borough and City 1865-1938*, London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Briggs, A. *Victorian Cities*, London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Briggs, J.H.Y. Elite and Proletariat in Nineteenth-Century Birmingham Nonconformity, in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 71-98.

Brown, S.J. *Thomas Chalmers and the Godly Commonwealth in Scotland*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Brundage, A. *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Budd, S. *Varieties of Unbelief, Atheists and Agnostics in English Society 1850-1960*, London: Heinemann, 1977.

Burgess, H.J. *Enterprise in Education. The Story of the Work of the Established Church in the Education of the People Prior to 1870*, London: National Society/SPCK, 1958.

Cannadine, D. *Lords and Landlords: The Aristocracy and the Towns, 1774-1967*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1980.

Castle, E.B. *Moral Education in Christian Times*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1958.

Chancellor, V. *History for their Masters*, London: Adams & Dart, 1970.

Clarke, P. *Liberals and Social Democrats*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Collini, S., *Liberalism and Sociology. L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Collini, S. *Public Moralists. Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Copley, T. *Black Tom: Arnold of Rugby, the Myth and the Man*, London: Continuum, 2002.

Cronin, J. *The Politics of State Expansion. War, State and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain*, London: Routledge, 1991.

Cruickshank, M. *Church and State in English Education. 1870 to the Present Day*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1963.

Bibliography

Cunningham, P. *Being a Primary Teacher in the Twentieth Century*, Coventry: University of Warwick, Centre for Research in Elementary and Primary Education, 1999.

Cunningham, P. and Gardner, P. *Becoming Teachers. Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950*, London: Woburn Press, 2004.

Daglish, N. *Education Policy-making in England and Wales. The Crucible Years, 1895-1911*, London: Woburn Press, 1996.

Davie, G. *Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing Without Belonging*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Davin, A. *Growing up Poor. Home, School and Street in London 1870-1914*, London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996.

Digby, A. and Searby, P. *Children, School and Society in Nineteenth-Century England*, London: Macmillan, 1981.

Evans, R.H. The Local Government of Leicester in the Nineteenth Century, in A.E. Brown (ed.) *The Growth of Leicester*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1970, 71-77.

Eyck, F. *G.P. Gooch: A Study in History and Politics*, London, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1982.

Fraser, D. *Power and Authority in the Victorian City*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

Fraser, H. Municipal Socialism and Social Policy, in R.J. Morris and R. Rodger (eds.) *The Victorian City. A Reader in British Urban History 1820-1914*, London: Longman, 1993, 258-80.

Freeden, M. (ed.) *Minutes of the Rainbow Circle, 1894-1924*, London: Royal Historical Society, 1989.

Freeden, M. *The New Liberalism, An Ideology of Social Reform*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Friess, H.L. *Felix Adler and Ethical Culture. Memories and Studies*, ed. by F. Weingartner, New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Gathorne-Hardy, J. *The Public School Phenomenon*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977.

Gill, A. The Leicester School Board 1871-1903, in B. Simon (ed.) *Education in Leicestershire 1540-1940*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1968, 156-77.

Gillis, J. *Youth and History. Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770-Present*, London: Academic Press, 1974.

Gordon, P. *The Victorian School Manager*, London: Woburn Press, 1974.

Gordon, P. and Lawton, D. *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978.

Gordon, P. and White, J. *Philosophers as Educational Reformers. The Influence of Idealism on British Educational Thought and Practice*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Bibliography

Gouldstone, T. M. *The Rise and Decline of Anglican Idealism in the Nineteenth Century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.

Greenleaf, W.H. *The British Political Tradition, Volumes One and Two*, London: Methuen, 1983.

Grosvenor, I. and Watts, R. Schooling and Education in Birmingham in C. Chinn (ed.) *Birmingham: Bibliography of a City*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2003, 181-99.

The Growth of the City, *A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 7: The City of Birmingham* (1964), pp.4-25, [http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.asp?compid=22959], accessed 1 August 2006.

Guttchen, R.S. *Felix Adler*, New York: Twayne, 1974.

Halstead J. and Taylor, M. *The Development of Values, Attitudes and Personal Qualities: A Review of Recent Research*, Slough: NFER, 2000.

Harris, B. *The Health of the Schoolchild. A History of the School Medical Service in England and Wales*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

Harris, B. *The Origins of the British Welfare State. Social Welfare in England and Wales, 1880-1945*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Harris, J. (ed.) *Civil Society in British History. Ideas, Identities, Institutions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Harris, J. *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870-1914*, London: Penguin Books, 1993.

Harrison, R. *Before the Socialists. Studies in Labour and Politics 1861-1991*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.

Haynes, B. *Working-Class Life in Victorian Leicester. The Joseph Dare Reports*, Leicester: Leicester Libraries and Information Service, 1991.

Hempton, D. Religious Life in Industrial Britain, in S. Gilley and W.J. Sheils (eds.) *A History of Religion in Britain*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994, 306-21.

Hendrick, H. *Images of Youth. Age, Class and the Male Youth Problem, 1880-1920*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Hennock, E.P. *Fit and Proper Persons. Ideal and Reality in Nineteenth-Century Urban Government*, London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

Herrick, J. *Vision and Realism. A Hundred Years of the Freethinker*, London: G.W. Foote & Co., 1982.

Hollis, P. *Ladies Elect. Women in English Local Government 1865-1914*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Honey, J.R. de S. *Tom Brown's Universe. The Development of the Public School in the 19th Century.* London: Millington, 1977.

Hopkins, E. *The Rise of the Manufacturing Town. Birmingham and the Industrial Revolution*, 2nd edition, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998.

Hopkins, E. *Working-Class Self-help in Nineteenth Century England*, London: UCL Press, 1995.

Horn, P. English Elementary Education and the Growth of the Imperial Ideal: 1880-1914, in J.A. Mangan (ed.) *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988, 39-55.

Horn, P. *The Victorian and Edwardian Schoolchild*, Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1989.

Humphries, S. *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

Hunt, T. *Building Jerusalem. The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004.

Hurt, J.S. Drill, Discipline and the Elementary School Ethos, in P. McCann (ed.) *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1979, 167-90.

Joyce, P. *Visions of the People. Industrial England and the Question of Class 1848-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Keating, P. *Into Unknown England 1866-1913. Selections from the Social Explorers*, London: Fontana, 1976.

Koss, S. *Nonconformity in Modern British Politics*, Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1975.

Lancaster, B. *Radicalism, Cooperation and Socialism: Leicester Working-Class Politics 1860-1906*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987.

Laqueur, T.W. *Religion and Respectability. Sunday Schools and Working Class Culture 1780-1850*, London: Yale University Press, 1976.

Lawton, D. and Gordon, P. *Dictionary of Education*, 2nd edition, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.

McBriar, A.M. *An Edwardian Mixed Doubles. The Bosanquets versus the Webbs. A Study in British Social Policy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

McGee, J.E. *A Crusade for Humanity. The History of Organised Positivism in England*, London: Watts & Co., 1931.

Mackenzie, J. *Propaganda and Empire. The Manipulation of British Public Opinion 1880-1960*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Bibliography

MacKillop, I.D. *The British Ethical Societies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

McLeod, H. *Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City*, London: Croom Helm, 1974.

McLeod, H. *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1984.

Machin, G.I.T. *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth-Century Britain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Mangan, J.A. *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Mangan, J.A. (ed.) *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Manton, K. *Socialism and Education in Britain 1883-1902*, London: Woburn Press, 2001.

Marsden, W.E. *The School Textbook: Geography, History and Social Studies*, London: Woburn Press, 2001.

Marsh, J. *Back to the Land. The Pastoral Impulse in Victorian England from 1880 to 1914*, London: Quartet Books, 1982.

Marsh, P. *Joseph Chamberlain. Entrepreneur in Politics*, London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Mazumdar, P. *Eugenics, Human Genetics and Human Failings. The Eugenics Society, its Sources and its Critics in Britain*, London: Routledge, 1992.

Mowat, C.L. *The Charity Organisation Society 1869-1913. Its Ideas and Work*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1961.

Nash, D. and Reeder, D. with Jones, P. and Rodger, R. (eds.) *Leicester in the Twentieth Century*, Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1993.

Nash, D.S. *Secularism, Art and Freedom*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992.

Norman, E. *Church and State since 1800*, in S. Gilley and W.J. Sheils (eds.) *A History of Religion in Britain*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994, 277-90.

Ofsted, *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools*, London: Ofsted, 2006.

Pritchard, R.M. *Housing and the Spatial Structure of the City*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Prochaska, F. *The Voluntary Impulse. Philanthropy in Modern Britain*, London: Faber & Faber, 1988.

Prochaska, F. *Women and Philanthropy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Rathbone, K. *The Dales. Growing up in a Victorian Family*, compiled and edited by B. and H. Walker, Birmingham: Northstep Ltd., 1989.

Reeder, D. Predicaments of City Children: Late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society, in D. Reeder (ed.) *Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Taylor & Francis, 1977, 75-94.

Richter, M. *The Politics of Conscience. T.H. Green and his Age*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.

Rimmington, G.T. *Education, Politics and Society in Leicester 1833-1903*, Hantsport, Nova Scotia: Lancelot Press, 1978.

Rimmington, G. *The Rise and Fall of Elected School Boards in England*, Peterborough: IOTA Press, 1986.

Romein, J. *The Watershed of Two Eras. Europe in 1900.* trans. by A.J. Pomerans, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.

Rose, N. *The Psychological Complex. Psychology, Politics and Society in England 1869-1939*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

Rosenthal, M. *The Character Factory. Baden Powell and the Origins of the Boy Scout Movement*, London: Collins, 1986.

Rousmaniere, K., Delhi, K. Coninck-Smith, N. de (eds.) *Discipline, Moral Regulation, and Schooling: A Social History*, London: Garland Publishing: 1997.

Royle, E. *Radicals, Secularists and Republicans: Popular Freethought in Britain, 1866-1915*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980.

Rozin, M. *The Rich and the Poor. Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London*, Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1999.

Sacks, B. *The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-1914*, Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1961.

Searle, G. *A New England? Peace and War 1886-1918*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Searle, G.R. *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Selleck, R.J.W. *The New Education, 1870-1914*, London: Pitman, 1968.

Sheehan, N. Indoctrination: Moral Education in the Early Prairie School House, in D. Jones, N. Sheehan, R.M. Stamp (eds.) *Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West*, Calgary: Detselig, 1979, 222-35.

Sherington, G. *English Education, Social Change and War 1911-20*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.

Silver, P. and Silver, H. *The Education of the Poor. The History of a National School 1824-1974*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

Simmons, J. *Leicester, Past and Present, Volumes I and II*, London: Eyre Methuen, 1974.

Simon, B. *Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965.

Simon, B. *The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.

Simon, W.M. *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century. An Essay in Intellectual History*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1963.

Skidelsky, R. *English Progressive Schools*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Skipp, V. *The Making of Victorian Birmingham*, Studley, Warwickshire: Brewin Books, 1983.

Smith, J.B. The Economic History of Birmingham, in C. Chinn (ed.) *Birmingham: Bibliography of a City*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2003, 158-60.

Smith, W.S. *The London Heretics 1870-1914*, London: Constable, 1967.

Springhall, J. *Coming of Age: Adolescence in Britain 1860-1960*, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1986.

Springhall, J. *Youth, Empire and Society. British Youth Movements, 1883-1940*, London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Stedman Jones, G. *Outcast London*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Stephenson, J., Ling, L., Burman, E., Cooper, M. (eds.) *Values in Education*, London: Routledge, 1998.

Sutton, D. Liberalism, State Collectivism and the Social Relations of Citizenship, in M. Langan and B. Schwarz (eds.) *Crises in the British State 1880-1930*, London: Hutchinson, 1985, 63-79.

Thompson, D.M. R.W. Dale and the 'Civic Gospel', in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 99-118.

Tosh, J. *A Man's Place. Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*, London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Tribe, D. *100 Years of Freethought*, London: Elek, 1967.

Upton, C. *A History of Birmingham*, Chichester: Phillimore, 1993.

Walkowitz, J. *City of Dreadful Delight*, London: Virago Press, 1992.

Waters, C. *British Socialists and the Politics of Popular Culture 1884-1914*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

Wooldridge, A. *Measuring the Mind. Education and Psychology in England, c.1860-1990*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Wright, T.R. *The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Wykes, D.L. 'A Finished Monster of the True Birmingham Breed': Birmingham, Unitarians and the 1791 Priestley Riots, in A. Sell (ed.) *Protestant Nonconformity and the West Midlands of England*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1996, 43-69.

Articles and papers

Amsing, H. Unexpected Similarities: Gendering Dutch History Textbooks for Secondary Education, 1870-1920, *History of Education Researcher*, 76, 2005, 69-79.

Ashton, R. Bray, Caroline (1814-1905), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32048], accessed 14 March 2006.

Bartley, P. Moral Regeneration, Women and the Civic Gospel in Birmingham, 1870-1914, *Midland History*, 25, 2000, 143-61.

Bartley, P. Preventing Prostitution: the Ladies' Association for the Care and Protection of Young Girls in Birmingham, 1887-1914, *Women's History Review*, 7:1, 1998, 37-60.

Bartrip, P. 'A Thoroughly Good School': An Examination of the Hazelwood Experiment in Progressive Education, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 28:1, 1980, 46-59.

Behagg, C. Myth of Cohesion: Capital and Compromise in the Historiography of Nineteenth-Century Birmingham, *Social History*, 11:3, 1986, 375-84.

Bérard, R.N. Frederick James Gould and the Transformation of Moral Education, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 35:3, 1987, 233-47.

Bérard, R.N. Gould, Frederick James (1855-1938), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/38882], accessed 14 March 2006.

Bérard, R.N. The Movement for Moral Instruction in Great Britain: The Moral Instruction League and its Successors, *Fides et Historia*, 16:2, 1984, 55-73.

Bernstein, G.L. Liberalism and the Progressive Alliance in the Constituencies, 1900-1914: Three Case Studies, *The Historical Journal*, 26:3, 1983, 617-40.

Bibliography

Betts, R. A Campaign for Patriotism on the Elementary School Curriculum: Lord Meath 1892-1916, *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 46, 1990, 38-45.

Boughton, J. Working-Class Conservatism and the Rise of Labour: A Case Study of Birmingham in the 1920s, *The Historian*, 59, 1998, 16-20.

Brehony, K.J. A 'Socially Civilising Influence'? Play and the Urban 'Degenerate', *Paedagogica Historica*, 39:1/2, 2003, 87-106.

Brickman, W. The Teaching of Secular Moral Values in the Nineteenth Century: USA, England, France, *Paedagogica Historica*, 12:2, 1972, 370-85.

Bruneau, W.A. The 'New' Social History and the History of Moral Education, *Paedagogica Historica*, 30:1, 1990, 7-33.

Chancellor, V. Dixon, George (1820-1898), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7697], accessed 5 August 2005.

Chinn, C. Was Separate Schooling a Means of Class Segregation in late Victorian and Edwardian Birmingham?, *Midlands History*, 13, 1988, 95-112.

Coatman, J. Paton, John Lewis Alexander (1863-1946), rev. M.C. Curthoys, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35412], accessed 14 March 2006.

Cox, D. The Labour Party in Leicester: a Study in Branch Development, *International Review of Social History*, 6:2, 1961, 197-211.

Davin, A. Imperialism and Motherhood, *History Workshop Journal*, 5, 1978, 9-65.

Dewsbury, M. The Teaching of Religion and the Huddersfield School Board, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 11:2, 1979, 22-28.

Eggermont, B. The Choreography of Schooling as Site of Struggle: Belgian Primary Schools, 1880-1940, *History of Education*, 30:2, 2001, 129-40.

Franklin, B. The State of Curriculum History, *History of Education*, 28:4, 1999, 459-76.

Freer, D. The Dynasty-Builders of Victorian Leicester, *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and Historical Society*, 53, 1977/78, 42-54.

Gillis, J. The Evolution of Juvenile Delinquency in England 1890-1914, *Past and Present*, 67, 1975, 96-126.

Glendenning, F.J. Attitudes to Colonialism and Race in British and French History Schoolbooks, *History of Education*, 3:2, 1974, 57-72.

Bibliography

Gordon, A. Paton, John Brown (1830-1911), rev. R. Tudur Jones, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35410], accessed 14 March 2006.

Gordon, P. Commitments and Developments in the Elementary School Curriculum 1870-1907, *History of Education*, 6:1, 1977, 43-52.

Gordon, P. Holmes, Edmond Gore Alexander (1850-1936), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46694], accessed 19 June 2006.

Grosvenor, I. 'There's no place like Home': Education and the Making of National Identity, *History of Education*, 28:3, 1999, 235-50.

Grosvenor, I. and Lawn, M. Days out of School: Secondary Education, Citizenship and Public Space in 1950s England, *History of Education*, 33:4, 2004, 377-89.

Gunn, S. The Ministry, the Middle Class and the 'Civilizing Mission' in Manchester, 1850-80, *Social History*, 21:1, 1996, 22-36.

Harper, G. H. Textbooks: An Under-used Source, *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 25, 1980, 30-40.

Harris, J. Political Thought and the Welfare State 1870-1940: An Intellectual Framework for British Social Policy, *Past and Present*, 1992, 135, 116-41.

Heathorn, S. 'Let us Remember that we, too, are English': Constructions of Citizenship and National Identity in English Elementary School Reading Books, 1880-1914, *Victorian Studies*, 38:3, 1995, 395-427.

Hennock, E.P. Finance and Politics in Urban Local Government in England 1835-1900, *Historical Journal*, 6:2, 1963, 212-25.

Hilliard, F.H. The Moral Instruction League 1879-1919, *Durham Research Review*, 12, 1961, 53-63.

Hoffman, S. D. School Texts, the Written Word, and Political Indoctrination: A Review of Moral Education Curricula in Modern Japan (1886-1997), *History of Education*, 28:1, 1999, 87-96.

Leighton, D. Municipal Progress, Democracy and Radical Identity in Birmingham, 1883-86, *Midland History*, 25, 2000, 115-42.

Leinster-Mackay, D. Frank Hayward, British Neo-Herbartian Extraordinaire: An Examination of his Educational Writings, *History of Education Researcher*, 69, 2002, 26-48.

Bibliography

McCormack, S. Citizenship: Is this the Worst taught Subject?, *The Independent Education*, 6 July 2006.

McLeod, H. Class, Community and Region: The Religious Geography of Nineteenth-Century England, *Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 6, 1973, 29-72.

Mandler, P. The Problem with Cultural History, *Cultural and Social History*, 1, 2004, 94-117.

Manton, K. 'Filling Bellies and Brains': The Educational and Political Thought of Frederick James Gould, *History of Education*, 30:3, 2001, 273-90.

Marsden, W.E. 'Poisoned History': a Comparative Study of Nationalism, Propaganda, and the Treatment of War and Peace in the Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century School Curriculum, *History of Education*, 29:1, 2000, 29-47.

Marsden, W.E. Rooting Racism into the Educational Experience of Childhood and Youth in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Centuries, *History of Education*, 19:4, 1990, pp.333-53.

Murphy, H.R. The Ethical Revolt against Christian Orthodoxy in Early Victorian England, *American Historical Review*, 60:4, 1955, 800-17.

Murphy, J. Religion, the State, and Education in England, *History of Education Quarterly*, 8:1, 1968, 3-34.

Nash, D.S. F.J. Gould and the Leicester Secular Society: a Positivist Commonwealth in Edwardian Politics, *Midland History*, 16, 1991, 126-40.

Nash, D. Reconnecting Religion with Social and Cultural History: Secularization's Failure as a Master Narrative, *Cultural and Social History*, 1:3, 2004, 302-25.

Orchard, S.C. Picton, James Allanson (1832-1910), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35527], accessed 9 October 2006.

Orr, K. Moral Training in the Boy Scout Movement, in E.L. French (ed.) *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 1963, 283-320.

Page, S. The Mobility of the Poor: A Case Study of Edwardian Leicester, *The Local Historian*, 21:3, 1991, 109-19.

Payne, E.A. The Religious Educational Dilemma, *Baptist Quarterly*, 23:8, 1970, 360-76.

Plant, H. 'Ye are all One in Christ Jesus': Aspects of Unitarianism and Feminism in Birmingham, c.1869-90, *Women's History Review*, 9:4, 2000, 721-42.

Platten, S.G. The Conflict over the Control of Elementary Education 1870-1902 and its Effect upon the Life and Influence of the Church, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 23:3, 1975, 276-302.

Pugh, D.R. English Nonconformity, Education and Passive Resistance 1903-6, *History of Education*, 19:4, 1990, 355-73.

Reid, F. Socialist Sunday Schools in Britain, 1892-1939, *International Review of Social History*, 11:1, 1966, 18-47.

Rimmington, G. The Baptist Churches and Society in Leicester 1881-1914, *Baptist Quarterly*, 38:7, 2000, 332-49.

Rimmington, G. Methodism and Society in Leicester, 1881-1914, *The Local Historian*, 30:2, 2000, 74-87.

Roberts, N. Character in the Mind: Citizenship, Education and Psychology in Britain, *History of Education*, 33:2, 2004, 177-97.

Scott, J.W. Mackenzie, John Stuart (1860-1935), rev. M.J. Schofield, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34.753], accessed 19 September 2006.

Sheldon, N. Policing Truancy: Town versus Countryside – Oxfordshire 1871-1903, *History of Education Researcher*, 77, 2006, 15-24.

Simpson, L. Imperialism, National Efficiency and Education, 1900-1905, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 16:1, 1984, 28-36.

Smith, A. Anger over Plans to Scrap Moral Guidance Teaching in Schools, *Education Guardian*, 31 July 2006.

Smith, J.T. The Real Milch Cow? The Work of Anglican, Catholic and Wesleyan Clergymen in Elementary Schools in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, *History of Education*, 31:2, 2002, 117-37.

Springhall, J. Lord Meath, Youth and Empire, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 5:4, 1970, 97-111.

Stewart, J. 'Christ's Kingdom in Scotland': Scottish Presbyterianism, Social Reform, and the Edwardian Crisis, *Twentieth Century British History*, 12:1, 2001, 1-22.

Stewart, J. Ramsay MacDonald, the Labour Party, and Child Welfare, 1900-1914, *Twentieth Century British History*, 4:2, 1993, 105-25.

Stray, C. Paradigms Regained: Towards a Historical Sociology of the Textbook, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26:1, 1994, 1-29.

Tholfsen, T.R. Moral Education in the Victorian Sunday School, *History of Education Quarterly*, 20, Spring 1980, 77-99.

Wilkinson, P. English Youth Movements, 1908-1930, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 4:2, 1969.

Wright, S. *The 'Universal Objector': Frederick James Gould and Education in Leicester 1899-1910.* Paper given at UKHES/ANZHES Conference, Swansea, 29 November-1 December 2002.

Wright, T.R. Positively Catholic: Malcolm Quin's Church of Humanity in Newcastle upon Tyne, *Durham University Journal*, 75:2, 1983, 11-20.

Unpublished dissertations and theses

Freathy, R. *Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-1944*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Exeter, 2005.

Larsen, M. *A Comparative Study of the Socio-historical Construction of the Teacher in Mid-Victorian England and Upper Canada*, Unpublished PhD thesis: Institute of Education, University of London, 2004.

Rawnsley, R. *The Celebration Movement and the Influence of J.F. Herbart on Moral Education in England through the work of Frank Herbert Hayward (1872-1954)*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Manchester, 1998.

Smith, D. *A Comparative Case Study of Class Relationships and Institutional Orders in Birmingham and Sheffield between 1830 and 1895, with Particular Reference to the Spheres of Education, Industry and Politics*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leicester, 1981.

Taylor, A. *The History of the Birmingham School Board 1870-1903*, Unpublished MA thesis: University of Birmingham, 1955.

Taylor, G. *The Developing Elementary School Curriculum under School Board and Local Education Authority: A Study of the Educational Debate, Personalities and Policy in Birmingham, Nottingham and Derby, 1870-1933*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Leicester, 1992.

Wong, W. *Continuity and Change in Citizenship Education in England in the Twentieth Century*, Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Liverpool, 1991.

Wright, S. *Morality without Theology. The Movement for Moral Instruction with Special Reference to the Ideas and Influence of Frederick James Gould*, Unpublished MA dissertation: Oxford Brookes University, 1999.