

RELIGION AND THE RISE OF TEACHER TRAINING
COLLEGES IN ENGLAND, 1839-1852.

A thesis written in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

E. Patricia Harrison,
St. Mary's University,
School of Education,
April 1, 1973.

© Copyright

RELIGION AND THE RISE OF TEACHER TRAINING
COLLEGES IN ENGLAND, 1839-52.

(Abstract of thesis prepared by Pat Harrison, as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education, April 1973).

This study attempts to investigate the influence of 'the religious difficulty' on the early history of English teacher training colleges. It is concerned with the sectarian attitudes and actions which, in 1839, prevented the inauguration of a national normal school and which, in the period 1839-52, firmly established the pattern of state-aided voluntary colleges for training elementary school teachers. It is particularly concerned with the Nonconformist role, in both its inhibitive and promotional aspects; with the significant Wesleyan part in thwarting the 1839 Government Minute; with anti-government 'Voluntaryism'; with the inception of the Nonconformist training colleges, Westminster and Homerton.

Any endeavour to delineate the conflicting politico-religious forces affecting the development of the first training colleges entails a survey of:- the place of religion in society and education, in early Victorian England; the extent of the Established Church's control of elementary education and privileged position; the disunity of Protestantism; the educational fervour of some denominational bodies; the paucity of secondary education and consequent low standards of teachers; the lack of training; the example and influence of Stow's Glasgow Academy; the

setting up of the secular Committee of Council on Education, with Kay-Shuttleworth as secretary; the 1839 Whig National Normal School proposal with its clauses concerning Religious Instruction; the resultant reaction; the deadlock of Church and State which impelled the private foundation of 'Battersea', the first real training college; the stimulation of denominational training colleges by the failure of the projected national normal school; the changing religious affiliations through the 1840's; and Kay-Shuttleworth's 1846 Minutes, which drew almost every denominational body into co-operation with the State in provision of teacher training, setting the pattern which, basically, still exists.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: A Religious Era	5
CHAPTER II: The Teachers	12
CHAPTER III: Reaction to the 1839 Normal School Proposal .	38
CHAPTER IV: Outline of Training College Development through the 1840's	67
CHAPTER V: The Religious Difficulty through the 1840's . .	79
CHAPTER VI: The Wesleyans and Westminster Training College	100
CHAPTER VII: The Congregationalists and Homerton Training College	119
CONCLUSION	140
APPENDICES	144
SOURCES CONSULTED	160

PREFACE

The development of any educational system cannot be effectually studied apart from its societal context. Similarly, study of a feature of that system as important as the origins of teacher training colleges, cannot neglect the contemporary condition of educational provision in the country.

In England, training colleges grew in piecemeal, seemingly haphazard, typically English fashion. Any research into factors influencing their establishment shows that acrimonious sectarian strife played a vital and pervasive part in retarding State provision of teacher education. Some knowledge of the religious divisions and dissensions of the time, then, aids understanding of this and of the consequent 'Dual' system. "The germ of the religious difficulty has lain in the English elementary system from the beginning,"¹ declared Graham Balfour: "the ecclesiastical foundation of our elementary education explains our sectarian training colleges," added Miss E. P. Hughes.²

In 1839, before England could boast any institution justifying the title 'Training College', a notable attempt was made to establish a civil normal school and inaugurate a national system of teacher training.

¹Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland, p. xix.

²"The Training of Teachers," Education in the Nineteenth Century, (ed. R. D. Roberts) p. 185.

The attempt failed. Too little research has gone into delineating the conflicting forces in the bitter arena of religious politics and assessing their responsibility, though Graham's statement, "Religion, the keystone of education, is in this country the bar to its progress,"¹ became axiomatic.

By 1839 other countries were achieving organized state-controlled teacher training systems despite religious differences; notably Holland, Germany, Sweden, France, Switzerland, Scotland, Ireland, Lower Canada and Massachusetts.² The reasons for England's peculiar obduracy can only be fully explained through research into her sectarian attitudes and clerical control of education.

In 1966, R. Prouty stated that "clerical control has been much discussed but little studied apart from J. Murphy's The Religious Problem in English Education".³ The situation seems almost unchanged. Certainly,

¹ Quoted, for example, by H. B. Binns, A Century of Education, p. 139. N. B. Graham considered that progress lay in bolstering Anglican dominance; for others, Church dominance meant an iniquitous strangle-hold.

² Vide: Brougham's speech to the House of Lords, May 21st, 1835.
(Hansard, Vol. XXVII)
Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education, pp. 214-220.
H. Barnard, Normal Schools, (1851) part 2.
R. W. Rich, The Training of Teachers, p. 27.

N. B. The public normal school which opened in Montreal in 1836 (pre-dating Mann's in Massachusetts) was of only six years' duration.

³ "England and Wales 1820-1870", Changing Views on British History, (E. Furber) p. 246.

Murphy researched a short-lived experiment in inter-demoninational elementary education, in Corporation schools in Liverpool. Religious strife proved implacable, annulling the experiment in 1841.

the effect of the religious problem on the evolution of teacher training colleges needs further research. My intention is to try to investigate the religious ferment in the crucial period 1839-52 which made the inauguration of a national normal school impossible and set the pattern of elementary teachers' training which, basically, still exists. In particular, I wish to study the Wesleyan Methodist influence, inhibitive and promotional, on the early course of training college history. To set this in its complex context entailed use of valuable, acknowledged, secondary sources.

Just as the obstacles to the inception of public provision of teacher training, in 1839, were religiously based, so subsequent development owed much to religion. Religious zeal, denominational principles and jealousies spurred on attempts to fill the gap. Frank Smith, I think, underestimates these when he says: "If the Church had prevented the State from training the teacher, Dr. Kay had compelled her to undertake the task herself."¹ He is, also, typical in neglecting the Nonconformist part in that prevention and in the establishment of subsequent colleges.

Along with numerous Church colleges and the improved training institution of the British and Foreign School Society, two important Nonconformist teacher training colleges began in the years 1839-52; virtually the only lay, elementary training colleges to do so as the Quaker foundation opened in 1848 concerned secondary school teachers, and the Catholic training college for clerical teachers did not start a lay department until 1854.

¹A History of English Elementary Education, 1760-1902, p. 186.

There was a few years' hiatus between the crisis of 1839 and the beginnings of the Nonconformist colleges, Westminster and Homerton. In the interests of continuity, I shall give a linking outline of teacher training development through the 1840's, which will form much of Chapter IV.

I am indebted to many people who made documents available ; in particular, Mr. Edmund Sackett of Westminster College, and Mr. Thomas Simms of Homerton College. I am especially grateful to Dean D. J. Weeren and Professor F. Phillips of St. Mary's University for their care and helpful suggestions.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the early nineteenth century there were individual advocates of institutions for specialized training for intending teachers - often termed 'normal schools', where the "Norma of education"¹ might be preached and practised - but widespread realization of the central importance of good teaching came slowly. Horace Mann's report that England, in 1844, lagged behind all civilized countries in general education standards confirmed what Lord Brougham had been saying in and out of Parliament for years. Brougham unhesitatingly blamed England's low quality of teachers for her comparatively poor showing in the field of popular education. In the area of some of the most palpable social evils, England held a good record of reform. This helped her to avoid the major disruptions of other nations, from the time of the French Revolution to the 1848 crop of rebellions. Yet, concerning education for the masses and the training of teachers to effect that education, she remained abysmally backward. Despite increasing pressure from humanitarians of many persuasions, on behalf of the illiterate, poverty-stricken, industrialized hordes, Parliament had rejected proposals for any State provision of education.

The House of Lords, reflecting Society, was run by the squire and the parson, but the House of Commons, too, was still predominantly aristocratic and Anglican. Progressive elements had proved powerless

¹A. R. Craig, The Philosophy of Training; 2nd. ed., 1847, p. xiv.

in face of Church antipathy to State interference in educational matters. "The first principle of education in this country," declared the Archbishop of Canterbury, opposing Whitbread's Bill in 1807, "is that schools should be under the control and auspices of the establishment."¹ Neither Whigs nor Tories could afford to anger the 'established' Church of England.

The Reformed Parliament of 1832 included representatives of England's new middle class, many of them non-Anglican, but elitism and Church dominance were difficult to combat. Through the 1830's this Government, too, proved equally ineffective in establishing any normal school - or, indeed, any school at all. Then came Dr. James Kay (more usually known by the name he adopted on marriage, Kay-Shuttleworth) with his notable attempt to inaugurate a national normal school system.

It is necessary at the outset to distinguish between the rudimentary in-service training which was in evidence in monitorial schools from the early nineteenth century, and the formal preliminary teacher training undertaken in separate colleges.

Asher Tropp, surveying the origins of the profession, quotes the Educational Expositor of 1853:-

Strictly speaking, the real professional school-master must, in all countries, be considered to date his origin from the first establishment of normal or training schools.²

¹Quoted by Frank Smith, The History of English Elementary Education, p. 109.

²A. Tropp, The School Teachers, p. 5.

Kay-Shuttleworth called his private venture at Battersea the first English training college. Champions of the National Society's 'Central School' and of the British and Foreign Schools Society's training school in Borough Road, London, would argue that the monitorial system provided the first lay teacher training institution. It is true that each Society had a training centre active for years before Battersea College began, but they were aimed at putting prospective teachers rapidly through the paces of the conveyor-belt system. "Give me twenty-four pupils to-day and I will give you twenty-four teachers to-morrow,"¹ said one of their founders. Although the courses lengthened, the monitorial training departments were never places of higher education as were Continental normal schools.

The first real training colleges in England developed in the 1840's. In marked contrast to monitorial routines, they sought to include a liberal education and some knowledge of subject matter as well as professional knowledge and skill. For the rest of the century these were fundamental attributes of English elementary training colleges.

In secondary training colleges, on the contrary, steps are usually taken to ensure that the students possess the required liberal education and subject knowledge before they enter a college, and the training course is usually limited to acquiring professional knowledge and skill.²

¹Quoted by R. D. Roberts, (ed.) Education in the Nineteenth Century, p. 186.

²E. P. Hughes, "The Training of Teachers", Education in the Nineteenth Century, (ed.) R. D. Roberts, p. 172.

Miss Hughes was Principal of the Cambridge Training College for Women. The contrast she pointed, at the beginning of the twentieth century, continued; being represented by the concurrent system in most training colleges, and the consecutive teacher training of University departments of Education.

This may clarify traditional British practice but is not relevant to the mid-nineteenth century situation. Secondary education, although chronologically first, was then exceedingly sparse and teacher training for secondary schools generally unthought-of. In this study, teacher training for elementary education, only, is considered.

CHAPTER I

"The early Victorian era was essentially a religious age."

J. F. C. Harrison¹

Victoria came to the throne in 1837, at a time when new religious fervour was evident in formation of schools as well as churches and charitable associations; in campaigns against ignorance, child-slavery and Poor-Law hardships as well as against sin. Indubitably widespread indifference and hostility to religious matters, and persons, existed among the lowest sections of society, but middle and upper-class church-going and church adherence was regarded as the acknowledged basis of national life. England was theoretically a Christian country, ruled by the Established Church and the Aristocracy, firmly linked. The task of a Christian Society then was to teach the law of Christ, but not to the extent of upsetting the status quo.

The Evangelical Revival had generated a religious atmosphere of great intensity through many lower levels of Protestantism. Religious zeal fostered educational efforts; salvation of souls necessitated removal of such obstacles as illiteracy and ignorance. Sunday Schools grew into Charity Schools, Church Schools, Ragged Schools and Common Schools. These were often prompted by the wish for safeguards against social unrest or for proselytization of rival sects, and seldom by desire for

¹The Early Victorians 1832-1851, p. 122.

Equalization of opportunity, but the fact remains that religion was a vital force in promoting education.

Indeed, very little elementary instruction given in this country was of any value which was not given in schools directly or indirectly connected with religious denominations or societies.¹

Religion was a valuable social force: it was also a source of strife.

G. F. A. Best discusses the difficulties of forging a national system of education where the "age and the people are disposed to take religion seriously".² He suggests that common ground can quickly be found if there is predominantly one religion, as in Spain, or government strong enough to impose its will despite sectional strife, as in some German states, or where there has been a good tradition of inter-denominational co-operation, as in Massachusetts. England was not in any one of these categories. Wordsworth declared a national system to be "comparatively easy anywhere but in England".³

From the first, England owed its education to the Catholic Church and the teaching of her priests. The connection of education with religion, thus forged, persisted. A famous court case in 1410 resulted in a declaration by the Common Law courts that schools were a spiritual matter and under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. Clergy continued to

¹Graham Balfour, The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland, p. xviii.

²"The Religious Difficulties of National Education, 1800-1870", The Cambridge Historical Journal, Vol. XII, 1956.

³Quoted by H. B. Binns, A Century of Education, p. 3.

to dominate schools and universities through post-Reformational swings in reigning beliefs. Church and State developed in close liaison, and Statutes - notably that of 1604 - legislated a distinctive relationship between the Government and the Church of England, including the Church's power over all licensing of teachers.

The relationship was intended to mean mutual obligations rather than privilege. By the 1830's, however, to many citizens the Church of England had become a resented monopoly identified with elitism and with Tory power. By this time, Dissenting bodies had proliferated. The early-seventeenth-century efforts to stamp out Dissent and Roman Catholicism faded into toleration, followed by a series of Acts culminating in the Repeal of the Test Acts in 1828, and Catholic Emancipation in 1829. These negated many civil disabilities, such as prohibitions on preaching and teaching, but, in effect, affirmed the reality of a national church in a religiously pluralist society.

Membership of the Established Church in the late 1830's presented a wide spectrum. At the 'High Church' extreme were the Anglo-Catholics - the "Tractarians", rigidly doctrinaire, ecclesiastical and clerical; at the 'Low Church' extreme were "Evangelicals" - anti-ritualistic, filled with religious and reforming zeal. A very large body of Anglicans between these groups viewed both with distrust and distaste.

One of the most vital leaders of the Evangelical Revival was an Anglican clergyman, John Wesley. Wesley was a great organizer as well as a fervent preacher. He, with his brother Charles and some like-minded

friends (notably George Whitfield) came to be called "Methodists" because of the methodical way in which they practised their faith. Wesley hoped to keep his ardent followers within the Anglican fold and did not cut adrift to form a distinct new church, but after his death in 1791 the Methodist Society seceded from the Established Church. By 1839 further secessions had devolved to suit democratic, fundamentalist, proletarian elements, and these - the Calvinistic Methodists, the Methodist New Connection, the Unitarian Methodists, the Bible Christians, and, later, the Primitive Methodists - took their stand on public issues with militant Dissenters. The original Wesleyan Methodists, though very active in good causes, remained the most conservative of all Dissenting bodies and most closely connected with the fringes of Anglicanism.

In England in the 1830's and 1840's, "Dissent" generally referred to that part of Protestant Christianity which was neither in the Establishment nor connected with Wesley. The newer, wider word "Nonconformity" tended to include Wesleyans.

Traditional Dissent meant especially Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists; the first mainly in Scotland, the latter two in England. The small group of Quakers joined valiantly in reformatory measures and had an effect quite out of proportion to their numbers. Unitarians, probably the most liberal branch of Nonconformity, shocked Orthodoxy by their disbelief in the Trinity and in the divinity of Christ. They continued to suffer stringent social and religious disabilities until 1813.

The Roman Catholics, a decade after Emancipation, still made up

only a small fraction of the population, except in the port city of Liverpool where an influx of destitute Irish immigrants congregated thickly before spreading to London and other cities. The Catholics tended to be identified with the Irish and the dispossessed though some of the great historic land-owning families were Catholic, and, by mid-century, some notable educated converts were added.

Legislation granted certain liberties to all these bodies but withheld others. Only Anglicans were admitted to Oxford or Cambridge, for example, until after mid-century.¹ Legislation, in fact, accentuated the special position of the Established Church. Prevailing attitudes then graded the rest of the citizens (Dissenters, Catholics, Jews) down the social hierarchy. Status and religious grouping were inextricably linked in stratified layers beneath the echelon of people "who mattered", invariably Anglican. Not until later in Victoria's reign was the prominence of the new emergent middle-class entrepreneurs (often Nonconformist) accepted.

Early Victorian England was decidedly conscious of its social and religious divisions. Despite marked differences, however, denomination-
alists of all varieties believed that education should not be separated from religion. No education worthy of the name could be other than a religious education. Certainly this was an early-Victorian tenet; one held by the young Queen herself, whose expressed wish concerning education was that

¹All non-Anglicans were excluded from Oxford until 1854 and from Cambridge until 1856; only Churchmen could be "Fellows" until 1871.

"the youth of this kingdom should be religiously brought up".¹ Secular radicals, like the Benthamites, might protest and the illiterate masses might care little, but opinion that counted held it essential for education to have a religious core.

Bitter disagreement, however, erupted as to the exact nature of that religious core.

Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, spokeswoman for Orthodoxy, was ardent in arousing the national Church to form the National Society for the Promotion of the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church.

The standard of Christian education was erected by our pious forefathers at the Reformation and we have everyone of us been enrolled as members of the National Church, and are solemnly engaged to support it ourselves and to bring up our children according to its holy ordinances.²

The National Society and its rival, The British and Foreign Schools Society which was dominated by Quakers and other Nonconformists, undertook the major part of such week-day schooling as reached any of England's poor during the first four decades of the nineteenth century. Their voluntary efforts accounted for the spectacular growth of schools, but this, and the sectarian jealousies which were partly instrumental in accomplishing it, drastically retarded civil provision. The Churches held the field ✓

¹Vide: Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education, p. 240.

²Sarah Trimmer; quoted by Francis Adams, The Elementary School Contest in England, p. 58.

to such an extent that the State could then only assume a directional role through conflict, conciliation and compromise.

Dissenters call for one scheme of education, the Church objects; this party objects, and that; there is endless objection, by him and by her and by it: a subject encumbered with difficulties on every side.¹

declaimed the uninvolved 'Sage of Chelsea' in 1839.

As religion and the controversies associated with it affected the burgeoning elementary schools in very decisive manner, it is not surprising that they affected, also, the attempts to institute training of teachers.

Before surveying these attempts, it is necessary to find out what sort of teachers were involved in elementary education, and what, if any, preparation they had had for their work.

¹Thomas Carlyle, Chartism; p. 61.

He, too, asked, "In very truth, how can Religion be divorced from Education?"

CHAPTER II

"Nothing can be done without schoolmasters -
of whom there are none."

Kay-Shuttleworth¹

In 1839 Kay-Shuttleworth propounded a review of public education. A subjoined Table gave the numbers of teachers in five of the largest northern towns and Westminster, noting those who had had any preparation for the task. This was part of his submission to the 1838 Select Committee on Education, set up by the Government. It demonstrated, as he said, "the necessity for the immediate establishment of Normal Schools".² We read in the Table (Appendix A) that the 230 teachers in Manchester's 'Dame' schools were all completely untrained. Teachers listed as "educated for their employment" would, for the most part, be little better prepared. Kay-Shuttleworth's verdict that there were no teachers was reached after thorough investigation. Visits to Scotland in 1837, and to Europe a year later, contributed to his realization that English teacher education was pathetically poor in comparison. He began to use a few teachers from Scottish training institutions as peripatetic guides and key personnel in the reorganization of workhouse schools, then under his care as Poor Law Commissioner.

A few earlier enthusiasts had tried to import effective foreign methods of teaching and of training teachers, into England. One of the

¹Letter to Mr. Lefevre M. P. (October 1839), quoted by Frank Smith, The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, p. 93.

²"Explanation of the Measures of 1839", reprinted as part of Four Periods of Public Education, p. 241.

most indefatigable of these was Lord Brougham, whose thirty years of campaigning climaxed in an impassioned speech in Parliament in 1835. After praising Continental education and the normal schools to which much of the credit was due, he pleaded for such "seminaries" in England, "where good schoolmasters might be trained and taught the duties of their profession".¹ This prompted the House of Commons, on March 31st, to vote 10,000 pounds for the erection of a normal school. It seemed as if a giant step forward had been taken, but the scheme had to be shelved because of conflicting sectarian pressures. Brougham felt that:

The Church wished for education, but they wished to keep down the sects a little more. The Dissenters wished for education, but they wished to pull down the Church a little more.²

Government ineptitude drove Brougham, and seventeen other Members of Parliament, to assist in founding the voluntary Central Society of Education in 1836, to investigate matters relating to education at home, and to learn from practices abroad. The Society was particularly aware of the need to improve the quality of the teachers.

Have any means been adopted for securing the efficiency of those to whom so important a charge is deputed? Has any course ever been adopted for educating and certifying the efficiency of such persons?³

¹Mirror of Parliament, May 21st, 1835. Vol. 1, 1008.

²Hansard, 3rd. series; L 592.

³B. F. Duppa (ed.), "Objects of the Society", Central Society of Education, New Impression, 1969, Vol. I, p. 3.

The Society realized that to be effective it must avoid becoming an arena of contending sects. It determined to remain studiously undenominational.

Important a part of education as religion forms, it is one upon which the Society, if it intends to effect good, must observe strict neutrality; religious controversy must be avoided.¹

Politicians and writers were beginning to map out the way; already in the field were some practitioners influenced by Continental methods. One was E. T. Craig, who taught in Lady Byron's London school for poor boys, after teaching experience in Ireland and after attending Wehrli's Teachers' Course at Hofwyl in 1834.

Better known were Dr. Charles Mayo and his sister Elizabeth. Dr. Mayo had spent three years teaching and training in Pestalozzi's school in Yverdon, and returned in 1822 to found a school for the young sons of the upper classes. In 1836 the Mayos were instrumental in setting up the first English training school for 'Infant Teachers'. It was run on Pestalozzian principles, "leavened by evangelical truth", and owing something, also, to Robert Owen's gospel of the importance of infant education.²

The Mayos' main problem in their "Home and Colonial Training College" was to find candidates of any adequate educational background.

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²Vide Owen's Autobiography. Owen had been preaching and practising an exciting new concept of education, in Scotland, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. He repudiated Pestalozzi's ideas, yet similarities in their methods were evident.

Early reports stress the lack of suitable persons.¹ It soon became obvious that the course should be extended from the initial twelve weeks to at least six months, in order to achieve a less lamentable standard of competency.

The great difficulty facing anyone interested in staffing schools or seeking student teachers accrued from the dearth of education. There was an almost total absence of secondary schooling for children of the middle or lower classes. Scions of the elite, who had the chance of better, longer education, were most unlikely to think of becoming teachers. Conditions and remuneration offered were generally so unattractive that teachers in many schools were persons who could get no other job or those who could combine supervision of children with other ploys in the home or parish. A report in 1834, on conditions of schools and teachers in Manchester, had described the teachers in the Common Day Schools as almost universally untrained, uninterested and unfit, and teachers in the Dame Schools as seldom more than mediocre child-minders.

The greater part of them [the Dame Schools] are kept by females, but some by old men whose only qualification for this employment seems to be their unfitness for any other. Many of these teachers are engaged at the same time in other employment, such as shopkeeping, sewing, washing, etc., which renders any regular instruction among the scholars absolutely impossible.²

Other reports added to a picture of so-called teachers; incompetent,

¹Vide C. Baker's report in Central Society of Education, Vol. 3, pp. 18-19.

²Manchester Statistical Society's Report, 1834.

Physically and mentally inadequate, lazy,¹ sometimes drunken and brutal.

Kay-Shuttleworth tried to draw Government attention to the "lamentable

inefficiency of the teachers commonly employed in the primary schools . . .

In many cases, the profession of the educator has fallen into the hands of persons who are destitute of means, not merely from want of ability, but from defects of character, and who resort to this calling² after they have been proved to be unfit for any other.

Increasing numbers of influential people were being forced to realize that something had to be done to raise the standard of teaching in the country. Societies, such as the Central Society of Education and the Manchester Society for Promoting National Education, enlisted men of eminence. Working-class commitment to the cause was shown in societies like William Lovett's Working Men's Association, "to promote, by all available means, the education of the rising generation".³

Lovett denounced religious intolerance and urged the inclusion of all children in a liberal system of state-supported education. This would be nearer the real spirit of Christianity than the prevalent "selfish desires and sectarian jealousies".

The growth of schools owed something to those sectarian rivalries. That growth was now highlighting the urgent need for teachers: the

¹Cobbett, opposing educational grants, declared that their sole result would be to "increase the number of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, that new race of idlers". (Hansard, XX 734).

²Four Periods of Public Education, p. 251.

³Lovett's Address (from his autobiography) is quoted by F. Smith, The History of Elementary Education, p. 164.

conditions reported in the schools were highlighting the urgent need for trained teachers. Lone English voices had been calling for quality as well as quantity - at least since Mulcaster in 1581¹ - but it took the problems arising out of the Industrial Revolution and the influences from Scotland² and from Europe³ to force attention to formal training of teachers.

Although the Industrial Revolution meant unprecedented wealth for a segment of society, it aggravated the hardships of poverty for the masses in city slums, and spawned multitudes of children in factories, Poor-Law workhouses and on the streets. Factory schools, workhouse schools and 'Ragged' schools attempted to cope with but a fraction of these and they faced a shortage of teachers even more acute than did the Common Schools and Dame Schools.

If the Mayos found it difficult to recruit teachers and would-be teachers for upper-class infants, it was understandably far from easy to secure adequate teachers for the outcasts. Kay-Shuttleworth's investigations, in 1838, showed that in the cities the highest proportion of masters and mistresses with any training were to be found in "superior private schools", where 125 of the 324 teachers had training, however meagre.⁴

¹Vide Lance Jones, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales p. 9.

²From Owen, Wood and, especially, Stow.

³From Pestalozzi, Wehrli and DeFellenberg.

⁴Appendix A.

The Table shows that, descending the scale, were:

Endowed and Charity Schools	with	46	trained teachers	
			out of	122
Evening Schools	"	20	"	162
Common Boys' and Girls' Schools	"	59	"	455
Dame Schools	"	14	"	606

Below these came the Factory Schools and the Workhouse Schools.

Charity (or Ragged) Schools, like the Workhouse Schools, tried to provide the rudiments of education for the most destitute elements of society, but there were marked differences. In the former, for instance, teachers were not paid. Missionary zeal and dedication drew into this cause certain clergymen and their friends, educated middle-class 'Dogooders', pious self-educated men and women of forceful character.

Despite the rough and undisciplined nature of many of the recipients (of all ages and less apt to have their spirits broken than the confined Workhouse inmates) some good teaching occurred in Ragged Schools.

C. J. Montague tells the story of the Ragged School Movement and of devoted voluntary teachers, known and unknown; men like John Pounds, a poor Portsmouth cobbler, and General Gordon, who for six years ran a Ragged School in his own home. Montague, as well as 'Old Humphrey', paid tribute to the "heroism of the ragged school teachers".¹

Factory and Workhouse school buildings were very different from General Gordon's home, and in them good teaching was extremely rare. The factory inspectors had oversight of schools in mills and factories.

¹Quoted by C. J. Montague, Sixty Years in Waifdom, p. 100.

In 1839, one of these, Leonard Horner, drew attention to teachers who were unable to sign their own names. He wrote:-

It is not an unusual thing to have certificates presented to me subscribed by the teachers with his or her mark; this generally happens in the case of female teachers; but they are held to be equal in quality to the majority of those who keep dame schools.¹

Similarly depressing reports are recorded of teachers in Workhouse Schools. A Mr. Hall, one of the Assistant Poor Law Commissioners, wrote in 1839:-

The general impression resulting from my investigation is very unsatisfactory. . . The teachers were themselves too destitute of information, and too inexperienced in the art of instruction, to be able to interrogate or catechise their pupils. . . It is too much to reckon upon procuring a competent teacher for any workhouse school.²

B. F. Duppa did find, in one workhouse school, "a Scotch master who teaches so as to excite interest".³ This school, of eleven thousand pauper children in a London district, was Norwood. The man responsible for procuring such a phenomenon was Kay-Shuttleworth - then Dr. Kay a Poor Law Commissioner. Duppa commended his improvements including the importation of model teachers from Stow's Glasgow Academy.

Norwood holds an historic place in the history of teacher training. It was there that Kay-Shuttleworth first tried his "Pupil-teacher" scheme. The idea of a pupil-teacher apprenticeship system came to him as a result of a supervisory visit to an East Anglican pauper school. There,

¹Parliamentary Papers, 1839, Vol. XLII, p. 358.

²Central Society of Education, pp. 309-311. (Vol. 3) "The Education of Pauper Children in Union Workhouses."

³Ibid., p. 288.

he was impressed by the initiative and ability of a thirteen-year-old boy who voluntarily substituted for a sick master. The boy - William Rush - had caught the spirit of a peripatetic teacher from Scotland. Years later, Kay-Shuttleworth writing about the birth of the pupil-teacher system, said:-

In this incident was much matter for reflection. As to the boy himself, the question arose whether his spontaneous action and remarkable success were not indications of natural aptitude for teaching? How could this be cultivated, and if it were so developed, what career could be provided for him? If an efficient master were appointed might not William Rush remain there as his assistant?¹

The experiment began at Norwood. The most promising schoolboys there were made 'probationers': boys from other workhouse schools were sent to be apprenticed also. Before long, promoters of private schools sent youths for a period of training, and prominent politicians began to take an interest in the venture. In an age when no child went to school if he could get any sort of job and parents often had to rely on very young wage-earning members of the family, there had to be some inducement made to encourage future teachers to stay at school.

In 1839, instruction in workhouse and factory schools consisted of attempts to "drill into the children, by means of a cane, a little reading and writing".² In addition, of course, "religious instruction and religious exercise occupy a due portion of the day".³ At best there would be the

¹ 1877 Manuscript, quoted by F. Smith, The Life and work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, p. 50.

² B. F. Duppa, "The Education of Pauper Children in Union Workhouses", The Central Society of Education, Vol. 3, p. 285.

³ Ibid., p. 288.

"Three Rs" - reading, religion and reckoning.

The teaching of religion seemed to cause no protests at that time.

Parents - where there were any - made no fuss. Some consciously upright citizens were prone to comment that it was because of lack of parental interest in religion that the family sank to workhouse level. The public in general was unconcerned, or unaware until the matter came into prominence with Graham's Factory Bill in 1843.

In the Common Schools, however, religion was an issue. Practically without exception these were under the auspices of some church or religious society. Catholics and Methodists had started schools, in manufacturing towns especially, but the vast majority of schools was provided by the two great rival societies, the "National" and the "British and Foreign". The National Society, the Established Church in education, based all its teaching on Church doctrines and demanded strict adherence to them. After Robert Owen gave 1,000 pounds to the other Society, he offered the same to the National Society, or "half that sum if they persisted in their rule to shut the doors against all except those professing the creed of the Church of England".¹ The National Society accepted the latter offer, "keeping their doors closed against Dissent".

The British and Foreign Schools Society thought of itself as undenominational but was generally regarded as representative of Dissent. Gladstone, in a Parliamentary wrangle on June 20th, 1839, declared, "The British

¹ Robert Owen, Life of Robert Owen, p. 117.

and Foreign . . . is for Dissent, and that is admitted".¹ The Society was, in fact, a heterogeneous association, open to supporters, schoolchildren and teachers of all denominations. H. F. Binns writes of the:-

extraordinary variety of social and religious outlook represented on the committee and among its supporters. There were freethinking Radicals of several hues in the group of Place's friends, Bentham, James Mill, David Ricardo, with Joseph Hume, Robert Owen and Sir Samuel Romilly; there were the Whigs of the Edinburgh Review group, Brougham, Horner, Jeffrey and Mackintosh; there were Whitbread the brewer, Wilberforce and Clarkson the abolitionists, and several philanthropic dukes; there were the Irish Catholic peers, and personages of Unitarian sympathies like the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Carrington, W. Smith M. P., and John Martineau; among the seven reverend gentlemen were famous Dissenting ministers like Rowland Hill and Dr. Collyer; while there was besides a whole range of Quaker worthies whose names from Barclay, Capper, Foster, and Fell, to Newman, Sturge and Sterry, recall the story and tradition of the Society of Friends.²

It was not surprising that there were differences of opinion within the group concerning religious teaching in the schools, but for the most part the Society set an admirable example of inter-denominational co-operation unusual in the period. The rivalry which existed was between the "British and Foreign" as a whole and the orthodox Anglican National Society. According to Francis Adams, Lancaster, founder of the former, "pursued education as a civil policy and without bigoted aim, although he unwittingly provoked the sectarian jealousy which has so constantly retarded progress".³

¹ Error of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4., 3172.

² Century of Education, p. 94.

³ The Elementary School Contest, p. 50.

It was Mrs. Sarah Trimmer who sounded the Anglican alarm and roused Bell and the Church to check the "Goliath of the Schismatics"¹ whose schools dared to usurp the prerogatives of the Established Church.

Lancaster was made the focus of the Nonconformist and Whig efforts in education, while Bell was exalted as the saviour of Church schools.²

The two societies were for years,

the centre towards which all educational forces of society turned. There was hardly a man, eminent as a statesman, politician or writer, who did not take a side in the controversy between them.³

Government grants given to the two Societies - and to these alone, 1833-1839 - tended to heighten competition and tension between them. Grants depended upon the extent of voluntary provision, so stimulated the canvassing of support.

Yet, both Societies practised, and claimed to have discovered the same monitorial method, by which older pupils ("monitors") were put through a routine and subsequently drilled groups of their fellow-students in the same routine. One master could keep watch over several hundred children in one large room: the cost of staff being minimal. Monitorial schools encouraged copying and rote learning, and discouraged, in effect, comprehension and initiative. As long as a teacher was expected to be merely a disciplinarian and a supervisor of mechanical processes, there seemed

¹ Comparative View of the New Plan of Education, p. 46.

² Frank Smith, A History of English Elementary Education, p. 78.

³ Francis Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

little need for complicated training. Both Societies, early in the century, formed training departments attached to one of their London schools to prepare staff for their respective network of monitorial institutions; very limited preparation was deemed necessary.

Bell wrote that each of his prospective teachers was:-

trained as every other boy in the school was, and selected according to his abilities. Every child in the school witnessed every process in the mode of conducting matters, and understood it well . . . It is by attending the school, and seeing what is going on there, and by taking a share in the office of tuition, that teachers are to be formed, and not by lectures and abstract instruction.¹

This was aimed at Lancaster. "Nothing was ever so burlesque," said Bell, "as his forming his teachers by lectures on the passions."²

Lancaster was, apparently, an early purveyor of some elementary educational psychology. His disciplinary ideas and novel incentive methods showed an understanding of the child mind, and he lectured his students on the duty of "successfully cultivating the affections and studying the dispositions" of their scholars.³ He can hardly have had much faith that his precept would be carried out in practice, surely, as he also advocated a single master to factory-like schoolrooms of up to, or even over, 1,000 pupils.

¹Letter to Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, Jan. 13th, 1806; quoted in Southey's Life of Rev. Andrew Bell, Vol. 2, p. 127.

²Ibid.

³Quoted by F. Smith, A History of English Elementary Education, p. 74.

Lancaster's unpracticality led to a take-over of the "Lancastrian Society" by a committee, of which the most active members were William Corston (a Moravian), Joseph Fox (a Baptist), and two Quakers, Joseph Foster and William Allen. They assumed increased control as Lancaster dropped out. Compared with the National Society, the British and Foreign Schools Society gave a slightly wider education to its trainee teachers. It also used a broader curriculum in its schools: the National Society stuck rigidly to Church liturgy and catechism, and the Bible.

In evidence to the 1834 Select Committee on Education, the secretary of the "British and Foreign" lamented the shortness of their training course. He wished the Society could provide more general education for the student teachers as well as the quick training in monitorial methods. In contrast, the superintendent of the National Society's central training institution professed himself satisfied with their short courses. He was asked:-

If a man were sufficiently well skilled in writing, reading and arithmetic, could he learn in five months the difficult art of teaching?

and he replied, "Yes, decidedly; and it may be learnt in three months, if he has tact."¹

All too few candidates were sufficiently well skilled in writing, reading and arithmetic. Earlier, the official in charge of training masters for the National Society - a Mr. Grover - had reported that the masters and mistresses were "in many instances, unable to write, and in some even to

¹R. W. Rich, The Training of Teachers, p. 45.

read".¹ It was decided to take more care in ascertaining that students had some proficiency in these areas, as well as ensuring their commitment to Africanism.

By the 'thirties', both Societies were trying to secure more mature trainee teachers than their original senior monitors. It was hoped that the 'school of life' would have taught some lessons, there being so little other education available.

The pervasive difficulty of attracting applicants of some degree of intellectual and moral adequacy was made more acute for the National Society by their insistence on commitment to the Church of England. That the British and Foreign Schools Society, although less stringently selective on religious grounds, also found it hard is illustrated by the following example:- In 1834, the Society advertised for a number of student teachers but could accept only one out of nearly eighty candidates because the standard was so low.²

Gradually it was being recognized that some sort of further education must be provided for intending teachers to compensate for the lack of secondary schooling: that, indeed, better education should be made more generally available. Monitorial teaching was increasingly falling into disrepute. Pestalozzi had been an early critic, attacking the "new-fangled order of cheap, artificial teaching tricks".³ Owen, likewise believing

¹R. W. Rich, (op. cit) p. 14.

²Arthur Tropp, The School Teachers, p. 12.

³Cited by Kate Silber, Pestalozzi, The Man and his Work, p. 136.

in education which would develop a child's unique potentialities, said that to be "taught by either Dr. Bell's or Mr. Lancaster's system" was to have "minds rendered irrational for life".¹ As early as 1814, Owen denounced this "mockery of learning", cancelling his initial approval.

Perhaps the most effective voices in spelling the doom of monitorial schools (although their death was a lingering one) belonged to the two Select Committees set up by the Government, in 1834 and 1838. Their reports led to the crucial developments of 1839 and the beginning of real teacher training colleges.

The revelations of the state of the schools in England had largely centred round the appalling inefficiency of the teachers, and the two Select Committees of the House of Commons had recorded evidence of the meagre training that was given in the central schools of the two voluntary societies at Westminster and Borough Road. Dr. Kay had obtained from Scotland masters for his workhouse schools and had demonstrated the truth of the claim that an efficient teacher makes an efficient school.²

The teacher was the crux of the problem: that was becoming more and more apparent.

Monitorial schools, despite obvious defects, did draw public attention to education besides exposing large numbers of poor children to at least elements of learning. The method was an attempt to grapple with a chronic situation. Unfortunately, it reduced "teaching-craft to rule of thumb",³

¹ Robert Owen, A New View of Society, (Essay 4, 1814) p. 25.

² Thus Frank Smith summarizes the situation in 1839;
A History of English Elementary Education, p. 174.

³ Ibid., p. 84.

and depreciated the teacher's role by:

requiring little else of him than an aptitude for enforcing discipline, an acquaintance with mechanical details for the preservation of order, and that sort of ascendancy in his school which a sergeant-major is required to exercise over a batch of raw recruits before they can pass muster on parade.¹

SCOTLAND

There were monitorial schools throughout the British Isles. Scotland first realized their deficiencies to the extent of demonstrating a better method. This is perhaps not surprising since Scotland's long-standing veneration for education had led to a good record of national provision. Before Union with England in 1707 almost every parish had its school. By the 1830's Scotland was setting an admirable pattern of teacher training although bitter religious dissensions and bigotry existed.

Scotland . . . with an ecclesiastical history 'the most perverse and melancholy in man's annals',² yet without a religious difficulty in her schools.

The high value placed on learning helped to keep matters in perspective and prevent the retardation of a national system. This drew favourable comment from Lord Brougham's 1818 investigating committee and, some years later, from Horace Mann. Mann praised the mental activity apparent in Scottish schools.

I do not exaggerate when I say that the most active and lively schools I have ever seen in the United

¹Asher Tropp, The School Teachers, p. 7.

²Braham Balfour, op. cit., p. xviii.

States must be regarded almost as dormitories compared with the fervid life of the Scottish school.¹

One explanation of this phenomenon was that for nearly twenty years Stow, in Glasgow, and to a lesser extent Wood, in Edinburgh, had been forming a new type of teacher; a teacher more adept at stimulating intellect and arousing desire to learn. By 1839 hundreds of such teachers had benefitted from the new training principles, and were active in Scottish schools. It was not until 1836 that a building specifically for teacher training was erected: this "Glasgow Academy" being the first British normal school.² Actually founded by a secular body, the Glasgow Education Society, the Academy was soon taken over by the (Presbyterian) Established Church of Scotland, becoming embroiled in religious turmoil in 1843. The setback suffered by the Academy was part of a general upheaval known as the "Disruption" of the Scottish Church in which 474 ministers resigned their livings in protest against State interference in religious matters. They formed the new Free Church of Scotland.

When the doctrinaire Established Church of Scotland had insisted that all staff and students in the normal school be conforming members of that Church, Stow and almost the entire college broke away, and built up the training college anew under the auspices of the Free Church, admitting all denominations.

Stow had been drawn to his life-work because:-

¹ Cited by Balfour, *ibid.*, p. 134.

² David Stow, Tracts on Education, p. 49; James Scotland, History of Scottish Education, p. 313.

The candidate teacher had no model school to look at, far less a Normal Seminary to be trained in. The gardener, the joiner, the jockey, the artisan must all be trained, and yet at that period it was never thought necessary to train the schoolmaster.¹

Stow deplored the monitorial methods; the "'knock-in', 'cramming', 'rote system' which was all but universal".² He believed strongly that every child should be directly instructed by an adult; should be trained by a mature person adequately equipped for the task. (He preferred to call teachers "trainers".)

No monitor who is a mere scholar himself can be expected to train his class. He may teach it but cannot develop their minds on any subject.

The Master's own mind is the immediate source whence all children are trained . . . it is in this individual training that the great virtue, as well as the chief difficulty of the art lies.³

For this it was essential to improve the pupil-teacher ratio and accept the fact that education costs money. Stow kept pointing the way, struggling through years of financial strain. He devised a hall with a gallery from which students could watch a class in progress, supplemented by thirteen classrooms. Teachers and student-teachers rotated round classes in the model school portion of the Academy while other trainees were receiving instruction in the normal school itself.

Each student had, weekly, 16-1/2 hours of general instruction, 8 hours

¹ David Stow, The Training System, p. 10.

² Ibid., p. 9.

³ A. R. Craig (enthusiasing about Stow's method), The Philosophy of Training, pp. 132, 133.

observation in the model school, 11-1/2 hours giving trial lessons, 3-1/2 hours of public criticism in the gallery and one hour giving each other Bible lessons (the students being taught imagining themselves to be children of some stipulated age).¹

Stow hoped that all students would remain in the professional training course for at least one full year, but, with financial stringencies and with the current demand for teachers, the average length of stay in the Academy, in 1840, was nine months.

Academic adequacy was the main basis of selection of students. The high regard for education and for teachers meant more promising candidates in Scotland than in England. Some had secondary schooling; a few had been to a university.

The urge to improve the intellectual standards of teachers did not diminish Stow's concern about moral precept and practice. 'Train the whole person', he constantly advocated; 'combine intellect and morals'. He also preached and practised broad non-sectarianism.

Teachers of all communions and of both sexes are regularly under training - Episcopalian, Wesleyan, Presbyterian, Independent, etc.. All act in harmony under the same religious, intellectual and moral training.²

He claimed to have introduced two new and fundamental elements into teacher training, namely, "Moral Training, and Picturing out in Words".³

¹ Inspector's Report, Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1840-1841, pp. 412-421.

² David Stow, "National Education", Tracts on Education, p. 49.

³ " " The Training System, p. 8.

For the former, example and the Playground were important: the latter, being the antithesis of rote learning, encouraged pupils' deductive thought.

"One of the chief peculiarities of the training system," said Stow, is:-

the gallery and the Simultaneous principle of Picturing out in words . . . a new more natural mode of cultivating the intellectual powers.¹

Tribute was paid to Stow's method by Sir John Graham in Parliament during the heated debates on the 1842 Factory Bill. "I consider it to be the greatest discovery in education of modern times," he said.²

During the 1840's Stow's fame was spreading and so were his trainees. Kay-Shuttleworth chose three of them to steer Battersea, the pioneer English training college. Of non-Scottish bodies making use of the unique training in operation in Glasgow, the Wesleyan Methodist Church was prominent. From the inception of the Wesleyan Education Committee in 1838, an effort was made to send students to Stow, and, from the first, high praise was reported. The Wesleyans felt "providentially directed to . . . the Normal Seminary at Glasgow, peculiarly fitted for the important work of Education."³ They testified to the high moral and religious character of the seminary as well as extolling the excellence of its professional training. Stow reciprocated with commendation of the Wesleyan students.

There was mutual benefit. The Wesleyan schools in England

¹David Stow, Tracts on Education, p. 50.

²Quoted by Stow, Tracts on Education, p. 50.

³Wesleyan Education Reports, 1841 Report, p. 8.

certainly benefited and the early students were ready to form the nucleus of the Wesleyans' own training college, opened in 1851. Stow was helpful in its planning. The Glasgow Academy benefited from the revenue provided by the Wesleyans, who during the 1840's sent 384 teacher trainees. Despite the fact that the Academy received a Treasury grant of 1,000 pounds in 1838, the drastic difficulties of financing better, longer courses persisted. They were, indeed, especially acute following the "Disruption" of 1843 when a new start had to be made in new premises, under the aegis of the new Free Church.

For the rest of the century training colleges in Scotland were managed by various Churches grant-aided by the British Government. Stow had set an example of tolerant grant-aided training as well as of improved methodology.

IRELAND

A yet-earlier experiment of co-operation between various religious bodies and the British Government in the field of teacher training occurred in Ireland. Ireland, hotbed of religious strife through so much of her history, actually pioneered a national, inter-denominational, government-assisted, teacher training institution. The praiseworthy venture was unfortunately of rather short duration.

From 1786, St. Catherine's Parish in Dublin had been running a school in which nearly a thousand poor children of 'various religious persuasions' were regularly taught. In December 1811, a voluntary society of prominent Dublin citizens developed the scheme. Their special project

was the establishment of a training college for teachers and associated practising schools. In 1815, the mother Parliament in London was petitioned for financial aid and granted 6,980 pounds. By April 1819, buildings in Kildare Place (costing 14,000 pounds) were ready for up to 800 pupils and "a full supply of Masters in Training".¹ The training of mistresses did not begin until five years later.

The 'Kildare Place Society' based their training, initially, on the monitorial method. Lancaster himself had secured the person appointed to take charge - one, John Veevers, "a member of the Church of England but no bigot".² Veevers extended the Lancastrian system, incorporating some of the teachings of Pestalozzi, and won acclaim from eminent Scottish and European visitors before increasing sectarian acrimony brought the work of the Kildare Place Society to an end.³

Quakers were notable among the initiators of the Kildare Place Society but all creeds were represented on the committee and among the students. The first candidate for training to be registered was James Maze, a 26-year-old Protestant from the far North; then came Daniel Horan, a 36-year-old Dublin Catholic. Numbers seemed to settle at about half Catholic and half-Protestant. From the beginning there were no religious tests

¹H. Kingsmill Moore, An Unwritten Chapter in the History of Education, p. 55.

²Ibid., p. 164.

³The name lingered; the work was gradually taken over by the Church of Ireland. The Rev. H. K. Moore found the early documents and told the story in 1904.

for entry and no doctrinal teachings: "the Scripture without note or comment to be used, excluding all catechisms and books of religious controversy".¹

For a time all went well.

Members of the Irish Church, Roman Catholics, and Non-conformists joined hands and laboured zealously together for the common good.²

The government grants, which Peel had been instrumental in achieving, were awarded knowing that the education and teacher training courses were intended for "all classes of professing Christians, without interfering with peculiar religious opinions".³ Unfortunately this link with a government which persistently refused to grant Catholic Emancipation engendered suspicion among the Catholics, who in any case disliked the "colourless denominationalism which the society enforced".⁴ The great national leader, Daniel O'Connell, inspired formation of Catholic education associations throughout the 1820's, which ardently crusaded for denominational control. Bitter charges of proselytism were levelled against the Society. These grew increasingly acrimonious although a Catholic Inspector (Mr. Donelon) protested that far from any attempts at proselytism he had found care exercised for the special protection of Catholics, and a Commission

¹ Quoted by Kingsmill Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

appointed in 1824 to enquire into Irish education refuted such charges.

The Commission praised the Society's normal school.

The training of teachers, in the opinion of the Commissioners, is so extremely well managed that they propose leaving the Society undisturbed in this part of their work.¹

The Commissioners, however, like the Catholics, disapproved of the denominationalism which was the base of the Society. This, in the minds of British parliamentarians, outweighed all the commendations. In 1831, Earl Grey - more rigid than Wellington or Peel - held the reins of power. Government grants were withdrawn. The work of the Kildare Place Society could not long continue unaided. It faded out and a rigorously denominational system of teacher training replaced the united college. After a period of signal success, a striking example of co-operation in providing national, inter-denominational, teacher training succumbed.

Ireland was still the forerunner of the sort of subsidized co-ordinated denominational system which was eventually achieved in England. The Government, which spelled the doom of the Kildare Place Society by withdrawal of funds, set up a National Board of Education in Ireland in October 1831, with representatives of various religious bodies including the native Catholics who had won 'Emancipation' two years earlier.²

The Board immediately tackled the vital question of teacher training. By 1837, Thomas Wyse could report progress in Ireland:-

¹ Ibid. , p. 100.

² The first Board consisted of 2 Anglicans, 2 Catholics, 1 Presbyterian and 1 Unitarian.

They have taken Tyrone House, with a considerable portion of ground, in Dublin, for their normal and model schools, and in the present year are likely to commence the first normal establishment under state superintendence known in these countries. ¹

The Board had earlier started a training and model school beside their headquarters in Merrion Street. When the normal school was moved in 1837, the course was extended from three months to five months.

Wyse also wrote:-

The National Board . . . has followed up with judgement and activity the stimulus first given to such labours by the Kildare Place Society. ²

He lambasted England for her failure to make any such provision in her own land - as had Lord Brougham - and said:-

The great defect of English education, to which most of its injurious and inefficient working may be traced, is the total want of a national organization. . . . It forms the one great exception to the entire civilized world. ³

The English 'religious difficulty' still made impossible the inauguration of a central educational organization and a national system of teacher training.

¹ Papers of the Central Society of Education, Vol. 1; p. 54.

² Ibid., p. 53.

³ Ibid., p. 62.

CHAPTER III

"The small quarrel over the planning of religious teaching is a projected training college raised the old stormy issues"

A. V. Judges. ¹

By 1839 England had authorized State administration and State sub-
 sidi-
 zation of teacher training in Ireland despite thorny problems of religious
 vari-
 ation; yet such an arrangement seemed impossible to accomplish at
 the
 time. In the Spring of 1839 there was a valiant attempt to set up a
 national normal school for England and Wales. The records of the ensuing
 par-
 liamentary debates show something of the religious bigotry which doomed
 the reformers' hopes. ²

Wyse's proposal for an English Board of Education, in 1838, had been
 ab-
 ruptly negated in the House of Commons. He envisaged a Board repres-
 ent-
 ing the Churches, as that in Ireland. At the same time Leonard Horner
 was urging a non-ecclesiastical 'Board of Commissioners', made up of
 pre-
 m-
 inent men from various walks of life, whose first task would be to
 es-
 tablish normal schools. Any such suggestion inevitably met the force of
 Church opposition to relinquishing - or even loosening - its entrenched
 hold on education. But, whilst the House of Lords behind its bench of

¹ "James Kay-Shuttleworth," Pioneers of English Education, p. 119.

² Copies of Hansard, for this period, are missing from Province House,
 Halifax, Nova Scotia; Mirror of Parliament, there provides a full
 account.

of Bishops was still invincibly Anglican, in the House of Commons, Church
 dominance was waning.¹ Moreover, Lord Melbourne's weak, middle-
 way, Whig Administration was then in such a tottering state that it must
 perforce yield to some of the reforming demands of its left-wing supporters.
 One of the increasingly importunate demands was for teacher improvement.
 Something had to be done.

Lord Melbourne, who inclined to resist all reform if possible, was
 particularly opposed to educational reform. For one thing, he realized the
 certainty of provoking Anglican antagonism; for another, he feared that a
 semi-educated populace would be even more troublesome than an uneducated
 one. A thin spread of learning could do more harm than good, in his opin-
 ion. "You may fill a person's head with nonsense which may be impossible
 ever to get out again," he said.² His obduracy provoked Howick's furious
 retort, "Thank God there are some things which even you cannot stop, and
 this is one of them".³

Melbourne made his aversions clear to the Queen - especially his strong
 hostility to normal schools. "You will see," he told her, "they will breed
 the most conceited set of blockheads ever known, and will be of no use

¹ We cannot here explore the complex link between this and parliamentary
 reform with its destruction of aristocratic monopoly of seats.

Vide R. G. Cowherd, The Politics of English Dissent, and
 N. Gash, Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics.

² Cited by Lord David Cecil, Lord M., p. 129.

³ Ibid., p. 279.

whatever."¹ However, his early potent influence over the young Queen was waning as her confidence grew and Albert (from the land of the prototype training colleges) was at hand to advise her.

Lord Melbourne was obliged to concede. Lord John Russell, keen though fearful, took charge. Discussions with other members of the Government who supported educational reform, and with the Queen, culminated in an official letter, on February 4th, asking Lord Lansdowne to head a committee of the Privy Council to superintend "all matters affecting the Education of the People".² This task Lord Lansdowne undertook: a normal school was the declared priority.

Lord John Russell put their plans before the House of Commons on February 12th. For months he had been negotiating with representatives of the Established Church and with dissenting leaders. The response from Dissent, on the whole, seemed encouraging but the Church, even before any proposals were made, distrusted him as a member of the radical Central Society of Education and a long-standing adherent of the dissenting British and Foreign Schools Society. He declared in Parliament that he was not prepared to accept the Church's claim "that the whole of education of the country must and ought to be confided to the hands of the clergy of the established church".³ Nor was he willing that reform should be impeded

¹Ibid., p. 194.

²The wording was later changed (by Lord Melbourne, it is presumed) to read: "to superintend the Application of any Sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education." (Minutes of the Cttee. of Council of Education, April 10th, 1839).

³Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 175.

by awkward minorities - for instance, the Unitarians who wanted no Bible reading in schools. Unlike Ireland, "in England, the Roman Catholics do not form any great portion of the community,"¹ said Lord John. He thought it should be less difficult, therefore, to draw up an acceptable plan.

Priorities were clearly stated.

I say the measure which should be first adopted is the establishment of a good normal school, [under the direction of a Privy Council Board.]²

Lord Ashley's immediate response foreshadowed the coming conflict:-

The proposed plan . . . with its board of Privy Councillors, its normal school . . . presents features well calculated to excite alarm in the friends of religious education.³

As few leaders of the time could conceive of education in any way divorced from religion, the plan certainly did excite alarm. In face of some of the first tricky questions, Russell prevaricated. Gladstone demanded, "What will the religious instruction in the normal school be?" Viscount Sandon was more explicit: "What guarantee that it will be Church of England?" Russell replied that the Board would have to deliberate on that.⁴

It was realized that any measure legalizing State 'interference' with the Churches' educational control - and especially with the favoured position

¹ Report of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 173.

² Ibid., 175.

³ Ibid., 181.

⁴ Ibid., 181, 182.

of the Established Church - would be thrown out by the House of Lords even if it succeeded in passing through Commons. This obstacle was dexterously circumnavigated by setting up the Education Committee by 'Order in Council'. This, being a Queen's command, could not be reversed by either House, and its actions would be somewhat sheltered from diehard Tories and Churchmen. Funds for its operation, however, were voted by the House of Commons, under general Supply, and at that time debate could, and did, rage.

The Lords, in furious protest, marched to the Queen. She held firm. The Committee in Council, which became fact on April 10th, consisted of Lord Lansdowne, Lord John Russell, the Lord Privy Seal, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They wisely chose Kay-Shuttleworth as the first secretary - a man who had shown himself very deeply concerned about the low standard of England's teachers.

Kay-Shuttleworth promptly proposed a national normal school, non-denominational, residential, influenced by Stow. He was well aware of the passionate and varying attitudes of the Churches and the difficulty of making one all-embracing normal school acceptable to the many. The need being so great, some way must be found. Would-be reformers, such as the Central Society of Education, believed co-operation to be possible. There were warnings against trying to formulate any ingenious plan of Scripture teaching which would prove equally agreeable to members of all religious persuasions; a task, said Leonard Horner, "beyond the capabilities of man to devise".¹

¹Cited by Hugh Pollard, Pioneers of Popular Education, p. 196.

Religious instruction, of course, there must be. The initial announcement stated the intention: -

To found a school, in which candidates for the office of teacher in schools for the poorer classes may acquire the knowledge necessary to the exercise of their future profession, and may be practised in the most approved methods of religion and moral training and instruction. ¹

"The religious instruction of the candidate teachers" was "to form an essential and prominent element of their studies". ² Kay-Shuttleworth, conscious of the desperate need for teacher training, tried to subvert protest by his scheme of separating 'Special' (i. e. doctrinal) religious instruction from 'General' religious instruction, on supposedly common ground. In both the normal school and the model school the General Religious Instruction was "to be combined with the whole matter of instruction, and to regulate the entire system of discipline", whilst the Special Religious Instruction would be given in periods set apart, and by an appointed Anglican Chaplain and visiting Dissenting Ministers, each dealing with his own flock. Daily Scripture reading was obligatory: Roman Catholics were permitted to read their own version of the Scriptures. ³

The Church of England was shocked. Kay-Shuttleworth was himself a deeply committed Churchman but his tolerance and his earlier connections with Dissent provoked distrust among the more rigid Anglicans: some

¹Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education, p. 179.

²Ibid., p. 181.

N. B. Appendix C.

³Ibid., p. 180.

regarded him as tainted because he had taught in a Nonconformist Sunday School in his youth. He, as well as his proposal, was subjected to virulent attack.

The scheme aroused storms of abuse. Violent protests were launched at the Special and General clauses. A raging Church demanded: 'How dare any but their clergy decide what was religious and what was not?'; 'How dare the State enact intrusion of dissenting ministers into the Church's rightful domain?'.¹

In Parliament Tory opposition fulminated; not, at this critical time, commanded by Peel. He held the position of Leader of the Opposition but was regarded by his, mostly Anglican, followers as being much too moderate on this vital issue. Peel recognized the extreme difficulty of formulating a better scheme and he did not think it politic to try to take over the reins of government at such a shaky time. There was no dearth of impassioned eloquence against the proposal, however. It was generally led by Ashley, Bandon, Stanley and Gladstone - men whom other protagonists termed:

highly principled noblemen and gentlemen who defended, so powerfully, the doctrine of a Christian Education, from the leaven of Popery, Socinianism, and Infidelity.¹

Typical of antagonistic Parliamentary reaction were Lord Ashley's forceful objections to the licence given minority religious groups, especially the Catholics; to power passing into the "hands of men of strong political bias and connexions"², instead of resting with Church leaders; and

¹ The Watchman, July 3rd, 1839.

² Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 2051.

his avowal, "I will never consent to a plan that will sever religious from secular education".¹

The ferment forced the withdrawal of the idea of a national normal school. On June 3rd the Committee reported that they experienced "so much difficulty in reconciling conflicting views" that they had to "postpone taking any steps . . . until greater concurrence of opinion is found to prevail".²

The Committee were still decidedly

of the opinion that the most useful application of any sums voted by Parliament would consist in the employment of those monies in the establishment of a Normal School, under the direction of the State, and not placed under the management of a voluntary society.³

Kay-Shuttleworth wrote of the "incalculable benefits from such an institution" in face of the appalling need for teachers:

capable of making knowledge attractive by the simplicity and kindness with which it is imparted - imbued with a deep sense of their religious responsibilities, and hallowing all their moral instruction by a constant reference to the sanctions of religion. . . Deeply, therefore, do we regret the difficulty experienced in devising any method by which the religious instruction of children and teachers can be reconciled in such an establishment, with due regard to the rights of conscience.⁴

So strong were his feelings that "the feuds of sects and the interests

¹ Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 2955.

² Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education, p. 182.

³ Ibid., p. 182.

⁴ Ibid., p. 257.

of bodies incompetent effectually to deal with this national question should not rob the people of England"¹ of some answer to the need, that he, with his friend Tufnell, gallantly embarked on the private venture of a prototype training college. They bought a large house in Battersea, later in 1839, and recruited the local vicar, saying:

We are come to make a revolution . . . to defy the Church . . . to take a sly hit at the Government for a mistake they made. . . I give you my solemn benediction as chaplain of the first training college in England - the training college at Battersea. Will you let me have the village school to try on? What we cannot do by force, we will do by cunning.²

The founders hoped that the results shown at Battersea, which were undeniably splendid, would encourage State support. This, however, was still only granted to the main educational societies. To ask for public support would, they felt, further stir up religious controversy. Battersea had to be transferred to the National Society.³ Instead of becoming the first civil college it became strictly Anglican. Denominational teacher training seemed to be the only way forward.

Throughout the land bitter arguments continued to rage after the Government withdrew the proposal for a normal school, which had been ostensibly the cause of the furore. The wild petitions to Parliament, the extremist repetitious allegations in Parliament, the many frantic meetings and vehement

¹ Ibid., p. 280.

² Cited by Thomas Adkins, The History of St. John's College, Battersea, pp. 43-44.

³ The detailed story of 'Battersea' can be read in Adkins' History of St. John's College, Battersea, and in Four Periods of Public Education.

denunciations, all pointed to a state of real alarm in the country and in the Church. Perhaps Lord John Russell's early hesitancy had been justified and the times indeed unpropitious.¹

It was not only the Government which felt insecure. The people generally were suffering upheavals and alarms. The Winter of 1838 had brought Chartist agitation to a peak; growing religious acrimony added to secular turmoil; Dissenters were becoming increasingly hostile to the favoured position of the Church of England and to the payment of rates to subsidize Church schools; Radicals attacked the tenets of the Church. The 1839 secular Education Committee, and the provisions of its first Bill, played particularly on Church fears at a time when it felt especially vulnerable - attacked on many sides and itself fearful and disunited.

Through the 1830's there had been escalating anxiety that a reformed parliament would disestablish and degrade the Church.

¹In 1838, Lord John Russell, although keenly desiring educational reform, had advised the Government that it might be sensible to await more settled times and a greater degree of concord.

Reformers in the Church were active but in conflict with one another; Evangelicals at one extreme, Tractarians at the other. In the late Thirties, the Tractarian ('Oxford') Movement was at its height. Its efforts to reform liturgies, and to purify the Church as a bulwark against erastian threats, seemed to alarm the majority of Churchmen rather than to inspire emulation of 'High Church' ways. 'Pussey's perilous pranks' engendered as much suspicion among moderate conformists as among Nonconformists. Only a common fear could draw together a deeply divided Church and rally all her forces to resist a mutual enemy.

The 1839 'Minute' was unifying because it struck at the roots of over-riding anxieties in the Church. The educational issue became entangled in the disestablishment issue. Even 'reasonable' clergymen like Blomfield, Bishop of London, suspected a Whig plot to level down the Church of England to the ranks of other denominations. Church reaction was "immediate, intense, wide and deep".¹ It was not only the threat to the Church-State link which rallied such opposition, but also the concept of Special and General religion. Religion and education were inseparable. All Churchmen felt this, though a few argued that the current need justified more compromise. Dr. W. F. Hook, the working man's Vicar of Leeds, advocated

¹ Olive Brose, Church and Parliament, p. 186.

the 'Irish System';¹ something on the lines of the Kildare Place Society's work. He was prepared to accept Kay-Shuttleworth's similar plan.

There is little doubt that the vast majority of Anglicans voicing any opinion bitterly opposed the scheme, and that throughout the whole Church the normally wide spectrum narrowed in denunciation. "A scheme . . . proposed by the established church as one man," said Lord Stanley during the acrimonious June debate.² 'Church in danger' tensions preempted reasoned argument. Some moderate, liberal Churchmen, though reacting similarly, tried to put forward their views with less intransigence and more cogency. F. D. Maurice was one such. He explained that he dreaded above all, "the attempt to treat a human being as composed of two entities, one called religious, the other secular".³

¹ An experiment of the Irish System was then showing signs of success in an area of Liverpool thickly populated by immigrant Catholic Irish. James Murphy writes about it in The Religious Problem in English Education. It was carried out in Corporation schools by men anxious to demonstrate "that children of all sects might well be educated together in publicly owned elementary schools: and that, therefore, the 'Religious Problem', so often said to be insoluble, ought no longer to deter the government of the day from establishing a national system of elementary education." (p. 1). An apprenticeship scheme for training teachers was started: in 1841 there were 4 Church of England apprentices, 5 Dissenters, 8 Catholics and 1 Unitarian. Then, in 1841, Religious strife - incited especially by an Anglican firebrand, Rev. Hugh McNeile, annulled the scheme.

² Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 2933.

³ Frederic Maurice, Life of Maurice, p. 277; quoted by Desmond Bowen, The Idea of the Victorian Church, p. 232.

The High Church element gave the most uncompromizing opposition to the mooted normal school. It fought pungently. The more doctrinal the stance the fiercer the objection to the comparatively tolerant provisions of the Bill, and to power passing from the Bishops.¹ Although the Tractarians apparently had most in common with the Roman Catholic faith, they were among the most implacable opposers of a normal school which would train Roman Catholics (as well as other non-Anglicans). Fear of 'Popery' seemed a very real threat in England since Catholic Emancipation in 1829 and this undoubtedly played its part in closing Anglican ranks against Kay-Shuttleworth's proposal.

This fear gained the Church a useful, and unexpected, non-Anglican ally - the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion. By 1839, the popular movement called Methodism had two sides; the politically conservative, predominantly middle-class, Wesleyans, and the more radical, evangelical, working-class side of its origins, represented now by the secessionists. Since the time of its founder's injunctions, the sect had constantly striven towards better educational chances for all. Cowherd even asserts: "Popular elementary education arose . . . as a result of the Wesleyan revival".²

J. F. C. Harrison writes, thus, of Methodist Sunday Schools, 'class meetings, preachings and teachings:-

¹ The "anti-erastian polity of the Tractarians" is mentioned, for example, in Newman's Apologia, p. 165.

² Raymond Cowherd, The Politics of English Dissent, p. 36.
N.B. The terms 'Wesleyan' and 'Methodist' were then synonymous.

It is not an accident that almost every self-educated working man in early and mid-Victorian England, who came to write his memoirs, paid tribute to the beneficial influences of Methodism in his youth. . . . Methodism for them was almost a natural stage in their educational and moral development.¹

By 1839, the Wesleyan Methodists were deeply involved in formal educational provision; had founded and were running numerous schools; had appointed an Education Committee, and were showing mounting concern over the professional as well as the moral standards of their teachers. Lord John Russell specifically mentioned "the Wesleyan Methodists" when acknowledging the difficulties of inaugurating a national educational system in a 'field' occupied by voluntary bodies.² If he anticipated alignments, a natural expectation would be that the Wesleyans would side with the Nonconformist British and Foreign Schools Society. Russell could hardly have foreseen that they and the National Society would forge a union so strong and so detrimental to the normal school plan, that all support of radical reformers, hopes of Catholics and other minority bodies, along with 'British and Foreign' acquiescence, would be of no avail.

The Wesleyans had been as forceful as any Nonconformist in denouncing the "rabidly pro-Anglican" 1820 Education Bill. By this new proposal they stood to gain. It included a suggestion that grants for education should be spread beyond the orbit of the two recognized Societies: the Wesleyans were considered to be the most likely future beneficiaries. Yet, differing from

¹The Early Victorians 1832-1851, p. 128.

²Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 173.

other branches of Methodism, as from all Dissent, they roundly repudiated the Bill and swung over to the side of their old protagonist, the Established Church.

Recognizing that their voice in Parliament was inadequate to express their revulsion to the scheme, they sent in 2,872 petitions, with 355,661 signatures, testifying to their trenchant opposition. Richard Cobden, writing to Thomas Wyse on June 2nd, said, "The Methodist howl and the high church crusade will succeed."¹

Succeed it did. The united clamour proved too much for a shaky Government: hopes of a long-overdue training college were foiled. Lord Stanley, speaking against the project in the House of Commons, called it a scheme "opposed by the established church as one man, and by the next most active and important body in the country, - the Wesleyan Methodists".² Mr. Hawes likewise spoke of the opposition "of the great body of Wesleyan Methodists," and commented:

The plan has failed, certainly, from the union of the high church party and its new allies the Wesleyan Methodists;³

That Wesleyan resistance to the normal school measure proved effective is shown in parliamentary oration and its outcome. The Tory vanguard used it as one of the big sticks with which to beat the Government's brittle back. Lord Egerton declaimed on the theme of Wesleyan objections: he

¹ Quoted by James Murphy, The Religious Problem in English Education, p. 203.

² Error of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 2933.

³ Ibid., 2960-2961.

announced that he personally had had over fifty of their petitions; he summed

thus:

Now, with reference to this and other proofs of the unanimity of the great body of Wesleyan Methodists, he must say, that he was almost inclined to attribute more weight and authority on this question to the expression of opinion of that great body, than even to that of the leaders of that establishment to which it was his happiness to belong. (Hear, hear.) He thought the former expression of opinion would carry with it more weight and authority to the country, (Hear,) because he thought that it might perhaps be said that the establishment was at present exhibiting some degree of hostility to the existing government.¹

Lord Stanley, after noting the Church's absolute rejection of the plan,

said:-

To what quarter, then, would the noble lord next turn for confidence amongst the religious denominations of the country? He would ask the noble lord which, next to the Established Church, was the most important, which was the most numerous, which was the most zealous, which the most active, in the cause of education, of all the sects into which the other Protestant portion of the community was divided? The noble lord would answer him, - or if not, the country would answer for him - beyond comparison, the Wesleyan body. (Hear.)²

And later:-

They would tell him, and the petitions which had poured in upon the table of the House would tell him, in terms not to be mistaken, that among the Wesleyan Methodists of this country there was an universal feeling of absolute distrust and distaste toward the noble lord's scheme of education. (Cheers.) Among them there was no difficulty or hesitancy in deciding as to whether they should make common cause with her Majesty's government, or with the Established Church.³

¹Annual Register, 1839, p. 149.

²Ibid., p. 143.

³Ibid.

Lord Ashley was another who stressed the strong remonstrances and resolutions of the Wesleyan body, who "in ordinary times kept aloof" from the Established Church, but who had, "in the present momentous state of affairs - forgetting all minor differences - come forward most manfully and most generously, in defence of their common principles," having "generously abandoned all considerations of private interest".¹

There seems reason to affirm that it was the conjunction of Wesleyans with Anglicans which made defeat of the Government plan certain. At such a critical time, the part played by the former was significant.

When the scheme had been scotched, some Wesleyans had misgivings about the extremism of their anti-Government campaign. At their annual Conference, in July, questions were asked as to whether the promotion of petitions had been justifiable. Answer was given:-

The Conference, in its deliberate judgement, resolves, that the OCCASION, which especially called for vigilant and active exertions, constituted a full and perfect justification of the proceedings in question.²

Then we read the real reason for the strength of feeling.

The attempt to allow the introduction of the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures into the Normal School, which it proposed to establish and support by a grant of public money, could not but appear eminently calculated to afford facilities and means for the countenance and propagation of the corrupt and tyrannical system of Popery, highly detrimental to the best

¹Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 2955.

N. B., also, the Bishop of London's speech of May 28th about "demonstrations of an unquestionable kind," by Wesleyans, "a very large, influential, important, and, I believe, sincere body of Christians." (Quoted in The Watchman, July 3rd).

²Minutes of the Methodist Conference, 1839, Vol. VIII, p. 514.

interests of this country, the security of the Protestant faith, and the spiritual welfare of the community at large, particularly of its children and youth.

The Conference declaration continues:-

It was imperative on our regularly constituted authorities to pursue such a course as might most promptly and effectually call forth the united efforts of the Wesleyan Connexion, to defeat a project so fraught with danger.

In the columns of the Wesleyan newspaper, The Watchman, we can see signs of anti-Catholicism becoming stronger than traditional resentment of the Church. In the early months of 1839 the main objection mirrored was to Anglican arrogance and claim to monopolize education. Prevalent Anglican attitudes were such as voiced by Ashley and Gladstone during the furious debate on the normal school: Ashley declared that the State was better to teach nothing if it did not teach the truth - truth being embodied in Church of England tenets: Gladstone argued that the normal school proposal was tantamount to State recognition of all forms of religion and was, therefore, "unconstitutional".¹

Such attitudes naturally antagonized Nonconformists. The Watchman editorial of February 27th stated: "We object to the exclusive right, claimed by certain clergymen, to have in their hands the instruction of the people".²

No Government attached to the principles of civil and religious liberty can dispute the right of other orthodox religious communities, whose services to the commonwealth have fairly earned for them a name and place among our social institutions, to divide with the Church

¹ Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 3163.

² The Watchman, Vol. 5, p. 69.

the right of educating the people, and to participate, as is now the case in our colonies, in any such educational grants of the state as may be justified by a strong and clear expediency.¹

Various current articles and letters evinced a belief in a voluntary system aided by government, so long as recognition was fair and of 'orthodox' religious bodies. When the Committee in Council scheme was made known, however, the fact that a much fairer provision would operate and a much needed want be met, was drowned in the fear of a boost to 'Popery', now more active in England".

By May, anti-Catholicism was growing rampant. The leading article of May 22nd declared:-

Never was there a period since the defeat of Lord Sidmouth's Bill, in which it behoved the Wesleyan Methodists to bestir themselves so promptly, and act so determined a part, as at this moment;

for the "inevitable result" of the Government scheme would be:

to open a door for the introduction of Popish and other heretical teachers in the pay of the State, to the certain injury of our common orthodox Protestantism.²

There followed a stirring appeal to "Wesleyans through the length and breadth of the land to come forward at once, and petition the Legislature against Lord John Russell's obnoxious proposal".³

May 29th showed mounting acrimony. One letter writer announced: " 'War to the death with Popery' is the motto of the Wesleyans".⁴ We find

¹The Watchman, Vol. 5, p. 69.

²Ibid., p. 173.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 185.

clamation calls "to all friends of orthodox and Protestant education" to "protest to the uttermost".

The editors tried to prove themselves above unreasonable prejudice in the matter, with the statement:-

The Wesleyans have not the most distant wish to interfere with the religious rights and privileges of the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics may institute as many schools for the education of their own children, under schoolmasters of their own creed, as they please; and they will not be interfered with by the Wesleyans: but if they come to Parliament for help to train their schoolmasters at the public expense, and to erect school-houses in which these said teachers, when trained, shall be employed in teaching Popery, they must calculate upon a stern and uncompromising resistance. The Wesleyans may be ultimately compelled to pay taxes for such a purpose, but they will resist by every constitutional means.¹

The immediate urgency was to squash the normal school proposal.

When this had been effected, the Wesleyans reviewed the whole question and set out their standpoint, beginning:

It may be important, at some future day, to look back on the stirring times in which we live, and survey the grounds on which the Wesleyan body have taken up their present position on the momentous question of National Education.²

They are not usually prominent in political discussions, they proclaim; but when questions have arisen "affecting the vital interests of religion and humanity," they have "felt it their solemn duty to come forward," and fight - constitutionally - for what they passionately believe to be right. So,

¹The Watchman, Vol. 5, p. 185.

²Ibid., July 3rd.

in the past, they fought for the abolition of slavery: now, "in this hour of danger," they saw that - as Ashley said in Parliament:

if they did not protest against the admission of the principle contained in the minute of council, they would open a door for the establishment of erroneous creeds and doctrines, from which they most conscientiously and decidedly dissent.

The proposal was regarded as "fraught with the most injurious consequences to religion," and it was, therefore, imperative to join with those who were:

nobly seeking to conserve the best institutions of our land, and to preserve inviolate the religion of our country . . .

and to defend "the doctrine of Christian Education from the leaven of Popery".

The survey was largely occupied with tributes paid to the Wesleyans during the contentious June debate. The writers obviously gloried in these, and felt that they could "very well afford, therefore, the sneers, the taunts, and even the mendacious misrepresentations of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, and those who think with him. They were particularly proud of Gladstone's refutation of O'Connell's attacks on the Wesleyan sect as the enemy of civil and religious liberty. His remarks about Wesleyan zeal and philanthropy are quoted at length. Also quoted in praise of their motives, by Peel and Ashley; for example, "the most exalted and conscientious motives that one can adorn and dignify human nature," and "nothing but the purist motives".

The Methodists will not feel very anxious about the good opinion or the displeasure of Mr. O'Connell and his adherents, while such men as those quoted above . . . can appreciate their sincerity and do justice to their motives.

It was, indeed, a period of unprecedented mutual admiration - too

unsome, one suspects to survive a brief functional liaison. Mr. Hawes, M. P. for Lambeth and a supporter of the normal school scheme, commented severely on the new union's responsibility for the failure of the Minute. He added, "It remains to be seen whether the Methodists will continue to be disposed to be dragged at the wheels of the Church".¹

Mr. Hawes' remark was perspicacious. It is important to note that there is evidence in many of the Methodist reports, letters, speeches and articles of the time, that the old bone of contention with the Church of England, though briefly buried, had not been forgotten. The over-riding concern of the moment, however, was the defence of Protestantism. One gets the definite impression that the 'marriage of convenience' between the Wesleyans and the Anglicans was prompted almost exclusively by the intention to fight the spread of Catholicism. The thwarting of the dreaded possibility of a public normal school, which would give licence to Roman Catholics, was seen as the matter of greatest expediency. Once, however, such an outcome was safely forestalled - even if only temporarily - the Wesleyans could revive their objections to the Church dictum that 'children of the poor should be educated in the tenets of the Church of England without exception'.

One of the best-known (and dictatorial) Methodist leaders, Jabez Estlin, was foremost in warning the 'Connexion' against subjugation. The closing paragraph of The Watchman article of July 3rd is from a

¹ Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 2960.

speech of Dr. Bunting's and is something of a clarion call. "Let the Church educate her children in her own way, but let us educate our children in our way," he trumpeted. It is clear that resentment of the Church's assumption of dominance in education continued to smoulder and would indubitably flare up again.

In July 1839, however, the annual Wesleyan Conference expressed its happiness in the fruitful alliance. It also recorded:

sorrow and alarm at the methods employed by different parties to revive and extend the influence of Popery in the United Kingdom, as well as in our Colonies;¹

and pledged itself to "arrest the progress of this evil."

The Conference praised the "watchful attention, exemplary zeal and wise Christian exertions," which averted the threat of a civil normal school which would permit the introduction of the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures. It emphasized that these watchful attentions must continue:

as the Committee of Privy Council is still in existence, and retains the POWER of promoting a scheme of National Education which would, if carried into effect, put to hazard the scriptural Christianity of the country, . . . taint society, . . . and prepare the public mind for the reception of the dangerous errors of Popery.²

There was hope of financial backing for Methodist vigilance and exertions. A 'Centenary Fund', commemorating John Wesley's 'heart-warming' conversion in 1738, had been started. The advance of Methodist education was one of the fund's major purposes: priorities within the field of

¹Minutes of the Methodist Conference, 1839, Vol. VIII, p. 514.

²Ibid., p. 515.

education had not been specified. The newly-appointed Wesleyan Education Committee voiced the hope that some of the Centenary Fund would go toward necessary "legislative or other proceedings on the question of national education".¹ In the opinion of J. H. Rigg, a Methodist educationalist, the fund had been set up to found a training college for day-school teachers.² The original intentions may not have been spelled out but it became clear within a decade that the Centenary Fund was making possible a Methodist training college.

Educational issues had been brought to the fore in all the Methodist Conferences of the late Thirties. After the 1837 meeting, an official central committee was formed to co-ordinate the sporadic, zealous but unorganized efforts to extend Methodist education. This action, one suspects, was propelled by two looming fears: a national system of education, worldly, irreligious or blatantly Anglican; and spreading Catholicism. The request for a committee under the official sanction of the Methodist Conference, included these words:

Should Popery and infidelity ever attempt, under any pretence, to take direction of the youthful mind of this country, it is to be hoped that Methodism will resist the attempt, even to the death; and, in order that we may then be in a condition to resist with success, let us now hasten to the field, and, as far as possible, pre-occupy the ground.³

¹ Wesleyan Education Reports, 1838-39, p. 15.

² Vide H. F. Mathews, Methodism and the Education of the People, p. 112.

³ Wesleyan Education Reports, 1837, p. 9; quoting speech given to the gathering of leaders in July, 1837.

There followed an intensification of educational effort. Methodism began to take definite steps to train her own teachers. The college which gradually evolved was a part of the piecemeal denominational teacher training provision which proliferated throughout the 1840's.

Wesleyan 'disinterested zeal for true religion' (as they regarded what we might now be justified in terming 'prejudice') cannot escape its share of responsibility for the contraversion of the plan put forward by the Whig Administration for the inception of a national system of teacher training.

We should remember, however, that it was not only the Wesleyans who saw in the Bill "the triumph of the Scarlet Woman".¹ At that time, an anti-Catholic bonfire was being built throughout English Protestantism. Kay-Buttlesworth's normal school proposal was just the sort of match to ignite a conflagration. Vociferous clergymen and leaders of 'the establishment' added fuel to the fire: so did newspapers. The Times carried suspicious and inflammatory leading articles. Mary Sturt quotes from a copy of May 25th:-

The attempt of the Queen's ministers is a downright fraud, it is to smuggle Popery into England as an item of Mr. Spring-Rice's budget, to pass the overthrow of our church as a clause in a money bill.²

Leading politicians were obviously as horrified as any Methodist at the projected inclusion of Roman Catholics in the normal school. Lord Ashley bracketed them with outlandish minority sects, and repeatedly queried:

Are we to understand that persons of all religious denominations are to be taught alike at the expense

¹B. and J. L. Hammond, The Bleak Age, p. 155.

²The Education of the People, p. 81.

of the state? . . . Roman Catholics and Socinians trained and fostered at the expense of the state, to enter, hereafter as teachers of their respective doctrines, into schools licensed and supported by the state? ¹

The idea was intolerable !

Lord Ashley emphasized that schoolmasters entrusted with the instruction of the young must be of sound doctrine: 'Baptists, Unitarians, Socinians, Quakers and Roman Catholics all had different views on questions of faith . . . How could they be educated together? Even Lord Russell admitted that education was not a thing separate from religion'. ²

Lord Stanley's objection was understandable. Certainly it was difficult, at that time, to envisage a master plan which would transcend all such obstacles.

The forceful, often repetitious and rancourous, arguments continued in the House of Commons, June 14th, 19th and 20th - lightened occasionally (for the reader) by exasperated liberal expostulations. Mr. Sheil, for example, pleaded for some "real Christianity" instead of all the dogmas of theology. ³ Mr. Buller boldly asserted that education could not be left to the Church; they had 'made a mess of it so far'. ⁴ To this, Sir Robert Inglis replied that education must always be connected with religion; moreover:

¹ Mirror of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 4, 2955.

² Annual Register, 1839, p. 143.

³ Ibid., p. 164.

⁴ Ibid., p. 151.

if the Roman Catholic religion were ever again in the ascendent the clergy of that church would be the last in the world to relinquish the office of educating the people.¹

It was staunchly maintained that it was right and proper for the Church to cling to its power. Sir James Graham added his voice to the effort to avert the danger of disestablishment: 'If the plan was adopted, a paramount state religion was at an end. The state had chosen the established church to represent government in religion'.² The state must enforce her tenets.

"The State adopts the Church of England as the true church," pontificated Lord Ashley.³

On this stand of legislated Anglican supremacy, Churchmen fought. They fought all the more desperately because tensions were then exacerbated by threats of the overthrow of established institutions, from such prominent men as the great Catholic leader Daniel O'Connell and such potent groups as the Chartists.

The Wesleyans had no such elevated position to defend. The arrogant Anglican claims to have a monopoly of truth might well have caused increased animosity rather than a honeymoon combination. They must have been fearful indeed of 'Rome' to ally so enthusiastically with proponents of the 'true Church' to crush the normal school proposal.

Crushed it was. Anti-erastian Churchmen and anti-Catholic Wesleyans

¹ Annual Register, 1839, p. 153.

² Ibid., p. 157.

³ Error of Parliament, 1839, Vol. 1, 2094.

rejoiced. Kay-Shuttleworth and progressive Members of Parliament sorrowed and despaired. Lord Brougham, who had been striving for years to promote State 'seminaries' for teacher training, said he was "mortified that parliament was not ready to do its duty to the people".¹

The House of Lords, on the crest of the vanquishing wave, tried to wash away also the Committee of Council on Education. Their massed protest failed to move the Queen. She refused to disband the Committee, appointed because of her "deep sense of duty". She 'appreciated' their "zeal for the interests of religion and . . . care for the established church," but said:

At the same time I cannot help expressing my regret that you should have thought it necessary to take such a step.²

It may have been her partisan feelings for Melbourne (constantly harassed by the House of Lords) which prompted her rebuke, but she was clearly displeased at the rebuttal of the Whig measure.

So signal was the failure to institute civil training colleges for elementary school teachers that no further attempt was made for over sixty years. 10,000 pounds had been voted by Parliament in 1835 for the foundation of a national normal institution. As it was still impossible, in 1839, to implement this decision, the money was given to the two educational Societies for separate training colleges. Denominational colleges were then increasingly aided by government funds.

¹ Annual Register, 1839, p. 169.

² Ibid., p. 171.

They were also increasingly supervised - through the new order of Government Inspectors. Kay-Shuttleworth, 'The Father of English Education', was determined that if the task of training teachers had to be left to the denominations he would do his best to ensure that it was undertaken with vigour and efficiency.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING COLLEGES THROUGH THE 1840's

Through the decade following the frustration of his "daring attempt to override the religious prejudices of the day in the interests of true education,"¹ Kay-Shuttleworth worked ceaselessly through the various communities to improve the quality and quantity of school personnel. The 'religious difficulty' remained unconquered. Sectarian strife persisted but underwent strange swings and alliances. The Committee of Council, with its lay composition, and its secretary, a Low Churchman, continued to anger the High Church party. The Tractarians were especially relentless in proclaiming that the State should assist the Church but in no way seek to influence, direct or control it.

Government action, on occasion, grossly aggravated dissension. When the Tories regained power in 1841, their blatantly pro-Anglican measures concerning education provoked alarm, distrust, antagonism and outrage in all sections of Nonconformity.

The vagaries of changing Governments, besides affecting public attitudes, altered the composition of the Committee. Kay-Shuttleworth was its constant secretary, and, during the forties, strove to assuage and reconcile opposing forces so that education - and especially the training of teachers - might be put on a firm footing. Repeatedly in his writings comes evidence of his sound belief that good teachers are the

¹R. W. Rich, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century, p. 51.

vital base of whole system; that, therefore, "The Normal School is the most important institution in a system of elementary education".¹ Over a century later we must surely agree with Judges, that, "with his mean little budget allowance, his concentration on teacher-training was good housekeeping".²

Kay-Shuttleworth kept stressing that the necessary teacher-training provision was "one of those projects"

too vast, or too complicated, or too important to be entrusted to voluntary associations; they need the power and application of the resources of the majority.³

"The expense," he said, "of supporting a Normal School in efficiency is a burden too heavy to be borne by purely voluntary contributions."⁴ Government grants could help, but they were very selective, as well as underpinning denominationalism. He felt sure that a 'combined' normal school would often prejudice and concentrate resources, and tried to demonstrate this at his own expense. His hope was that "Battersea" would "plead its own cause with the Government and with the public so as to secure the future prosperity of the establishment";⁵ that it would come "under the direction

¹"The School in its Relation to the State, the Church and the Congregation," 1847 Tract, p. 38.

²Pioneers of English Education, p. 122.

³Tract, 1847 ("The School in its Relation to the State, the Church and the Congregation"), p. 13.

⁴Ibid., p. 39.

⁵Four Periods of Public Education, p. 309.

of the State and in harmony with the Church".¹

Instead, Battersea came under the direction of the Church and in harmony with the State! By 1841, expenses were rising to 1,500 pounds per

annum. Kay-Shuttleworth wrote:

We were unable to pledge our personal resources to this extent and we could not claim the grant of 2,200 pounds offered by the Committee in Council without providing for the permanent support of the establishment by arrangements satisfactory to their Lordships [by attachment to one of the recognized Societies].²

In transferring the college to the National Society, he made certain that it would be under the auspices of a moderate group of Churchmen, who would continue its liberal as well as its religious character.

The religious base of a training college he held to be all important; the sort of religious base which resulted in missionary zeal. This was exemplified to a high degree at Battersea. The founders greatly admired Stow's 'moral training' and Wehrli's dedication to 'joy in the life of labour'. On these examples Battersea was built, making a landmark in English educational history. It was a 'household' where staff and students mingled in a life of continuous hard manual work, intellectual pursuits, exploration of new teaching methods and skills; a place where the atmosphere was, above all, one of highminded but happy dedication, self-denial and crusading fervour.

At the time, Kay-Shuttleworth wrote:

¹Four Periods of Public Education, p. 421.

²Ibid., p. 426.

The main object of a Normal School is the formation of the character of the Schoolmaster. This was the primary idea which guided our earliest efforts in the establishment of the Battersea schools on a basis different from that of any previous example in this country.¹

Forty years later, at a reunion of the college, he said:

We felt we had . . . the solution. We felt that the association of a deep spirit of religious teaching with religious liberty was the first problem that had to be solved. And so it was upon this type - a type that has so far flourished - that the Training Colleges of England were founded.²

He had always emphasized that religious upbringing was essential for good character development, and, at Battersea, his dictum, "Religion is not merely to be taught in the School - it must be the element in which the students live,"³ was truly practised.

Tufnell, speaking with his co-founder at the 1873 College Reunion, reminded his hearers of the 'religious difficulty' of the days of its inception.

"At that time," he said:-

it was thought to be the function of the Church alone to interfere in the education of the country; and it was thought presumption that two laymen like ourselves should found an institution to give education to all the land. . . . Hostility broke out in odd ways.⁴

He spoke of the rivalry within the Church of England which led to the High Church foundation of St. Mark's Training College.

¹ Four Periods of Public Education, p. 399.

² Quoted by Thomas Adkins, The History of St. John's College, Battersea, p. 294.

³ Four Periods of Public Education, p. 406.

⁴ Quoted by Adkins, op. cit., p. 170.

In one way or another, Battersea was a tremendous stimulus to the creation and the improvement of teacher-training institutions.

Kay-Shuttleworth's experiment at Battersea is the most significant event in the history of the development of the English training college, for it was the type to which all subsequently founded training colleges conformed until the advent of the Day Training College. For good or ill it established the residential college as the type.¹

Frank Smith, having mentioned the immediate impetus to Church training colleges all over the country, says: "The stimulus of Battersea led, by 1853, to the establishment of forty training colleges".²

In 1841, Kay-Shuttleworth, realizing its precarious position, made an urgent appeal to the new Prime Minister, Peel, saying:-

It has become the type on which other normal schools have been founded, and thus raised the standard of education for elementary teachers.³

Although the conditional Government offer which eventually materialized forced Battersea to follow the denominational pattern, yet within that pattern the college proved a valuable spur to voluntary provision. Before the end of 1839, the Bishop of Norwich consulted Kay-Shuttleworth; Norwich Training College started the following year. Chester and St. Mark's Training Colleges were close behind. The January 16th, 1844 Minutes of Committee in Council showed that Government grants had been voted to these and the 'Training Schools' of York, Ripon and Durham, as also to the British

¹R. W. Rich, op. cit., p. 75.

²The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, p. 243.

³Ibid., p. 116.

and Foreign Schools Society normal school. The Minutes of 1845¹ tell of over twenty Church training colleges, all very varied as to duration of courses and standards reached.²

The Inspectors' Reports on these colleges make interesting reading. A diluted inspection clause had been salvaged from the 1839 debacle; no grants to be given to schools or training colleges without inspection and reported adequacy. This finally eliminated the monitorial system. Reports on the Battersea training, which was the antithesis of the monitorial mechanism, were lavish in praise.

As grants to education increased, schools sprouted needing to be staffed. After 1839, the base of public aid widened somewhat but the Anglican National Society remained the main beneficiary. Gillian Sutherland goes so far as to say that "between 1839 and 1850 the National Society received eighty per cent of all government grants to education".³

In 1839 the Committee in Council had restated the policy, which had been so advantageous to the Church, to bring more help to "very poor and populous districts where subscriptions to a sufficient amount cannot be obtained".⁴ These were areas in which non-Anglican sects were especially

¹Vol. 1, pp. 333-334; N. B. Appendix D.

²Appendix E gives, as an example, comparisons between subjects studied and time allotted to each in four training colleges.

³Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century, p. 16.

⁴Minutes of Committee in Council, 1839-40, Vol. 1, p. vii.

active. The Established Church forced a reversion to the previous policy of apportioning grants according to the amount of voluntary contributions. This, in effect, favoured the National Society once again and assisted the formation of their training colleges as well as Anglican schools.

It is, indeed, not surprising that the great spate of training colleges of the forties were largely Anglican. Other denominations were struggling with the problem of upgrading their teachers, relying entirely on sacrificial private efforts.

The 'British and Foreign' Society suffered a sort of 'identity crisis' about 1840; questioning whether it should be a state-aided or completely voluntary body. It received Government aid since 1833 but many of its supporters had now come to believe that the voluntary principle should be carried to the extent of refusing the allotted money - especially as acceptance of grants entailed inspection. The Society was conscious of its comparatively low academic standards and the growing condemnation of the monitorial methods to which it still clung. In 1843 the decision to take a grant for its training school enabled the Society to build new premises and extend the courses, but alienated a voluble section of Nonconformity - the precipient 'Voluntaryist' movement. The break-away Voluntaryists then began to formulate separate teacher training plans.

Most Dissenters, especially noticeable being the large body of Methodists and the rapidly growing Catholic population, continued to suffer the social injustice of no state aid, until 1847. At that date the Catholic Poor School Committee was officially instituted to administer the hoped-for Privy

Council grants. It took over the educational work of the Catholic Institute, which had been campaigning for nearly ten years for better opportunities for Catholics. "Its work was to concentrate immediately on two key-problems: primary schools and the training of teachers".¹ The Wesleyan Education Committee had already been active in these fields, sending trainee teachers to Stow's Academy since 1838.

In the mid-forties Kay-Shuttleworth listed: 'the Anglican colleges; the Wesleyan youths sent to Stow; a Dissenting Training School for Mistresses at Rotherhithe and one for Welsh teachers at Brecon;' as proof of exertions to fill the need. He added that the difficulties "appeared to be insurmountable by private benevolence. The Normal Schools which had been established were struggling with great pecuniary embarrassment,"² especially those not connected with the Church of England. There was also, for all denominations, the tremendous stumbling-block of insufficiently educated candidates. To attack these problems came Kay-Shuttleworth's famous Minutes of 1846.

The election of that year returned the Whigs to power; with Lord John Russell as Prime Minister. Kay-Shuttleworth was then able to launch his long-fomenting plans for a 'Pupil-teacher' scheme. This scheme (and the concomitant provisions of the 1846 Minutes) was 'intended to provide remedies for the evils' arising out of, and contributing to, the poor quality

¹A. F. C. Beales, "The Struggle for the Schools", The English Catholics 1850-1950, G. A. Beck, (ed.), p. 367.

Some Catholic teachers were being trained in Ireland for English schools and sporadic training efforts were being made within the Communities of Teaching Orders now beginning to settle in England.

²"The School in its Relations to the State.", p. 53.

of teachers and the inadequacy of training. Kay-Shuttleworth felt that, despite poor schools and staff, there existed young people who, "by self-education and natural sagacity" were promising material for teachers of the future: that, if status and remuneration could be improved, "the profession will probably attract men of character and acquirements".¹

In his explanation of his proposals, he stated:

The arrangements for rearing a body of skilful and highly instructed masters are to commence in the school itself, by selection of the most deserving of the scholars who are to be apprenticed from the age of thirteen to that of eighteen.²

This paid five-year apprentice-ship as a Pupil-teacher was to culminate, after successful examinations, in the chance to win a 'Queen's Scholarship' for continued training in a college. The measures also stipulated:- that only schools with favourable inspection reports would be used for training; that the master must give 1-1/2 hours daily specifically to the task and would be rewarded for so doing; that better pay would be forthcoming for trained teachers; and that retirement pensions would be authorized.

The Minutes brought new incentives and new possibilities for social mobility. By upgrading the status of the teacher and by enabling many previously debarred scholars to avail themselves of opening opportunities, they augmented the quantity and the quality of recruits to the profession. Kay-Shuttleworth reiterated his maxim, "the Normal School is the most important institution in a system of elementary education," and expressed

¹"The School in its Relation to the State.", p. 37.

²Four Periods of Public Education, p. 481.

his confidence that his Pulip-teacher plan would "feed those Normal Schools with candidates having much higher attainments and greater skill and energy".¹

The Minutes stimulated training college expansion: it was obvious that college places would be needed for the Queen's Scholars, from 1850 onwards: the Government promised financial inducements to meet this need; training colleges could plan with more sense of stability. The Minutes were also a spur to college efficiency: a student received, and paid to his college, half of his fees at the commencement of training; only if his course was satisfactorily completed was the college fully reimbursed.

Inevitably there was opposition to such comprehensive and innovative reforms, and inevitably much of this came from Churches deeply involved in education. Antagonism to the measures of 1846, however, was much less intense and vehement, on the whole, than in 1839. It delayed but did not annihilate the Minutes.

Twenty years later Kay-Shuttleworth looked back on the struggles of 1839-1846. He recalled the disappointing defeat of the National Normal School project, and continued:-

Thus checked, the Government acted on the principle of stimulating and aiding the efforts of voluntary associations, but up to 1846 they had made no grants to promote the efficiency of instruction. The obstacles to this efficiency were - the want of competent teachers, and of any sufficient means for their training - the absence of any staff of skilled assistants - and of suitable books and apparatus. The Committee of Council therefore submitted to Parliament their Minutes of 1846.

¹Ibid., pp. 487-493.

. . . The outlay of upwards of twenty millions drew every religious communion, except the Congregational Dissenters and bodies allied with them, into co-operation with the Government. It created a vast denominational system, which firmly established popular education on a religious basis.¹

In fact, the denominational system had been gradually growing from much earlier beginnings. The 1846 Minutes organized, augmented and cemented it. What they created, above all, was the partnership between Government and numerous religious and other voluntary bodies in provision of elementary education, with training colleges as apex of an acknowledged denominational system. It can be said that "the ecclesiastical foundation of our elementary education explains our sectarian training colleges".²

The next few years saw the steady implementation of the 1846 Minutes and the continual effort to improve the profession. Kay-Shuttleworth, his health impaired, retired in 1849, but not before he had inaugurated certification of teachers.

Certification was a further prod to the training colleges, for they were grant-aided in accordance with their numbers of successfully certified students. Some of the smaller colleges were slow to reach the required standards.³ In 1849, for example, twelve of the diocesan training colleges

¹ Memorandum on Popular Education, p. 7.

² Miss E. P. Hughes, "The Training of Teachers", Education in the Nineteenth Century, p. 185.

³ The diocesan training college at Caernarvan, about which Roberts wrote, had achieved no certificates when he was there (circa 1850). "We were a miscellaneous lot," he said, "only two or three were tolerably well educated, could write grammatical English".

(The Life and Opinions of Robert Roberts, p. 256.)

ained no certificates, and it was 1851 before the Borough Road Normal School (under the guidance of the British and Foreign Schools Society) obtained any certificate.

In 1848 the Quakers, having long operated apprenticeship schemes of their own, opened a training college for men. It was made possible by a bequest of 40,000 pounds from Benjamin Flounders and became known as The Flounders Institute.

By this time, too, the Catholics, the Congregationalists and the Methodists were maturing their training college schemes; schemes which reached fruition as the new decade began. By 1852 the training college inspectors could report substantial progress,¹ on all fronts.

¹Battles over the right of inspection had resulted in Church of England colleges being judged by an Anglican clergyman. Any developing grant-aided Nonconformist colleges were to be judged - as the 'British and Foreign' normal school was - by a layman. The early inspectors were men of eminence. Matthew Arnold began his inspectorate of Nonconformist schools and colleges in 1851: The Rev. H. Moseley was the Inspector for 'Church' establishments during the period under our consideration.

Appendix F gives some details of the summary of Mr. Moseley's report for the year 1852.

CHAPTER V

THE MAIN STRANDS OF RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTY THROUGH THE 1840's

In trying to study the 'religious difficulty' of this period, one is struck by the swings of attitude and the strange alliances; the incredible complexity of denominational feeling and effort among sections of Protestantism, which affected the development of English educational provision. "The Catholics alone presented throughout a completely united front," said A. C. F. Beales: "on the schools' question they spoke as one."¹ He commented on the divisions within the Church of England and within Protestant Nonconformity, and asserted that the shoals which wrecked the pre-1850 Education Bills were the "variety of denominations each at war with the others, and all at war against the entrenched position of the Anglican Establishment".

This is in large measure true. Yet, in 1839, the Government might have succeeded in founding a civil training college, as they proposed, if the Wesleyan faction had maintained its anti-Establishment position. It was the joining of Wesleyan to united Anglican forces which thwarted Key-Settleworth and the Committee. At that critical time, Wesleyan anti-Catholicism rather than anti-Establishment fervour was uppermost. They had suspended their rancour against the entrenched position of Anglicanism - if only temporarily - in their anxiety to strengthen the Church stand against the mooted National Normal School.

¹"The Struggle for the Schools", The English Catholics 1850-1950, p. 369.

If Wesleyan weight had been swung against Anglican entrenchment instead of against the Government measure, might the normal school proposal have been implemented? There can now be speculation only on this point. It is certainly true that the Whig Administration would then have been in a somewhat stronger state to effect the loosening of the Anglican entrenchment, and to withstand Church demands. The institution of civil training colleges, in addition to supported denominational teacher training, might then have been achieved in 1839 or soon afterwards. The denominational basis would not, however, have been radically shaken. The *Zeitgeist* assured that. Nor was it the intention of the reformers to lessen the vast voluntary contribution to education; only to make good its deficiencies; to establish a pattern of co-operation which guaranteed rights of conscience and fuller equity; and which included public provision where necessary. This they just might have launched but for the Wesleyans. In 1846 the pattern of co-operation and fuller equity was accomplished: not until 1902 were civil training colleges for elementary teachers included in legislation.

Beales is right in noting the multitudinous Protestant groupings and the Catholic unity. The Catholics, however, were at that time among the comparatively impotent minority bodies. Their voices joined with most of Dissent in 1839 but combined support of the Government was insufficient to counteract the formidable power of the Established Church, fortified on the normal school issue - by Wesleyan Methodism. Methodism had not objected to the formation of the Privy Council Committee, only to the National Normal School specifications.

The shifting sands of the religious difficulty, through the forties, affected the creation of training colleges. We must, therefore, concern ourselves to some extent with the main attitudes and antagonisms, remembering the very wide diversity occurring in many Protestant sects and the dangers of misrepresentation in any generalization.

The 1840's began with most Nonconformist opinion reasonably favourable to the idea of a national system of teacher training, if not to the actual clauses presented the previous year. Even the Wesleyans were not opposed to the intention, so long as it reinforced Protestantism and respected rights of conscience within Protestantism. Congregationalists, who later vigorously repudiated State aid as well as State interference, had supported the 1839 Minute. The 'shoal' at that time had been an unusually unified Church of England allied to zealous Wesleyanism. That alliance had seemed so harmonious that, for a short time, some prominent Anglicans talked of the Wesleyans rejoining the Church.

The Church had shown her strength. It was not surprising, therefore, that the incoming Tory Government should envisage Anglican appeasement as a sine qua non for successful educational reform: it was largely composed of entrenched Anglicans in any case. Graham, hatching his beneficial schemes for factory children, ensured that the intended educational stipulations met with Church approval. After protracted negotiations, he even submitted the drafted Bill to leading Churchmen before the Cabinet. This, and the results, enraged all of Nonconformity. Graham had conceded to Church demands that headmasters should be Anglican and that power over

appointment of teachers should rest in the Bishops' hands.

Dissent saw itself victimized; impeded in its work; taxed increasingly to shore up the Church's advantageous position. Graham underestimated Dissent's reaction and rejection. He thought that the British and Foreign Society would concur, albeit reluctantly, because it encompassed a number of Anglicans among its members. He was amazed at the strength of the Society's opposition. He exhorted Kay-Shuttleworth to:

let no prudent means be omitted to prevent a rupture with the British and Foreign Society, whose perverseness at this juncture may defeat the best chance for the diffusion of education which has presented itself in our time. ¹

The British and Foreign Society loudly proclaimed that no Dissenting teacher would have any hope of employment.

Nonconformist disquiet was natural. The Bill, though intended to affect factory schools only, was believed to presage much wider developments, and it was indubitably pro-Anglican. We note, for instance, Graham's assurances to Gladstone:

By the education clauses as they now stand, the Church has ample security that every master of the new schools will be a Churchman, ²

and all teaching would be according to the Anglican creed.

The temper of all Nonconformity, including the normally pacific group of Quakers, was roused. No concessions or modifications were acceptable. The education clauses were obliterated.

¹Quoted by Olive Brose, Church and Parliament, p. 196.

²Quoted by Raymond Cowherd, The Politics of English Dissent, p. 126.

Wesleyans, that time, aligned themselves with the other non-Anglican subjects; effecting "the alliance of the Wesleyan Methodists with orthodox Dissent which was the death-blow to Graham's hopes".¹ The Wesleyan-Anglican entente of 1839 had soon shown signs of strain. Old grudges revived and festered, but the factor most instrumental in eroding concurrence was a new fear, prompted by Tractarianism, that the Church of England was ceasing to be a bastion against Catholicism. Suspicion of the 'Anglo-Catholic' Oxford Movement coloured Wesleyan outlook on the entire Established Church.

By the time Graham's Bill was finally publicized, the transient Anglican solidarity had dissolved. Moderation of opinion was noticeably on the increase among many formerly-rigid Churchmen but more flagrant High Church extremism was also evident. This aggravated denominational tensions and mitigated the Factory Bill's chance of success. Some Members of Parliament realized this. Lord John Russell wrote to Kay-Shuttleworth:

With the encroaching spirit of the Oxford Catholics, as they call themselves, I cannot expect a Bill to place education in the hands of the Church will be acquiesced in.²

Tractarian activities propelled the Wesleyans into joining the campaign against a Bill which "placed the people wholly at the mercy of the Church".³ Graham came to realize this. He wrote to Peel in April:-

¹ Norman Cash, Reaction and Reconstruction, p. 97.

² Ibid.

³ Hansard, LVIII, 1417.

It is clear that the Pusey tendencies of the Established Church have operated powerfully on the Wesleyans, and are converting them rapidly into enemies.¹

The formal protest he had received from them', he continued, "is more hostile than I anticipated, and marks distinctly a wide estrangement from the Church". Ashley lit on the core trouble.

The Wesleyan Methodists, hitherto friendly to the Church, as they showed in 1839, are actuated by a deep and conscientious fear of Popery in the Church of England.²

Official Wesleyan sources supply some confirmation of this contention.

The annual Conference reported:-

It has been publicly stated, that one ground of our strenuous opposition to the lately-projected measure of public education was, its obvious tendency to give to the Clergy of the Established Church, an unfair and undue control over the religious teaching in the schools which it would have established. We think it right to confirm this statement, not out of any hostile feeling towards the Established Church as such, for this has never been the feeling of our Body, but with a view to bear our distinct and solemn testimony against those grievous errors which are now tolerated within her pale. We have been hitherto accustomed to regard her as one of the main bulwarks of the Protestant faith; but her title to be so regarded has of late been grievously shaken.³

Practices, "which can only be distinguished from Popery by an acute and practised observer, and which in their necessary consequences lead directly to Popery, have been revived" and "have spread with fearful rapidity,"

¹Quoted by N. Gash, op. cit., p. 97.

²Ibid.

³Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference, 1843, p. 557.

ried the alarmed leaders of Wesleyan Methodism.

Even before Graham's Factory Bill was presented, Parliament was deluged with petitions opposing the mooted educational measures. Of the 25,505 petitions with 3,988,633 signatures, 8,945 petitions with 910,080 signatures were from Wesleyans alone.¹

The Bill lost wholehearted Anglican support because of Tractarianism. Peel commented: "Puseyism has alienated the Wesleyans, and redoubled the hostile activity against the Church, of other Dissenters, and made many sober and attached friends of the Church lukewarm in its defence."² In vain Graham appealed to 'men of all parties and all creeds to rise above their political and religious prejudices and unite on neutral ground to build up a scheme of national education. Dissenters of all factions vigourously refused; proving their power of opposition. Peel's verdict was, "It is a sorry and lamentable triumph that Dissent has achieved". Ashley responded:-

Let this last trial be taken as sufficient proof that united education is an impossibility. It ought never again be attempted. The Dissenters and the Church have each laid down their limits which they will not pass; and there is no power that can either force, persuade, or delude them.³

No wonder Graham considered that, in England, 'religion, the keystone of education, was the bar to its progress'.

¹ Ibid.

² Croker Papers, iii, p. 10; cited by Gash, op. cit., p. 97.

³ Letters cited by C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, vol. 2, p. 250.

Tory attempts towards establishing a national system under Church dominance had failed as had Whig attempts to inaugurate national teacher training with broad rights of conscience protected.

Growing secularist agitation added to the difficulties of an already tortuous situation. In a letter to the British Magazine, October 1843, Ashley wrote: "No government can devise measures for general education," which would please both the sects and the "tax-paying infidels".

In victory Dissent became more divided, more factionalized, and, in some of the sections, more militant. Militancy had already been provoked by the imprisonment of Dissenters for non-payment of Church rates. This affected especially such individualists and anti-establishmentarians as the Congregationalists. Edward Baines, one of their leaders, had been imprisoned in 1840. Protest was then led by a Congregational minister, Edward Miall, who resigned his pastorate to take up religious and political journalism. He founded a weekly newspaper, The Nonconformist, and the Anti-State-Church Association. One of the historians of Congregationalism tells us that "Miall came to believe that he was called to dedicate himself to the task of freeing Christianity from State control".¹

Miall did not carry all Congregationalists with him in his extremism. The Congregational Union was less radical: it publicly affirmed in 1841 that it was a religious, not a political, body. Graham's Bill, however, impelled many Congregationalists towards a more extremist viewpoint;

¹R. Tudor Jones, Congregationalism in England 1662-1962, p. 215.

particularly towards 'Voluntaryism'. At a meeting of the Congregational Union, in October 1843, the younger Edward Baines opened a new campaign.

I am compelled to declare my opinion that it is not the province of a government to educate the people; and that the admission of the principle that it is its province would lead to practical consequences fatal to civil and religious liberty.¹

For the next few years Baines was in the forefront of the Voluntaryist movement, and his newspaper, The Leeds Mercury, provided the Voluntaryists with a valuable mouthpiece.

Voluntaryists repudiated the Whigs and attempted to elect Radicals and Liberals to Parliament. The movement was an essential part of the new liberalism, with its faith in laissez faire doctrines, increased democracy and religious liberty. Congregationalism provided its leaders and main thrust but many other Evangelical reformers and some Benthamite Radicals came intermittently within its orbit, making a vociferous group during the rest of the period under our consideration.

Though only the Voluntaryists carried their principles to the extent of refusing all State aid to education, voluntary effort was stimulated throughout England. One notable aftermath of Graham's Bill was the Nonconformist disillusionment on the prospect of a national education system. Nonconformity felt forced to conclude that any future State provision would inevitably be biased in favour of Anglicanism. Voluntary bodies, whether Catholic Protestant or secular, were spurred into sacrificial giving to extend, each, its own brand of education. The Congregational Education Committee was

¹The Congregational Magazine, 1843, Vol. VII, p. 836.

formed in 1843, becoming the Congregational Board of Education the following year. This body and the Methodist Education Committee each raised 70,000 pounds to spread schools and to begin, each, a teacher training college - although the Methodists had made a colossal effort for their Centenary Fund during the previous few years. Both bodies laid strong emphasis on teacher training.

The Wesleyan Methodists had been well pleased with Stow's training of their students but now wanted their own distinctive institution - which would be based on Stow's methods. They began to mature concrete plans instead of the vague wishful thinking of the preceding decade. The Congregationalists had to make immediate and definite provisions for teacher training. They had dramatically severed allegiance from the British and Foreign Schools Society when it accepted State aid, withdrawing Congregational trainees from the Borough Road normal school as well as all financial support from the Society. The final break was made in 1845 and was the prelude to renewed intense Voluntaryist activism.

Into the maelstrom Kay-Shuttleworth interjected his 1846 Minutes for the betterment of the profession. Later he wrote:-

Though the proposals of the Government could scarcely have been more moderate, the whole question of the authority of the State and of the Church, of civil rights and religious immunities, and of combined and separate education, necessarily became subjects of controversy.¹

He excoriated perverse sectarianism, and wrote:-

When freedom of education from interference of the Government becomes the war-cry of any party, will

¹Four Periods of Public Education, p. 448.

it not be suspected that they seek the interest of a class rather than the welfare of the nation; that they prefer popular ignorance to party insignificance; the liberty to neglect the condition of the people, rather than the liberty of progressive civilization? ¹

A similar note was struck by A. R. Craig, writing about the same time but writing more specifically on teacher training. He deplored the fact that it had "been dragged into the arena of political and polemical strife". ² He wrote about "the Principles and Art of a Normal Education" - meaning teacher training - and said that the discussion of the subject, "by parties of different religious views,

has tended hitherto rather to mix it up with the sectarianism of peculiar denominations, than to define its own principles and prerogatives; and though so well calculated to promote the best civil interests of the whole community, it has more frequently been dragged into an instrument for serving the mere purpose of a faction. ³

Kay-Shuttleworth's tact and patience with importunate and awkward members of those 'peculiar' denominations - as evidenced in the volumes of the Minutes of the Committee in Council - was rewarded by the general acceptance of his 1846 measures. To steer such a comprehensive reform safely through the prevalent sectarian strife has been hailed as a triumph. It undoubtedly was. Yet, the very multitudes of conflicting groups, the shifting nature of the cross-alliances, might have made the task a little easier than to have been faced by more united and solid power-blocks, as

¹"The School in its Relation to the State.", p. 16.

²The Philosophy of Training, p. 1.

³Ibid.

in 1839. Certainly, the mammoth 1839 power-block of the Established Church in unison plus the Wesleyan corps, had disintegrated. The Established Church, moreover, had noticeably softened its opposition to civil intrusion into the field of education: for this feat much of the credit is due to Kay-Shuttleworth's work and behaviour during his years in office. By 1846, many more Churchmen were willing to accede to such 'interference'. They might still be much less enthusiastic about the idea than the formidable Dr. W. F. Hook¹ but the majority realized that increasing State aid was imperative for adequate educational provision and they were willing to submit to the concomitant increase in directives.

The extreme High Church element persisted in its objection to any lessening of clerical control, but in the Church as a whole moderate opinion had become predominant. Parliamentary speeches of leading Churchmen, in 1846, showed a marked contrast to those of 1839. Even the Bishops in the House of Lords - especially in the early months of 1847 - were most conciliatory. Far from opposing the extension of Government intrusion into the Church's affair of education, they proclaimed it to be the Government's duty to educate the people! They termed the proposed measures 'wise and prudent'. The Archbishop of Canterbury recorded the general approval of the 'Bench of Bishops', and thanked the Government for the care taken and the propositions put forward.² The Bishop of St. Asaph

¹Dr. Hook was currently urging the necessity of complete State responsibility for education.

²Hansard, 1847, Vol. LXXXIX, 882.

made "one small objection" to "the plan which met everybody's approbation"; that being, the possibilities for social mobility it offered; the raising of masters and mistresses "from the lowest orders of Society".¹

In the House of Commons, Lord Macauley was declaring how low in ability most existing teachers then were: "many of these men are now the refuse of other callings - discarded servants or ruined tradesmen". He believed that the state of popular education ought to induce shame; that in future years, when a national system had been achieved, people:

will look back with astonishment to the opposition which the introduction of the system encountered. . . with even more astonishment that such resistance was offered in the name of civil and religious freedom.²

For resistance there was: resistance from Dissent, still suspicious of increased Church influence as a probable accompaniment of increased bureaucratic control. Macauley found it hard to understand why the plans should be thought biased. "The advantage of the scheme is intended for all in common," he said: "the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Wesleyans and the Church of Scotland," as well as the Church of England, could benefit.³ (He did not mention Catholics.)

Russell maintained that there was no reason to expect objection from Dissenters, remembering that in 1839:

Dissenters of the various denominations, the Dissenting Ministers of London and of various bodies of Dissenters

¹ Hansard, 1847, Vol. LXXXIX, 881.

² Ibid., Vol. XCI, 1016, 1024-1026.

³ Ibid., 1024.

through the country, applauded the Government of 1839 for allowing the subject of education to be entrusted to the Committee in Council, and supported the government of the day in that proposition.¹

Russell failed to realize that the hostility and suspicion aroused by Graham's Bill and further inflamed by Peel's increased grant to the Catholic college of Maynooth, in Ireland, was becoming attached to any government action, even by Whigs in whom their faith was steadily lessening.

All this had added fuel to the Voluntaryist fire. The escalating attitude of extreme voluntaryism is illustrated by an example concerning the unusually pacific, non-political, association of 'Dissenting Deputies'. In 1839, at one of their meetings, a resolution that 'the education of the lower classes was not a legitimate function of the government' had failed to find a seconder: in 1846, the same body publicly affirmed that State intervention in education was "uncalled for, inexpedient, necessarily unjust in its operation, and dangerous to public liberty".² The Congregational Union, too had manifested a rapid slide into Voluntaryism. In 1839 it had supported the Committee of Council and its proposals: in 1843 its members had voted 307 to one against Graham's Bill: by 1847 leading members, if not the entire Union, were waging a war of letters, speeches and pamphlets, inciting Dissent to militant repudiation of the Government measures.

The Minutes of the Privy Council, first introduced in the Autumn of 1846, entailed much discussion and negotiation through the early months of

¹Hansard, 1847, Vol. XCI, 959.

²N. Gash, op. cit., p. 103.

1847. At that time the majority of Anglican training colleges, through the National Society, were co-operating or wished to co-operate with the Government. The British and Foreign Society, after initial protest, had brought their Borough Road training college into line. The Congregationalists adamantly rejected all State assistance or direction for their normal schools as for all their educational efforts. The Wesleyans had voiced strong opposition to the Minutes and gave indications of joining the Voluntaryist flood. There were some signs, however, of Wesleyan indecision. There was certainly much less vehemence in The Watchman. Letters deplored the Voluntaryists' stirring up of strife.¹

Frank Smith writes:-

The Wesleyans, who had recently drawn up a systematic plan for building schools and a training college, showed opposition, and had to be placated by the promise of an inspector for their own schools.²

There was much more to it than that. The Wesleyans were 'much exercised in their minds'. They believed in the voluntary principle; they had been strenuously practising it. They agreed with Baines that 'if the public purse opens, the private purse will shut - with all that would entail in loss of interest and zeal. They were proud of their schools - over 300 day schools for the poor, entirely financed by voluntary contribution - and their Glasgow-trained teachers. They had bought a site to start their own training college. Much had been done but they were conscious of how much

¹For example, one entitled, "Mr. Baines and the Methodists", from "An old Wesleyan", vol. XIII, p. 334.

²A History of English Elementary Education, p. 205.

more could be done if they accepted Government grants. Dr. J. H. Rigg - later the principal of their training college for thirty-five years - said:-

The question which Methodism had to determine in 1846-47, was whether, or upon what terms, the Wesleyan Methodist Church would be prepared also to accept pecuniary help and general guidance of the State in the establishment and organization of its Training Colleges and Church schools. ¹

Mary Sturt makes this comment:-

The Wesleyans proved that they were sincere in objecting to state aid by refusing it; but their attempts to deprive others of it were, so The Times felt, inspired by a most sectarian jealousy. ²

Undoubtedly their more worthy considerations were infiltrated by sectarian jealousies, prompted often by fear. Notable men were turning to Rome - Newman's conversion was in 1845 - or abandoning religion. All who believed emphatically that education must be grounded in religious doctrines that were not 'erroneous', must strive to extend their teaching. Undoubtedly some of the Wesleyan fervour and alarm was stirred by anti-Catholic feeling, still widespread in many Protestant sects, and undoubtedly this feeling coloured their reaction to the Minutes. Following the State grant to Maynooth in 1845, the Methodist Conference stated:

The Conference deems it an imperative duty . . . to declare it to be their fixed resolution, by all constitutional and Christian means, to oppose the further endowment of the Romish Church in any part of the United Kingdom. ³

¹ Dr. Rigg's Reminiscences, p. 103.

² The Education of the People, p. 185.

³ Minutes of the Methodist Conference, vol. X, p. 240.

If the hand of Government stretched to Protestant Dissenters with any endowment, would it not stretch a little further and reach the Catholics?

Early in 1847, the Wesleyans made their crucial decision. Official reports tell none of the background story, but Dr. Rigg, then a young supply preacher, years later told how he was admitted as a silent listener to the critical meeting, and what transpired. It appears that Kay-Shuttleworth had informed Lord Ashley of the intended meeting and Ashley decided to pay an unexpected call upon the conferring Wesleyan leaders. The meeting marked a turning-point in Wesleyan educational history; Rigg called it "the spring-head" of future Wesleyan-State relations. Its effect on Westminster Training College, at least, entitles the inclusion of Rigg's story here.

The meeting had been called by the Secretary of the Education Committee, John Scott. Some of the best-known Methodists of the day spoke persuasively and "all seemed set to reject the Government proposals". Then Lord Ashley came -

as a voluntary and unofficial philanthropist, to find out what might best and most fittingly be done in the way of securing the co-operation of the Wesleyan Methodists in the painfully necessary work of National Education, and in interpreting to the Government the ideas and requirements of the Wesleyan leaders.

Mr. Scott and Lord Ashley conversed in private for a considerable time.

When Ashley left, Scott "was guarded on return; stressing secrecy; also the nation's educational needs . . . After Mr. Scott had spoken the business of framing a resolution was taken up". Fears were expressed lest Roman Catholics would also be:

taken into partnership, as to which Mr. Scott informed the meeting that he had mentioned that difficulty to Lord Ashley,

who assured him that no grant would be made to any school where the Holy Scriptures were not regularly read, which would be likely to exclude the Romanists . . . The practical result of that committee was that Mr. Scott and a few other ministers were entrusted with the difficult work of drawing up a resolution which should give a guarded and conditional consent to co-operate with the Government.¹

The annual Methodist Conference then unanimously passed the resolution "not to offer any further Connexional opposition to the scheme embodied in the Minute of Council."² At the Conference,

Dr. Beaumont intimated that after the bargain made with the Government to save their own consciences and feelings, they could not object to a similar bargain being made by another community (the Roman Catholics) whose consciences and feelings were entitled to equal consideration. Cries of "No, no". He said, "Yes, yes; they must do to others as they would that others should do to them."³

Dr. Beaumont was seemingly much in the minority. There were other Wesleyans who felt as he did but the majority voice opposed grants to Catholics. The remarks of some Wesleyan advocates of equity, by incidentally attesting to some bigotry of thought or action, suggest that current condemnation was warranted. One letter writer to The Watchman, for instance, "deeply regretted" that his sect had "endeavoured to exclude the Roman Catholics as citizens from the blessings of a secular education, by enforcing the daily perusal of the Protestant version of the Holy Scriptures".⁴

¹Dr. Rigg's Reminiscences, pp. 103-115.

²Reported in The Watchman, 1847, vol. XIII, p. 356.

³Ibid.

⁴April 21st, 1847.

In the House of Commons on April 19th a speaker said it had been:

rumoured that the Government had made official but private overtures to the Wesleyan leaders in London, who obtained from the Government the following concessions:- 1. Government exhibitions to be made only to schools which used the authorized version of the Scriptures; 2. The Wesleyans to be permitted to use their own catechism in their schools; 3. The Inspectors of Wesleyan schools to be Wesleyan.¹

Lord John Russell replied that 'there had been nothing official as far as he knew; that Lord Ashley had answered some questions to be helpful'. The matter was dropped. In fact, following the afore-mentioned meeting between Ashley and the Wesleyan leaders, protracted and (to Kay-Shuttleworth) tiresome negotiations continued throughout 1847.

That the third concession was a myth is shown by the long-term inspectorate of the Anglican Matthew Arnold. The Wesleyans did gain the right of having an agreed lay inspector instead of the intended Anglican clergyman.

If the Wesleyans thought they had successfully blocked Catholic access to Government grants, they were wrong. The subject was brought up in the House of Commons on April 26th. Although some die-hards vigorously protested against Catholic inclusion in State benefits, majority opinion favoured tolerance and equity. Sir R. H. Inglis, still fervently anti-Catholic, asserted that "the great mass of the people were at this moment distinctly hostile to any further concessions to the Roman Catholics".² He was checked by Sir W. Molesworth's successful plea to include Catholics

¹Hansard, 1847, Vol. XC1, 949.

²Ibid., 1383.

in the new scheme. Before calling for this inclusion to make the measure really fair, he commented:-

I considered that on the whole the measure is a fair one; that it showed no preference for any sect; that if the Church of England, or any other sect should obtain a larger proportionate share of public money, it would be in consequence of their voluntary exertions, and their greater zeal in the cause of the education of the people.¹

Molesworth's comment was propitious but not entirely apt. The Church of England's material heritage continued to maintain a position more privileged than zeal alone could win. A great step towards equity had, however, been made. Before 1847 came to an end the Catholic Poor School Committee was officially recognized as a religious association for receipt of Government grants. As Kay-Shuttleworth wrote, all bodies except the Congregationalist-Voluntaryist group were drawn into partnership with the State by the beginning of the 1850's. The new partnership enabled Catholics and Wesleyans to bring their training college plans to fruition. Throughout the forties there had been a boom in Anglican colleges: now there was a chance for 'outsiders'. The Wesleyan Methodists were the first to take advantage of it.

The development of the many Anglican colleges which sprang up in the forties has been well documented but the attitudes and events leading to the foundation of the Nonconformist colleges has not. They make an integral part of the story of 'Religion and the Rise of English Teacher

¹Hansard, Vol. XCI, 1370.

N. B. A third to a half of all expenses had to be borne by the voluntary bodies receiving grant-aid.

'Training Colleges', without which there remain lacunae. Westminster College shows how a Protestant Nonconformist training college could develop within the denominational-state partnership: Homerton College disrupted in fierce independence. On this point there were decided differences between two bodies with many similarities in principles and practices, especially the sound belief that religion was the vital factor which should permeate training, and adherence to religious convictions that were closely akin.

CHAPTER VI

THE WESLEYANS AND WESTMINSTER TRAINING COLLEGE

Throughout the period under our consideration the Wesleyan Methodists were deeply concerned about teacher training; for the large number of schools which they had managed to found. The period opened with their first students sent to Glasgow and closed with their 'Connexional' training college in operation. The partnership of Government and denominational bodies helped the Wesleyans to realize their dream of founding their own college, Westminster; so-called because set in the heart of the great city. It is not to be confused with the National Society's Central School which is sometimes found listed as 'Westminster Training Institution' or as 'Westminster'.¹

In 1839 the year-old Wesleyan Education Committee decided that:-

at least three young men should be immediately sought out by advertisement, and otherwise, to be educated either at the Glasgow or Borough Road School; who, when prepared, shall be employed in instructing other masters, or travelling about the schools already in existence, in order to perfect them in systematic modes of teaching.²

They later agreed to send four students for training but, of the first thirteen applicants, none was considered suitable. Although Wesleyans had been in the forefront of secondary school provision early in the nineteenth century, these schools were mainly to educate future ministers, so,

¹N. B. The 'Westminsters' listed in the 1845 Minutes of the Committee of Council, (Appendix D) are branches of the 'Central School'. N. B., also, Appendix H.

²Wesleyan Education Reports, 1839, p. 23.

in common with all denominations, the Wesleyans suffered a dearth of potential teachers of any satisfactory educational standard.

As a sect, they had carried on John Wesley's keen interest in education; likewise maintaining it to be a religious matter.

The request to the 1837 Wesleyan Conference stated:

Mr. Wesley gave as his opinion, that the great design of God in raising up the Methodists was, by their instrumentality, to spread Scriptural holiness throughout the land: which means, we suppose, that they were to put forth an influence, partly direct and partly indirect, the effect of which should be to make the people of this country generally and truly religious. If this be indeed our calling, we cannot begin to deal with that portion of the public mind to which we have access at too early a period of life.¹

This urge to influence the young had led to the network of Sunday Schools. A Methodist woman, Hannah Ball, had pre-dated Raikes by opening a Sunday School at High Wycombe in 1769.² Many of the Sunday Schools developed into organized Methodist Day Schools.

By 1839, many Wesleyan Methodists - prodded by Richard Treffry, William Atherton and Samuel Jackson - realized that the standard of teachers left a great deal to be desired. They determined to tackle the problem, beginning in a modest way, and sought students for training in Glasgow. Three years later, the Education Committee reported that 'however much they might wish for more adequate funds for buildings they were sensible of the need to economise' realizing that:-

¹ Wesleyan Education Reports, 1837. p. 5.

² Methodist Magazine, Vol. LXIX, p. 561.

the most commodious buildings without well-trained teachers would still have been but a work of preparation; - whereas now, they are sure that the most diffusive good which could be accomplished has been realised in the solid education and thorough training of nearly THIRTY STUDENTS.¹

The Wesleyans adhered to the tenet that teacher-training was the natural complement - the keystone of the arch - of the religious education necessary to Christianize society. To Christize society was their mission. The extension of educational effort was:

from the first based on definite principles. Methodism felt that it was fulfilling a public duty in helping to educate the people and that that duty was an essential part of its evangelical work.²

This work was most necessary among the poor in the industrial areas.

Social evils other than illiteracy needed to be fought. The Methodist campaign evinced a mixture of piety and practicality; a "combination of utilitarianism with pious evangelism which was characteristic of the middle period".³ This attitude is illustrated in current records: for example:-

This meeting recognizes the solemn and imperative duty of religiously educating the young, as at all times binding on the Christian Church, but now more especially urged upon the Wesleyan Connexion, by the growth of juvenile depravity in the country - the admitted necessity of an education that shall be productive of moral improvement.⁴

Somewhat in the same vein, but fifty years later, Dr. Rigg was still declaring "the pressing need for increasing the number and the training

¹Wes. Ed. Reports, op. cit., 1842-43, p. 10.

²F. C. Pritchard, The Story of Westminster College 1851-1951, p. 6.

³H. F. Mathews, Methodism and the Education of the People, p. 128.

capacity of the distinctly Christian Training Colleges of the country,"

because:-

What has been and still is needed for England, as will be realised more and more as direct religious influence is being lessened, or quite set aside, . . . is not so much secular knowledge and intellectual culture, much as this is needed, as the training of character and of conscience, moral and religious training.¹

In 1842-43, an extensive correspondence in The Watchman discussed the need to extend Wesleyan schools and the training of their teachers. There were liberal offers of financial assistance and, also, exhortations to devise some official educational fund. The Education Committee took up the suggestion.

The people who could raise the Centenary Fund can surely originate a general system of Wesleyan education, which will in most cases, when originated, support itself, and become, moreover, a nursery for our churches.²

It drew attention to widespread "awakening to the important claims of educational interest; never were the churches so intent upon this object". This was the time of Graham's proposals. Altruistic motives merged with inflamed sectarian rivalries. We see something of this in the account of Robert Roberts, an ex-Methodist trainee in one of the lesser Anglican training colleges, the Welsh diocesan teachers' college at Caernarvon. He commented on:

a sort of education mania in Wales at that time. . .
Nothing would do but the new training school methods.

¹Dr. Rigg's Reminiscences, pp. 114-115.

²Wesleyan Education Reports, 1842-43, p. 17.

The clergy of the Church of England entered heartily into the movement, much more than they usually do in new projects. They saw that education was a matter of life or death to them. If they did not succeed in obtaining the direction of the education of the younger generation, and thereby making Churchmen of some of them, it was a poor look-out for the Church.¹

In Roberts' first job he found himself embroiled in denominational rivalries. His was a Church school, and a new curate in the parish (influenced by the Oxford Movement) made it clear to the young teacher that they must together struggle to recover 'ground' recently lost to Dissenters.

If denominational zeal was not wholly irreprehensible, not free from motives of proselytization, much of it was indeed admirable. Countless Wesleyan reports testify to a very real concern to labour for others and for Christ's Kingdom on earth.

Wesleyans were profoundly convinced that the best education a poor child could be offered was that under the guidance of a truly committed Wesleyan teacher. Religious conviction, therefore, was of prime importance in selecting candidates for the profession. Matthew Arnold noted this in the first inspectorial report on Westminster College: "Religious character is the primary consideration in selection of students," their aim being "to train a band of serious and religious men to send among the poor".² In every applicant's case, careful enquiries and interviews were

¹Life and Opinions of Robert Roberts, p. 255.

²Reports on Elementary Schools, pp. 233-234.

conducted to ensure moral rectitude and religious experience. In addition, the Wesleyans sought dedication to, and aptitude for, teaching. They rightly believed, says Dr. H. F. Mathews, "that the teacher was 'called' to his task as a result of a spiritual and religious experience".¹

It proved exceedingly difficult to find candidates satisfying these conditions, of high moral and intellectual standards, Wesleyan ardour and aptitude for teaching the poor. The British and Foreign Society admitted that they had to sacrifice academic standards, in the same dilemma. In a letter to Kay-Shuttleworth, the Society's Secretary wrote:-

The Committee cannot keep out of sight the fact that, in order to secure moral and religious influence in their schools, they have hitherto adopted and propose still to adhere to a course which frequently involves a considerable sacrifice of intellectual attainment. They refer to their practice of receiving only those who by age as well as by character may be ranked among persons of fixed and settled religious principles.²

The Wesleyans were determined to make no such sacrifice. All the early applicants for training were rejected. By 1840, six suitable young men had been sent to Glasgow, the Education Committee having received:

testimonials of an exceptional nature as to their religious and moral character, their ability for the work of teaching, and literary capacity and attainments.³

Good reports of their efforts in the Glasgow Academy followed. "Your friends with us," wrote Stow on April 16th, "are conducting themselves

¹ Op. cit., p. 112.

² Minutes of the Committee in Council, Vol. XL, 1843, p. 612.

³ Reports, op. cit., 1841, p. 8.

with the utmost propriety and attention".¹

The Wesleyan Education Committee continued to stress the qualifications required:

Every Teacher employed in the Day or Infant Schools, or trained for them, shall be of a decidedly religious character, and in connexion with the Wesleyan Methodist Society. . . shall be recommended by their Superintendent Minister, examined by the General Committee of Education, and 'general ability', (their being 'apt to teach') tested.²

The Glasgow Academy continued to express satisfaction with the Wesleyan students sent for training. In 1843, the Committee reported with pride that, although the Scottish standards were high, there had been no Wesleyan failures. In every case, so far, morals and aptitude were reported exemplary.

Mr. Stow, the eminent author of the Glasgow Training System, and founder of the Normal Institution, has several times, in his correspondence with us, borne his unsolicited testimony to the religious character, as well as the general ability, of the men we have sent. 'We are always happy,' he observes, in one communication, 'to receive students from your Society; these (now) with us are very attentive to their studies. I doubt not they will do your Society much credit, and, by the blessing of the MOST HIGH, advance Christ's kingdom in the various spheres you may assign to them'.³

Stow congratulated the Committee on their exertions in the cause of Christian education. Students who were trained were at the same time acknowledging the course's effect in promoting it. The seventh student to

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., 1842, p. 14.

³Ibid., 1843, p. 13.

go to Glasgow - a Mr. Bedford - when active subsequently in a Derby school, wrote:

I believe that training is the only way to impart religious education, and to give permanency to the instructions received on spiritual and moral subjects, by having them securely fixed on the mind. ¹

The annual report of the Education Committee to the Wesleyan Conference, the previous year, had recorded:-

Mr. James Ford, the first teacher sent out by the Committee, has been very successful in bringing the School at Brunswick Chapel at Sheffield into perfect order and efficiency, according to the plans pursued at the Normal Seminary at Glasgow. Other schools are adopting the same system. . . At Burslem, Mr. West (our second teacher in order of time) is settled also in a most encouraging field of labour. ²

These first students had been able to benefit by only six months' training.

The Committee regretted that it had to be "partial training". They were:

of the opinion that about twelve months in this invaluable Institution would be, in every case, desirable, could it be afforded; in order to have amongst us a body of thoroughly educated Schoolmasters, who might then be able also to instruct others for subsequent service. ³

Soon they were able to lengthen the training span; and each year they praised anew the "religious character" and professional excellence of Stow's Academy.

The senior Secretary's visit to Glasgow in 1843, "confirmed entirely every previous impression of the general excellence of the institution, and its admirable plans of instruction". ⁴

¹Ibid., 1843, p. 34.

²Ibid., 1842, p. 14.

³Ibid., 1841, p. 9.

⁴Ibid., 1842-43, p. 15.

In summary, five years of Wesleyan trainees sent to Stow read:-

- 1839: no suitable students found.
 1840: six sent for brief training.
 1841: out of 29 applicants, 7 selected and sent for longer course.¹
 1842: 30 trainees sent.
 1843: 110 candidates applied; 42 accepted and trained.

The 1844 Report did not give numbers but appended comparative expenses, which reinforce the picture of escalation.² The figures given were:

1840-41	pounds	129 - 12 - 10.
1841-42	"	260 - 9 - 0.
1842-43	"	358 - 18 - 1.
1843-44	"	1201 - 14 - 9.

The 1844 Report also set out a more formal list of qualifications necessary for candidates; stating:-

Candidates . . . are sent to a Normal Seminary, not to acquire general knowledge, but to acquire right methods of communicating it, and especially right methods of making it available to the moral and religious, as well as intellectual, improvement of young persons.

They must, therefore:-

have a fair acquaintance with English Grammar, Geography and Arithmetic, and also with the outlines of Ancient and English History, and the Doctrines and Evidences of Christianity.³

Singing ability is also requested!

The 1844 Report also urged serious thought about provision of a Wesleyan Normal School, which:-

may combine whatever is most excellent in the various systems of training now in use, and may . . . be more strictly adapted . . to the peculiar character and

¹One of these was a woman. The Committee, "having been repeatedly applied to for Female Teachers," included her. (1842 Report, p. 7.)

²P. xii.

³P. 11. (The "Qualifications for Candidates" given in the 1845 Report is found in Appendix G, in this study.)

requirements of the Wesleyan Methodist
Connexion.¹

It suggested, too, that there should be some further qualification available

to some of the best of the already-trained teachers:-

so that when circumstances shall permit the establishment of a Wesleyan Normal School, they may have persons in some good degree prepared to undertake the working of it.

This was the period when Dissenting denominations felt threatened by Graham's Bill. The President of the Wesleyan Conference - John Scott, later first Principal of Westminster College - and the Secretaries of the Education Committee, thought it imperative to stimulate increased fervour and contributions, to extend Wesleyan education. They accordingly published a long letter, entitled, TO THE FRIENDS OF WESLEYAN GENERAL EDUCATION, beginning:-

The necessity for enlarged and more strenuous efforts for the religious education of the children of the poorer classes, is now so generally and heartily admitted, that no further argument or evidence in proof of it appears to be required. . . It appears to be also generally admitted that . . . there is little or no reason to expect the establishment of any adequate and satisfactory National Plan of Religious Education; . . . The general duty thus plainly indicated is especially incumbent on the Wesleyan community. Considering that their Societies and Congregations are very largely composed of those classes whose benefit is more immediately contemplated in the present Educational movement, and that they were amongst the most strenuous opposers of the two systems of General Education proposed by two successive Administrations.²

¹Ibid.

²The Watchman, January 3rd, 1844.

The most urgent priority was declared to be teacher training.

First. Means must be taken by the General Committee for procuring and training suitable Masters and Mistresses, such training to be given either in some of the Normal Schools already existing, or, as very earnestly desired by many friends of this new undertaking, in a Normal Institution of our own.

This was the first official mention of a Wesleyan college. Some months previously, Stow, after commending the Wesleyan Education Committee's exertions in the cause of Christian education, wrote:-

I have reason to know that you are stirring up others in some quarters, to have moral training schools in their own communions; you are therefore promoting the cause of Christ directly and indirectly, and I doubt not you will bless God for all this.¹

There had been no apparent sign of a projected Wesleyan training institution at that time. By 1845, however, there were signs. The Minutes of Conference for that year recorded:-

that whilst this Meeting approves of the practice hitherto adopted by the Committee of sending their Teachers to be trained at Glasgow, . . . hears with satisfaction that arrangements are in progress towards the commencement of an (experimental) Wesleyan Training Establishment in London.²

It recorded also with approval that the laymen of Leeds offered to send, at their own expense, a number of students to Glasgow. The Committee had sent forty-four students in 1845, and Glasgow-based training continued whilst the slow development of college plans proceeded.

There seemed little progress to report the next year. The 1846 Conference recorded:-

¹ Wesleyan Education Reports, 1842-43, p. 13.

² Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference, Vol. X, p. 240.

This Meeting rejoices in the attention which is still paid by the Committee to the procuring and training of suitable Masters and Mistresses. Whilst this Meeting . . . continues to approve of the plan pursued by the Committee in the training of their candidates, it still cherishes the hope expressed . . . that a Wesleyan Training Institution may, at no distant period, be established in London.¹

To expedite this, the necessary application of funds was authorized.

Early in 1847 a site was purchased. It faced on Horse-ferry Road, in a thickly populated part of what was then the urban borough of Westminster.

The Watchman announced this to all scattered Methodists:-

The first purchase was a property called Moody's Gardens, comprising about an acre and a half, with old buildings, for 5,000 pounds. Afterwards 2,600 pounds were expended on three houses in Horse-ferry Road, facing westwards.²

The premises were later completed by the purchase of a fourth house for 900 pounds.

There followed protracted discussions and correspondence on the suitability, or unsuitability, of such a site. There were objections to the poverty-stricken nature of the area; wishes for a more salubrious site; explanations that Wesleyan principles demanded the college to be set where the need was greatest. (It was envisaged that over 2,000 children would be taught in the practising schools attached to the training college.) The first Principal, Dr. Scott, later stated that the college was founded in the midst of a population "as prostrate through ignorance and vicious habits as any in London or perhaps in the civilized world".³ Dr. Rigg remembered

¹Ibid., p. 392.

²Vol. XIII, p. 356.

³Matthew Arnold quoted Dr. Scott's inaugural speech, in his first Report, Minutes of the Committee in Council, Vol. 1, 1853.

it being called 'Scott's Folly' by opposers of the situation. A Member of Parliament remarked, at the time, that the Wesleyans "had been true to their traditions in founding a college where the need was so desperate".¹

Like Kay-Shuttleworth, Dr. Scott and the other Wesleyan leaders involved in the establishment of the college regarded teachers as "a band of missionaries". They, too, stressed the dedicated self-denying lives teachers would be expected to lead, and wished to inculcate such qualities from the start.

They did not wish their students to be spoiled in training; and by a lengthened residence away from the dwellings of the poor, and amongst the attractions of superior life, disinclined and rendered unfit to undertake the arduous and self-denying duties of school teachers.²

There had been criticism of some of the earlier colleges; suspicions that training there would raise teachers above their station in life, and the poverty of the children among whom they must work. The beautiful eleven acres and the relatively high academic standards of St. Mark's College, in particular, had drawn this fire. The Principal, the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, was deemed to be putting social mobility for teachers before the needs of the lowest sections of society.

As Pritchard commented in 1951, "Methodism has always started from the bottom".³ Nearly a hundred years earlier, P. W. Musgrave had

¹F. C. Pritchard, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

²Matthew Arnold, *op. cit.*

³The Story of Westminster., *op. cit.*, p. 14.

contrasted the Church of England's propensity for supplying education "from above" with the Wesleyans' more democratic system of 'class meetings' to train the lowest folk in Bible reading, and, incidently, in general literacy and oracy.¹ Their's was a self-help policy. Samuel Smiles, famous for his Self-Help, published in 1859, began his education in a Leeds Wesleyan Sunday School, in 1844.

The Wesleyans had planted their training college in the worst London slums, purposely. The Education Report of 1847 emphasized that not only would the five practising schools ensure that the training would never become exclusively theoretical, but in the crowded streets of Westminster the "Institution would constitute a great public charity to a vicinity in which such a charity is at present greatly needed".²

Methodists contributed 23,000 pounds to establish the college: the government granted 7,000 pounds, regretting that no more was then possible because of all the claims upon their funds. 35,000 pounds would be needed. The Wesleyans, faithful to their founder's injunction to keep out of debt, felt they could not proceed until the gap was closed. It was an anxious time, heightened by increasing popular agitation for a secular Education Bill as well as by denominational tensions.

The Wesleyan Education Report of 1849 showed the sect still hesitant. Sixty-six trainees were then at Glasgow. For the first time, the Committee

¹Society and Education in England since 1800, p. 11.

²P. 25.

sounded a note of apprehension about the "Calvinistic tendency of the theological doctrines prevailing" there.¹ This added to Wesleyan worries.

Jabez Bunting interjected his influential voice into the debate. He thought it right to 'advance in faith': 'a training college was a claimant need; more claimant even than churches.'

The plans were submitted to the Privy Council Committee on February 28th, 1849, and approved. Kay-Shuttleworth and Stow had both been helpful in their preparation. Stow's gallery was to be incorporated in the schools, as his methods were to form the basis of the teacher training. Some of the best Wesleyan students trained by Stow would form the nucleus of the new college staff; this, a substantial dividend from a decade of investment in teacher training. Mr. Sugden, soon to be "Head Master" of the training department, had the additional valuable experience of five years' headship of Stow's senior model school. Inspector Arnold "formed the highest opinion" of his work in Westminster.²

Still, in July 1849, the Education Committee were trying to convince cautious laggards of the necessity to implement their plans. "They had gone too far to retreat; they had bought the land; . . . received Government grants and approval; . . . must keep faith with the public; . . . Mr. Stow had been a valuable friend but it was better to have one's own training college; . . . other religious bodies had their own training establishments; . . . they

¹Rev. T. Vasey, reported in The Watchman, Vol. XIV, p. 356.

²Minutes of the Committee in Council, 1853, p. 559.

were called upon, by religious duty, to set up and maintain such an Institution . . . consistent with Methodist zeal".¹

The foundation stone was finally laid on September 27th, 1849. The college was to provide complete accommodation for sixty male and forty female residential students, some tutors' houses and five practising schools. The Committee looked upon:

The Institution as both a source of information on all matters connected with Wesleyan education, and as a centre of influence from which will radiate enthusiasm for advance in all directions. They expect to evolve here a distinctly Methodist contribution to the educational system of the country, and to contribute a complete set of text-books on elementary subjects.²

The 1850 annual meeting of the Committee, on July 31st, resounded with expressions of thankfulness, and rejoiced in the "triumph" of being able to hold the meeting "on the premises of the New Normal School, now nearly completed".³

These buildings, so extensive in their scale, and so impressive in their purpose and character, were calculated to convince all who saw them of the existence of a strong feeling in the Wesleyan Body in favour of education.

A speech of Jabez Bunting's brought thunderous applause:-

We will not disgrace our Connexion by thinking of retreat; . . . there must be further progress . . . All the great principles on which, some few years ago, this great educational movement of our Body was determined upon, continue to exist in undiminished

¹Reported in The Watchman and Wesleyan Advertiser, (successor to The Watchman) Vol. 1, p. 237.

²Wesleyan Education Reports, 1849, p. 30.

³The Watchman and Wesleyan Advertiser, Vol. 2, p. 245.

force. . . It is the duty of every Christian Church . . . ours in particular, to make all possible provision and to afford all possible facilities for the religious education of the poorer members of their own Body.

A chorus of voices agreed that 'education ought to be religious'. The new training college would promote the "great and glorious work" of religious education, and further the great Wesleyan design of "spreading Scriptural holiness through the land", by its converted teachers. Mr. James Heald M. P. saw it as a recognition of the Methodist principle of regarding the laity as an important part of their Church.

The practising schools were operational before the rest of the project. Kay-Shuttleworth had guided the schools' early efforts before he retired.

Whilst still in office he wrote:-

The Committee in Council have great confidence that in all their arrangements, the Wesleyan Education Committee will rejoice to become the instrument of diffusing liberally the great benefits of Christian civilization to that large portion of Her Majesty's subjects on whose welfare they have hitherto exerted so marked an influence.¹

The schools pioneered practical subjects such as handwork, woodwork and gardening. A combination of moral uplift and sound practical instruction was the aim. The Committee resolved:-

We will not, on any consideration, be induced, either by a desire to meet the views of scholarly Inspectors, or to compete with the high and useless pretensions of other training institutions, to depart from that course of sound and practical instruction - good and thoroughly mastered, but yet limited in its extent, and adapted in its character - which we deem best suited to the wants of the lower classes.

¹Wesleyan Education Reports, 1849, p. 65.

Evident, here, is the fixed discriminatory view of society which was typical of the times and the Wesleyan critical appraisal of some Church colleges. The mention of 'scholarly Inspectors' draws attention to the fact that Westminster College was, from the start, a state-inspected as well as a state-aided foundation. The site was said to cover:-

an acre and three quarters of freehold land in the heart of Westminster. The buildings are excellent; they are collegiate in their appearance and general arrangements. Light and air have been thus admitted into one of the most neglected, over-crowded, and unhealthy parts of Westminster.¹

The quality of students was praised, as also the innovative 'teaching-practice' procedures, which included a preliminary week of observation and 'criticism' lessons.

Following the opening of the Model Infant and Junior Schools in 1850, the 'Industrial School for Females' began in 1851. The students took over the unfinished residential accommodation on October 6th that year. Some of these students were the first Queen's Scholars to complete apprenticeship.

From the beginning, Westminster Training College was collegiate in atmosphere as well as in appearance. The Rev. John Scott continued his prodigious work for Wesleyan education as the first Principal. He was dynamic and liberal besides being truly pious, and he founded the college on the basis of mutual trust and respect, and Wesleyan zeal. He wished, and strove, for a hard-working, happy 'family', needing few rules; a harmonious, self-disciplined, self-governing community.

¹ Minutes of the Committee in Council, 1853, p. 561.

The candidates for training in Westminster, as at Glasgow, were selected on grounds of religious commitment, personality, dedication, and intellectual attainments. College life continued the emphasis on religion. Matthew Arnold rightly noted that, "as religious character is the primary consideration in the selection of the students, it is also the main end regarded in their discipline and training".¹

'Westminster', although transferred to Oxford and greatly expanded in a beautiful hill-top setting, still serves its original purpose. The limitations of 'simple education for the poor' have gone but it remains a distinctly Methodist college of high ideals and comparatively high academic standards. The reins of Government, so much dreaded, remain incredibly light considering that all running expenses and 80% of capital expenditure come from State funds.

Westminster College was, and is, a fine example of the English compromise forced into operation, 1839-1852.

¹Reports on Elementary Schools, p. 234.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONGREGATIONALISTS AND HOMERTON COLLEGE

Homerton and Westminster Colleges, founded alike in the central years of the nineteenth century, are still in the vanguard of English teacher training. Homerton transferred to Cambridge from London, in 1894. Both, far from their original anti-Establishment protests, are now linked with traditional symbols of the Establishment, Cambridge and Oxford Universities, through their curricula, certificate and degree examinations. They are now, alike, state-supported, state-inspected, while still denominationally directed training colleges.

They began, however, with a great gulf made by contrary decisions on the issue of Voluntaryism. Wesleyans and Congregationalists had many convictions and practices in common and, until 1839, had both been in the mainstream of Nonconformist thought regarding questions of national importance. Then, the latter supported the scheme for a national normal school while the former vehemently opposed the Government measure. Graham's Bill drove them again into unison, but, once the Bill was safely defeated, it proved an uncertain, half-hearted alliance.

Divergence became definite when, in 1847, the Wesleyans abandoned the 'voluntary principle' and joined the organized sect-state partnership. The Congregationalists, having completely reversed their earlier assent to a national system, expended a prodigious amount of nervous energy and printed matter on their fight to avoid the 'pernicious' influence of the State, before eventually (in 1867) agreeing to become part of the educational compromise.

When it was known that the Wesleyans had decided to accept Government assistance and direction, a letter from The Leeds Intelligencer, printed in The Watchman, extolled Jabez Bunting and his declared "conviction of the necessity and propriety of receiving government aid for educational purposes".¹

It is true he would rather dispense with such aid, if it were possible; but, finding that he has to choose between it and the utter neglect of some 50,000 or 60,000 children of his persuasion, he very wisely will not permit any 'high flown notion of independence' to lead him to the latter forlorn and criminal alternative.

This "common sense" the letter contrasts with the "finical, pedantic, extravagant voluntaryism" of the Congregationalists.

Other Nonconformist papers naturally reacted in a different manner. Baines' Leeds Mercury, not surprisingly, deplored the Wesleyan 'sell-out' and continued to fulminate against the 'dangerous and immoral' Government intentions. Similar attitudes were aired in The Nonconformist, The Patriot, and The Eclectic Review.

Tracts poured forth; the most notable and extremist being from the pen of Baines. The Congregational Board of Education issued a less militant pamphlet. It stated:-

The Congregationalists have borne, with other Nonconformists, what they believe to be a faithful and scriptural testimony to the non-interference of the civil power with the education of the national mind in religious learning:¹

It recorded that Congregationalists were united against the Minutes of 1846; also the Baptists; that the Scotch Free Church and the Quakers had taken

¹The Late Struggle for Freedom of Education, p. 3.

no action, though individual Quakers took a prominent part with the Congregationalists; but "the Wesleyans have attained by their policy an extraordinary notoriety".¹

Just before the Wesleyan decision to desert the Voluntaryist camp, Baines had presented a letter to Lord Lansdowne, in Parliament on February 5th, 1847.² It echoed his Alarm to the Nation, with its violent objections to "the prodigal expenditure of public money; . . . the hostility to voluntary religion and voluntary education; . . . the enormous extension of government influence; . . . the threat to liberty; . . . the fearful amount of influence and patronage given to the parochial clergy; . . . the shameful injustice to Dissenters".³ and asked:-

Why should the Wesleyan, the Independent, the Baptist, the Quaker, and every other Nonconformist, be forced by a new law to pay for the teaching of doctrines which they do not believe, and the upholding of a system which they regard as unscriptural?⁴

He decried the imposition of such an "unjust, unnecessary, insidious and mischievous measure" and warns Lord Lansdowne, President of the offending Council Committee:-

¹The Late Struggle for Freedom of Education, p. 24.

²It listed the training colleges then existing, as proof of voluntary zeal, (N. B. Appendix H) adding: "To most of the Normal Schools the Government makes grants; but I am confident that the Schools would be maintained by public liberality, if nothing were received from the Government."

³Edward Baines, An Alarm to the Nation on the unjust, unconstitutional and dangerous measure of State Education proposed by the Government., pp. 4-17.

⁴Published as a Tract (by Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1847) p. 15.

I believe you will find that you HAVE ALIENATED AND EXASPERATED THE DISSENTERS. It is for them now to speak. The time draws near, when it will be for them TO ACT.

In fact, for all Baines' agitations, excoriations and provocations, the Dissenting revolt fizzled out. Congregationalists only, and some small groups and some individuals allied with them, kept the flag of battle flying.¹ R. W. Dale wrote: "Most Nonconformists viewed increasing State interference with alarm but Congregationalists only with increasing hostility and refusal to accept grants".²

"Congregationalists like to think that the word Voluntaryism had been coined by Dr. Matheson", one of their leading ministers.³ They undoubtedly led the movement, attracting much abuse.

If there ever was an agitation which had all the signs of emanating from some very small and narrow-minded clique, this is it;⁴

was a typical comment.

The Congregational Board of Education publicly protested against unjust castigations. They most strongly refuted charges of enmity to popular education, claiming that their record of Sunday Schools and Day Schools "prove that

¹The Jews were drawn into the national system in 1852. Then Kay-Shuttleworth, thinking of the Tractarians - still intransigent - and the Voluntaryists, could write, "Two parties alone remain opposed to the general stream, and these parties are at the opposite ends of religious polity". (Public Education, quoted by Frank Smith, Life and Work of K-S., p. 242.

²History of Congregationalism, p. 661.

³A. McLellan, "Congregationalism and the Education of the People", p. 46. Dr. Matheson was an active Voluntaryist during the last years of his life, 1840-46.

⁴The Times, cited by Mary Sturt, The Education of the People, p. 185.

they have been, and are, the friends of secular and religious education".¹

It is difficult to substantiate this claim with figures. Congregationalists had been zealous in support of the undenominational British and Foreign Schools Society but had founded few exclusively Congregational schools - separate schools such as Wesleyans and Catholics preferred to have.

Congregationalists were among the most ardent advocates of popular education at a time when large and powerful classes of English society were sincerely afraid that if the children of the great masses of the people were taught to read and to write they would become a serious peril to the State.²

Congregationalists had certainly been active in the general Nonconformist Sunday-school movement. This they joined in 1785; the first of their educational ventures outside theological academies. In 1846, Baines said that Nonconformists in Lancashire and Yorkshire provided two and a half times the Anglican Sunday-school education; despite the more favourable position of the Church in respect of wealth, buildings and manpower.

During the first four decades of the nineteenth century, the Congregational educational effort tended to be an undifferentiated part of Nonconformist provision. The situation changed dramatically when the Congregationalists ruptured their alliance with the British and Foreign Schools Society, the latter accepting State aid and the former determined to have nothing more to do with any such organization or institution. Between 1843 and 1851, 'the Voluntaryists had built 364 schools and a training college, Homerton,' entirely

¹The Late Struggle for Freedom of Education, p. 3.

²R. W. Dale, *op. cit.*, p. 646.

without grant-aid.¹

Voluntary education soon surpassed the ancient foundations in its usefulness; and the voluntary support and spread of religion has awakened the dormant energies of the Established Church.²

So stated the Congregationalist Board of Education, and here, I think, it touched on one of the core reasons for the defensive Anglican attitudes and inflamed sectarian strife which thwarted Kay-Shuttleworth's vision of a national education system and forced the Committee to jettison the Normal School plan. The fervour responsible for the outcrop of schools (be they Wesleyan, Congregational, Catholic or Chartist) was being felt by many Anglicans as a real threat to their long-established supremacy. By the thirties it had roused them out of complacency and was intensifying fears and rivalries. This played a part in the proliferation of Church training colleges during the forties.

Some of the first steps towards the Congregational college were taken without a realization of where they were leading or any mention of teacher training. Graham's Bill might be said to have started Congregationalists on this course. They sent, to Parliament, two million signatures against the Bill. By appearing to preclude any hope of a fair national system, it impelled a change of mind about the desirability of State-supported education.

¹J. Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970, p. 36. N. B. Homerton was not built in this period. As regards the schools, accuracy is difficult as many Congregational documents perished in the London 'Blitz'.

²The Late Struggle for Freedom of Education, p. 5.

Baines' letters to Sir Robert Peel¹ in June 1843, advanced statistics to show "the power of voluntary Christian zeal to provide the means of Education and Religious Instruction," and continued, "we will not be dragooned into a State Religion and our children shall not be taught what our own consciences do not approve".

In October the Congregational Union of England and Wales held a special meeting in Leeds: the pernicious effects of State interference and the dangers to civil and religious liberty were expounded upon. The Union endorsed, anew, the principles of the essential religious basis of education and the importance of free competition and self-help. A Committee of Education was set up, which became the Congregational Board of Education the following year. Nearly half of the elected committee were ministers but some very well-known laymen were included. Miall represented Bradford, Baines represented Leeds; Samuel Morley, whose stocking factory in London was part of the growing Nonconformist industry, became treasurer - to serve magnificently for forty-three years.

At the Educational Committee's inception, there was no mention of teacher training. The members' duties were envisaged as the amassing of facts and statistics, liaison with the British and Foreign Schools Society, co-operation with other denominations, and, above all, watchfulness of the Government.

All the plans of national education by the agency of Government, suggested of late years, have been very objectionable either to friends of the Established

¹Printed under the title, The Social, Educational and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts.

Church; or to Dissenting bodies. This Meeting, therefore, concludes, without despondancy or regret, that both the general and the religious education of the people of England must be chiefly provided and conducted by the various denominations of Christians. It will behove the Congregational Churches to bear an extensive and zealous part in this important work.¹

For this they must "establish a central fund for assisting in the support of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses," and:-

should give to the British and Foreign School Society more effective support than heretofore, as an indispensable central institution to maintain model and normal schools for training teachers.

The apparent anomaly of supporting a Society, with whom as members they had been sharing school grants since 1833, coupled with strong repudiation of State interference and aid, is to some extent explained by their distinction between the 'British and Foreign' schools and its training institution. The training institution was, as yet, entirely voluntary; the schools were grant-aided.

The introductory address to the Meeting was given by Charles Hindley M. P., who announced that in future the Union would give "no grant to any school not entirely sustained by voluntary contributions". He appealed for increased subscriptions, saying:-

Do not forget that within the five next ensuing years, a great work must be done, a great fund raised. . . Never were the Congregationalists more evidently than now in a crisis.²

¹ Minutes of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, October 10th - 13th, 1843, p. 7.

² Introductory Address, printed by Blackburn & Pardon, p. 6.

A few weeks later the Education Committee sent a letter to all their Churches, asking the ministers if schools in their vicinity were often visited and if they needed improvement. The question was also put:

Can you discover, and draw forth to be educated for teachers, any truly pious, intelligent, and efficient young men or women?

These potential teachers, if selected, would "be required to remain in the Normal School of the British and Foreign School Society or some other Institution for the training of teachers for six months at least".¹

They should be between the ages of 20 & 30 - of undoubted piety - of good health - of decision and perseverance combined with humility - of amiable temper - able to read & write well - possessing some knowledge of English Grammar, Geography, General History & Arithmetic - apt both to learn and to teach, and full of disinterested love for the work.

The Congregationalists, six years after the Wesleyans, were seeking the same sort of candidates to train 'at Borough Road Normal School or some other Institution'. There were minor differences of emphasis: the Wesleyans seem to have been unconcerned about amiable tempers, and to have been more prone to stress singing ability. On the vital issue of church membership, the denominational connection is assumed, in the case of the Congregationalists, by asking the ministers to inform the Committee if "there are any members of your Church, that appear to be suitable". Wesleyans always specifically asked for affiliation. In a later list of questions to be put to prospective Congregational trainees, the subject of membership (and singing) is raised.²

¹Minutes of the Congregational Committee of Education, Vol. Nov. 1843-
May 1845, p. 81.

²Second Annual Report of the Congregational Board of Education, May 1846; Educational Reports, 1844-45, p. 15. (The list of questions is here found in Appendix J.)

The Committee soon realized, as had the Wesleyans, that the poor quality of candidates was a major problem. Their first decision was to provide some secondary education for potential teachers. Early in 1845 they resolved to establish an institution where twelve women could receive a general educational course of one year's duration, "before their attention is specifically directed to the method of teaching adopted by the British and Foreign School Society".

For this purpose a house has been taken at Rotherhithe for three years, that the experiment may have a fair trial. . . Better educated and better qualified teachers must be provided for the times coming upon us. ¹

Before the Rotherhithe house had been procured, a large Congregational conference on the subject of education was held in Wales. Wesleyans, Baptists and Calvinists were invited to attend.

The conference recommended:-

First that a normal school for Wales be forthwith established for the training of teachers expressly for the Principality.

It also recorded that:-

The Board being deeply convinced that the prosperity, if not the existence of schools, must greatly depend on well-qualified masters and mistresses, took into serious consideration the necessity of aiding persons of ability and piety to qualify themselves for this department of labour. It was finally agreed to educate and train six males and six females for the office of teacher. ²

The training was to be at the British and Foreign Society's Borough Road Normal School.

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Ibid., p. 8.

The Board recorded, later, that 20 - 10 - 0 pounds was paid in 1844 for training teachers. Wesleyans were at that time spending over 1,000 pounds on the task. A comparison in the Congregationalists' favour concerns the more narrow-minded Wesleyan emphasis on denominational membership. The Congregationalists' phrase, "None but members of Christian churches are eligible to be trained by the Board",¹ is less exclusive than the Wesleyan requirement: "It is expected of all Candidates coming before this Committee for selection that they be truly converted to God, and be accredited members of the Wesleyan Society".²

Both sects stressed religious conviction, believing implicitly that all education must be grounded in religious faith. An example of Congregational emphasis on this, is one of Samuel Morley's Reports, which discusses:

aiding in the religious training of religious persons to qualify them to give a religious Education to the children of any school to which they may be appointed.³

The year 1845 brought the rupture of the close association between Congregationalists and the British and Foreign Schools Society. After worried deliberation, the Society had accepted a grant of 750 pounds towards the extension of its normal school. When this was announced at the Annual General Meeting of the Congregational Board of Education, the Board carried a Resolution that 'it deeply regretted and could not be reconciled to the

¹Ibid.

²Wesleyan Education Reports, 1844, p. xii.

³Minutes of the Congregational Board of Education, 1845, p. 17.

Society's action'. Financial support and Congregational trainee teachers were immediately withdrawn from Borough Road. Six trainees only were affected, the intention to train twelve having been curtailed because of poor applicants: five women and one man had almost completed the course.

The decision to withdraw support and students was not as precipitate as might appear. The 'inner circle' of Congregationalists had previously heard of the acceptance of State aid for the normal school and had discussed the implications at length. Samuel Morley then recorded the unanimous expression of "deep regret and disapproval", continuing:-

That as it is a fundamental Rule of this Board not to receive any money raised by taxation for the purpose of religious education, nor even to vote any of its funds to schools that have received government money; it would be inconsistent in this Board to receive any advantages for its teachers under training at the Borough Road school, conferred even in part by means of the government grant for such a school: but as this Board is desirous to take no step in the difficult position in which it has been placed with respect to its teachers but such as shall be dictated by the calmest and fullest deliberations; it determines that arrangements shall be made to ascertain the opinion of the general Body of its constituents, as to the course to be pursued relative to the future training of its teachers.¹

The deliberations of the 'general Body' culminated in the decision to convert the plans for secondary education into plans for definite Congregationalist teacher training provision. The house at Rotherhithe - 2 Goldsworthy Place - was to become the first normal school of the Congregational Board of Education. Mary Anne Whitmore, aged 24, was appointed Principal.

¹Ibid.

She had taught in a private school for six months and trained at Borough Road for the same length of time. At Rotherhithe, with a few women, a modest start was made.

In August 1848, another house in the area - 10 Liverpool St. - was set up as a men's hostel and teacher training centre, under the guidance of Rev. W. J. Unwin. The two centres were to co-operate. Realizing the limited nature of Miss Whitmore's experience and being critical of the monitorial methods, from which Borough Road had not shaken free, Unwin was sent to Stow's Academy for a thorough grounding in improved methodology. He "spent a considerable period at Glasgow, to fit him the better for his high and important Christian work".¹ A teacher trained by Stow was put in charge of the practising schools being organized at Rotherhithe, and these were fitted with the recommended galleries for collective teaching.

The 'Regulations of the Normal School' were set forth, for both branches, beginning:-

1. The bell is to be rung at 6 o'clock every morning, but any teacher may rise earlier if so disposed.
2. The teachers are expected to be in the classroom at 7 o'clock precisely.
3. Every member of the family is expected to be punctual in attendance at family worship.²

Meanwhile, the 1846 Minutes of the Committee in Council had been announced and were gaining acceptance. Baines was feverishly trying to stir

¹The Training System, p. 511.

²Battersea students had to rise at 5:30 a.m. and do their quota of hard work in house, garden or farm before Prayers at 8 a.m., followed by breakfast. (Four Periods of Public Education, p. 328). Westminster students also rose early and were required to attend 'family' Prayers.

up all Dissenters against the measure. He was not successful. His optimism that the British and Foreign Schools Society could be persuaded to think better of their capitulation, proved unjustified. In 1853, Kay-Shuttleworth wrote: "The Voluntaryists have failed to capture the British and Foreign School Society and even prominent Congregationalist leaders".¹ It was true that such Congregationalist notables as Dr. Robert Vaughan, Henry Rogers and Thomas Binney did not support Voluntaryism. Vaughan wanted the State to supply secular education and the sects to be responsible for religious education, being one of the few members of any Church willing to concede such a division to be possible, at that time.

The active Voluntaryists were trying to gain more influence in Parliament. The encroaching State interference drove them to organize themselves into a political group with a campaign, led by Miall and Baines and the Anti-State-Church Association, and candidates for the 1847 elections.²

Most of the activists believed the educational issue to be vital, and voiced their determination to maintain independence.

We, the Congregationalists, are fully committed to an honourable contest to preserve liberty of education for this country . . . We are pledged, in the face of every opposition, to maintain, so long as we are able, a system of religious education independent of State aid. We firmly believe, that eventually we shall succeed. Government education will not be popular. Sooner or later our principles will triumph.³

¹Public Education, 1853; cited by Frank Smith, Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, p. 242.

²Succeeding in achieving twenty-six House of Commons' seats.

³Andrew Reed, Crosby Hall Lectures on Education, vol. IV, p. 99.

Andrew Reed rightly saw the importance of training colleges.

We Congregationalists must pass through the furnace to become worthy of success . . . This education struggle is our battlefield. I look upon the Normal Schools as a Thermopylae, where a few brave hearts may rally, and succeed in repulsing from a free territory the encroachments of a powerful host.¹

Later, when their two small institutions had become amalgamated as one college, Congregationalists boasted that it was the sole protest against the State's control of teachers; "the solitary protest against the beaureau-cratie [sic] spirit".²

Another of Andrew Reed's pronouncements, of this time, typifies what the Congregationalists, like the Wesleyans, were trying to practise. He wrote:-

Teachers should be trained beyond the point of intellectual attainment absolutely necessary; for no one teaches well what he knows, unless he knows a good deal more than he teaches.³

"The Congregational Board of Education," says Simms, "strove to add some degree of intellectual distinction to the piety and teaching power of its students".⁴

The ambition to improve and extend the training facilities led to the takeover of the nearby theological college, 'Homerton', which had been serving as a Congregational ministerial training centre since 1768. Samuel Morley

¹Ibid. , p. 136.

²The Eclectic Review, 1861, p. 483.

³On Normal Schools, (1848); quoted by Simms, p. 32. (Thomas Simms, "History of Homerton").

⁴Op. cit. , p. 34.

was treasurer of this, as of the Board of Education, and he was largely responsible for the merger. He was deservedly called "The founder of Homerton".¹

A practising, 'model' school was built in the grounds of the erst-while theological college, incorporating galleries. Following the lead of Stow, also, a playground was prepared. At a public meeting in 1849, the new function of the college was officially recognized. An Address was given, to the effect that, thus, the institution would be preserved to the denomination, and that:-

the spirit of the past would live in the present; and while training for a kindred vocation to that contemplated by its founders, many an earnest mind would gather a stimulus from surrounding associations to diligence and duty, and by the recollection of departed worth be impelled to renewed energy, devotion and zeal.²

Alterations were needed. It had, for instance, to be made the home of a number of women as well as of its traditionally male compliment. It was late 1851 before it could be 'declared open':-

This ediface, sacred to Nonconformity, will henceforward be the Alma Mater of those who in connection with this Institution, shall be trained as teachers of the young.³

Not until May 3rd, 1852, was it occupied by the eighteen men students and the fifteen women students from the houses at Rotherhithe, and become fully residential.

¹The Theological College, High Street, Homerton, became 'Homerton College' in 1823, but the name is always now associated with teacher training.

²Quoted by Simms, op. cit., p. 35.

³1851-52 Report, p. 12. (Published, London: Gresham Press, 1852).

Co-education was a part of Congregationalist policy, and one of the reasons for the Board's acquisition of the larger property. Early in the history of the co-educational establishment, one of the ministers deputed by the Board to assess the training facilities and the operation of the courses, said - concerning the co-education:

This experiment has, so far, operated very beneficially, and has appeared to increase the feelings of self-respect and of propriety, as well as to stimulate the zeal of both the male and female classes.¹

To the students, the 'experiment' was of a decidedly partial nature. Separate entrances were constructed as well as severed accommodation within: there were separate classes except for singing; a rigidly segregated life, in fact, except for examinations, prayers and meals. Communal worship and mealtimes presumably demonstrated the principles of co-education and family atmosphere, preached by the authorities, but the stern admonitions given the two male and two female students seen walking together, and the two students who somehow became engaged while being trained, left a more lasting impression of divisions, than of mingling, on the students. Homerton was described by one of the first students as "practically two colleges as distinct as if they were several miles apart".²

The staff felt differently. For most, it was an exciting and praise-worthy innovation. For Mary Whitmore, however, the dual college was a modern mistake. She resigned her position in 1851, leaving Unwin to take undisputed,

¹Rev. R. Redpath, cited by T. Simms, op. cit., p. 36.

²T. Simms, op. cit., p. 40.

and excellent, charge of the new college.

Like Scott of Westminster, Unwin was liberal and democratic for his time. Students at Homerton shared in roles of authority; each serving as 'Censor' in turn. Unwin, unlike Scott, believed that the children's parents had a role to play also; that their co-operation was an essential element in the success of a school. He advised his trainees to "commence a systematic plan of visitation," of homes.¹ Both Principals believed in co-education, in marked contrast the Church of England Principals.

Both Unwin and Scott believed above all in the moral end of education and strove to make this aspect the vital centre of their training colleges. Arnold said of the Wesleyan college: "A moral end, . . . a moral effect to be produced upon the student, was in view, even in planting the institution where it now stands".²

As the Wesleyans had stipulated that all their candidates should be of "decidedly religious character", so the original Rules for Homerton contain these sentences:-

In this Institution young persons of both sexes are prepared for Juvenile and Infant schools. In addition to unimpeachable moral character, sincere piety is indispensable.

The Congregationalists not only stated this as their avowed aim, in college rules, they also preached it to a wider audience through their quarterly journal, The Educator, or Home, the School and the Teacher. In the first

¹"Hints on Opening a School", 1848, No. 9.

²Reports on Elementary Schools, p. 233.

volume of this journal, Unwin wrote:-

Cherish the thought that it is the chief business of your lives to train as well as to teach, to form the mind and future character of the young . . . Secular and religious education, like the warp and the woof, must go together. Our youth, thus trained, will grow up with a conviction that religion is not a thing of places and times, but a life - a character.¹

The impact of David Stow's precepts and practices are very evident here, as they are in much of Congregational and Wesleyan foundations for teacher training. It would have been surprising if this had not been so, at Westminster, with so many Wesleyan students trained through ten years of going to Glasgow and most of the early Westminster staff products of Stow's system. With slimmer chances of indoctrination, the Congregationalists also absorbed Stow's 'Moral Training' and used it at Homerton.

Kay-Shuttleworth, too, had quickly caught hold of Stow's principles, so much in sympathy with his own outlook. Naturally, then, there were similarities in the four colleges, the Glasgow Academy, Battersea, Westminster and Homerton Colleges. They were each, besides being inevitable products of a religious era, based essentially on Stow's tenets. Each, under the aegis of a different denominational body, stressed religious faith as basic to the character formation which was seen to constitute the essence of teaching. Battersea and Westminster took a somewhat more narrow view of the brand of religious faith required of candidates. This was certainly true of Battersea after its transfer to the National Society, which insisted on Anglican adherence

¹Vol. 1, pp. 19, 20.

and instruction. The Glasgow Academy epitomized broad undenominationalism. In theory, Homerton stood for a liberal Evangelism. One of their rules was: "Members of all Evangelical denominations are eligible for Admission".¹ In practice, the vast majority of its early trainees were Congregationalists. The first list of students, for example, includes one Baptist among thirteen 'Independents'. Of these, one who had come from a Congregational home but was not herself a member, had a cross appended to her name; seemingly at a later date: perhaps she did not outlast the required two months probationary period.²

As the Wesleyans and Kay-Shuttleworth tried to send out to the schools, a "band of missionaries", so, with the start of Homerton, the Congregationalists had a similar aim.

The great object of the Board is to train up a band of pious, intelligent, and devoted teachers who shall be equal to the demands of the age and shall give themselves wholly to the work of instruction.³

Matthew Arnold had noted the Wesleyan aim "to train a band of serious and religious men to send among the poor". It was Matthew Arnold who inspected, also, Homerton, when at last they gave up the struggle to provide

¹Arnold discussed this, as it affected their schools and college: Their denomination being properly Evangelical. They are unlike the Church of England schools, or the Wesleyan schools, in that they are not merely for Anglicans, or for Wesleyans, but for those who hold "Evangelical views of religion." They are unlike the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, because, being for those who hold "Evangelical views of religion," they exclude Socinians and Roman Catholics. (op. cit., p. 257).

²Congregational Education Reports, No. 1, (Aug. 31st, 1849) p. 24. N. B. Appendix K. These were the girls who began at Rotherhithe: in September, three men were provisionally accepted.

a training college and schools entirely financed by voluntary contributions. Then - in 1868 - Arnold's praise for the training course, for Unwin and for their "Evangelical Protestantism", was high. Throughout the sixteen years of financial hardship, Homerton College was able to give good professional training to its students as well as keeping the religious goal of education in the forefront of their hearts and minds.

After sixteen years of standing defiantly aloof from the partnership of voluntary bodies and the British Government, of trying to prove the emerging pattern a mistake, the Congregationalists capitulated. Their independent effort is very much a part of the story of religion and the rise of teacher training colleges.

CONCLUSION

1839-1852 was a peak period in England in which religion was the paramount social force. New fervour in various religious bodies was reflected in the formation of reforms, charities, associations and schools, as well as in the building of churches. The educational movement of this religious age naturally included the belief that education - a matter of morals as of mind - must be grounded in religion. On that point there was general agreement among leaders of society. There were irreconcilable differences of opinion, however, as to the precise variety of religion which should be basic. Society prized religion highly; believed that the extending provision of popular education should be religious; but had insufficient common ground to evolve a common educational system. This was very evident when the Government proposed a national normal school in 1839.

Mid-nineteenth century England boasted a plurality of sects, each sure that it held the truth; each jealous of the entrenched position of the Established Church. Continental influence had helped to highlight the need for teacher training to the extent that the Government was prepared to initiate a national scheme, but the clash of traditional prerogatives with rights of conscience stultified its efforts. In proposing the scheme, Lord John Russell said:-

In any Normal or Model School to be established by the Board, four principal objects should be kept in view: namely, religious instruction, general instruction, moral training, and habits of industry. Of these four, I need only allude to the first. With respect to religious instruction, there is, as your Lordship is aware, a wide, or apparently wide, difference of opinion among those who have been foremost in promoting education.¹

¹Quoted by Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education, p. 239.

Having discussed the varying attitudes and the Government intention to be mindful of the "fair claims of the Established Church, and the religious freedom sanctioned by law", he closed with the sentence:-

I need only say, that it is her Majesty's wish that the youth of this kingdom should be religiously brought up, and that the rights of conscience should be respected.¹

This last was a phrase ominous to Churchmen. Lord Stanley, when demanding that the Order in Council should be rescinded, stated the Anglican case. "Education," he said, "was the peculiar province of the clergy" (he left no doubt that Anglican clergy, only, were considered) "and was a spiritual matter to be entrusted to their superintendence".² Such declarations provoked Dissenters, conscious of their independent rights which long generations of persecution had taught them to respect. Nonconformity, as its name suggests, was based on independence. Its history of repression and persecution from Church and State had made its members distrustful of both - epitomised in the Voluntaryist movement.

Other European countries had suffered persecutions for Faith's sake, yet were advancing in provision of national teacher training. This, England's passionate perversity impeded. Many years later, Dr. Rigg could still talk of:

the essential difficulties of the subject of National Education for England - where, because of our . . . liberties in Church and State, of our many religious sects, of our inborn spirit of individualism and of

¹ Ibid., p. 240.

² Annual Register, 1839, p. 143.

liberty, the difficulties have been far greater than in any other country in the world.¹

At the time, Lord Macauley testified to the awkward individualism of Nonconformists. He declared, in the House of Commons, that Protestant Nonconformists had always venerated above all, "that class of men, of high spirit and unconquerable principles," who had fought or fled the country for religious reasons.² This spirit and these principles were far from dormant in the years between 1839 and 1852.

I think that, in framing the 1839 Minute, Kay-Shuttleworth and the Committee were particularly conscious of Dissenters' fighting propensities which might easily be aroused if they believed their rights in the matter of teacher training were going to be usurped by Church or State. The proposers achieved the almost impossible task of winning a large measure of non-Anglican support for all the clauses of their 'National Normal School' scheme. They underestimated the watchful jealousies and fears in the Established Church and did not anticipate the Wesleyan reaction.

The Church of England's fears, at that vital time, were crucial in directing the course of English teacher training. The 'Church in danger' alarms succeeded in unifying Anglicanism long enough to effect its intensified determination to hold its ground. With unprecedented Wesleyan support, prevention of a civil take-over of teacher training was accomplished.

This might not have happened if the clauses of the normal school 'Minute',

¹Dr. Rigg's Reminiscences, p. 114.

²Hansard, Vol. XCI, 1010.

concerning religious instruction, had not been such as to touch on a very sensitive area at a very sensitive time. Gash calls those years, "the most testing period that the Church had passed through since the seventeenth century".¹ Besides the feeling that it was being undermined by reforming extremists within as well as attacked by growing secularism without, it suspected that the ancient partnership of Church and State was being dissolved.

The Established Church felt itself to be the State Church which should be, and was not being, defended by the State. In grim determination to maintain its educational prerogatives threatened by the normal school scheme, it refused to concede rights of conscience. This inflamed the sectarian bitterness which persistently plagued England's attempts to forge a national educational system. All Kay-Shuttleworth's diplomacy through the 1840's could only achieve the typically British compromise of state-aided, voluntary training colleges, and ensure improvement in teacher training by inspection, lectures, text-books and scholarships. He could not provide a single civil teacher-training unit.

Parliament could legislate for national teacher training colleges in Ireland or in the colonies, while utterly unable to do so at home: the closer a threat, the greater the fear and the more vehement the resistance.

One of the most prevalent fears of this period was of spreading Catholicism in England; a fear that was certainly influential in causing resistance to Government educational measures 1839-1852. Catholicism in their midst

¹Op. cit., p. 117.

was much more fearful than across the seas. All branches of English Protestantism were affected by this fear, but some of the most obsessional bigotry was found in the Wesleyan sect. Their determination to fight the 'erroneous and dangerous doctrines of Popery' was a responsible element in England's peculiar tardiness in inaugurating national teacher training colleges.

For England was peculiar, not only in having a large number of Protestant factions and 'inborn spirit of individualism', but in having, also, an Established Church which did not represent the vast majority of the citizens, as in some Catholic lands, and which included the new, potent Tractarian movement; in having a current invasion of Irish Catholic immigrants and marked Catholic resurgence; and in having had the Wesleyan Revival. Each of these affected the other and was affected by the unsettled times in a critical period of evolution from squirearchy to democracy.

Horton Davies maintains that all Dissenting denominations benefitted by the Wesleyan Methodist Revival.¹ Increased fervour there was, but this could mean increased rivalries. The religious zeal which continued as an afterglow of the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival provided the dynamism for popular education as for other reforms. It demonstrated, also, the apathy and corruption in the Church of England, prompting reform movements within the Church. The High Church reforming party - the Tractarians - aggravated Dissenters' fears and intensified their hostility to the Establishment. It intensified, too, the anti-Catholicism growing with the numbers of Irish

¹The English Free Churches, p. 143.

pouring into England from the poverty and injustice of their native land. So long as Catholics remained a small repressed sect, Dissent had supported their efforts to achieve fair recognition, but "anti-Roman Catholic feeling in England steadily increased in the twenty years after the grant of emancipation in 1829".¹

This had a powerful effect on Wesleyan reaction to a Government proposal which offered latitude to Catholics. Fears, that allowing Catholics to read their own version of the Scriptures in the projected teacher training college would stimulate the dreaded spread of 'Popery', dictated Wesleyan vehement opposition to the 1839 Minute. This alarm even overcame objections to the entrenched position of the Established Church and led to the Wesleyan-Anglican combination which I believe to be a significant factor in the defeat of the hopes for the inception of public provision of teacher training.

Figgis once called John Wesley 'the founder of undenominationalism rather than of Wesleyanism'.² It is true that throughout his life, Wesley continued to hope that his followers would remain a vibrant evangelical group within the Church of England. In the partisan sectarianism of the early Victorian era I find little evidence to support any contention of Wesleyan undenominationalism unless the phrase implies vacillation in alignments. The changes in alignments were regarded as necessitated by events and justified by the imperative duty of protecting young Wesleyans from both

¹N. Gash, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

²Typical English Churchmen, (ed. W. E. Collins) p. 218.

undue Anglican and from Catholic influence, especially the latter.

Wesleyans and Congregationalists alike deplored "the fearful amount of influence and patronage given to the parochial clergy".¹ For neither, however, was this their most overwhelming concern during the 1839-52 period. Wesleyans could, on occasion, overlook it in the more pressing need to combat Catholicism. The Congregationalists excluded Catholics from their training college but their main preoccupation became fulminations against the dangers of Government interference in education, rather than against the dangers of Catholicism. Both sects felt impelled to found their own distinctive training colleges.

The 'religious difficulty' which constituted such an impediment to a national teacher training system, was also a spur. Religious fervour - the powerful but indefinable combination of Christian zeal and watchful jealousies - precluded the '1839 Privy Council Normal School', but gave rise, in the 1840's, to many training colleges based vitally on religious convictions.

Homerton College and Westminster College were, and are, outstanding examples of this; the latter growing within the State-sect partnership which was hewn out of the 1839-47 difficulties and efforts; the former developing in defiant independence; both typifying religious and professional dedication.

¹Edward Baines, An Alarm to the Nation, p. 17.

LIST OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix:</u>	<u>Page:</u>
A. . Kay-Shuttleworth's sample of trained and untrained teachers, in 1838.	147
B. . Order in Council creating the Committee of the Privy Council on Education.	147
C. . Scheme for the National Normal School of 1839.	148
D. . Students in the Church training colleges in 1845.	150
E. . Comparison of subjects studied in four training colleges.	151
F. . Some details from Mr. Moseley's 1852 Report.	153
G. . Qualifications of Wesleyan candidate teachers in 1845.	156
H. . Edward Baines' list of normal schools in 1846.	157
J. . Questions put to candidates for training, by the Congregational Board of Education.	158
K. . Candidates accepted by the Congregational Committee of Education, in 1849.	159

APPENDIX A.

Part of Kay-Shuttleworth's submission to the
1838 Select Committee on Education.

Number of Teachers of various Classes of Day and Evening Schools, and the number who have received any Education for their Employment, in the undermentioned places:—

	Dame Schools.			Common Boys' & Girls' Schools.			Superior Private Schools.			Evening Schools.			Infant Schools.			Endowed and Charity Schools.		
	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.	Number of Teachers.	Number educated for their employment.	Not ascertained.
Manchester . . .	230	..	8	179	29	11	114	24	9	83	7	4	5	24	5	5
Salford . . .	65	10	..	42	8	..	29	14	..	28	7	..	3	13	2	..
Liverpool . . .	244	2	..	194	18	2	143	71	11	43	6	..	17	1	..	50	18	7
Bury . . .	30	2	..	17	2	..	8	6	..	6	2	4	2	..
York . . .	37	23	2	..	30	10	3	2	3	1	..	31	19	3
Totals . . .	606	14	8	455	59	13	324	125	23	162	20	4	30	2	..	122	46	15
Westminster Districts, St. Martin-in- the-Fields, St. Clement Dance, St. Mary-le- Strand, St. Paul, Co- vent Gar- den, and the Savoy . . .	21	1	5	33	9	4	32	18	2	5	3	1	14	7	3
St. John and St. Margaret St. George, St. James, and St. Anne, Scho. . . .	63	12	..	41	20	..	24	20	6	4	..	23	12	2
Totals . . .	46	7	..	55	25	..	73	54	1	6	5	..	18	10	..
Totals . . .	130	20	5	129	54	4	129	92	3	17	12	1	55	29	5

APPENDIX B.

ORDER IN COUNCIL, CREATING THE COMMITTEE OF
THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.

At the Court at Buckingham Palace, the 10th of April, 1839.

Present:

THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY IN COUNCIL.

'It is this day ordered by Her Majesty in Council, that the Most Honourable Henry, Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord-President of the Council; the Right-Honourable John William, Viscount Duncannon, Lord Privy Seal; the Right-Honourable Lord John Russell, One of H.M.'s Principal Secretaries of State; and the Right-Honourable Thomas Spring Rice, Chancellor of H.M.'s Exchequer, be, and they are hereby appointed, a Committee to superintend the Application of any Sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education.

'(Signed) C. C. GREVILLE.'

THE NATIONAL NORMAL SCHOOL OF 1839.

Extract from the Minutes of the Committee of Council appointed to superintend the Application of any Sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education.

April 13th, 1839.

Read, The following scheme for the future guidance of the Committee, viz. :—

'*Normal School.*—To found a school, in which candidates for the office of teacher in schools for the poorer classes may acquire the knowledge necessary to the exercise of their future profession, and may be practised in the most approved methods of religious and moral training and instruction.

'*Model School.*—This school to include a Model School, in which children of all ages from three to fourteen, may be taught and trained, in sufficient numbers to form an Infant School, as well as schools for children above seven.

'*Religious Instruction in Model School.*—Religious instruction to be considered as general and special.

'*General.*—Religion to be combined with the whole matter of instruction, and to regulate the entire system of discipline.

'*Special.*—Periods to be set apart for such peculiar doctrinal instruction as may be required for the religious training of the children.

'*Chaplain.*—To appoint a chaplain to conduct the religious instruction of children whose parents or guardians belong to the Established Church.

'*Dissenters.*—The parent or natural guardian of any other child to be permitted to secure the attendance of the licensed minister of his own persuasion, at the period appointed for special religious instruction, in order to give such instruction apart.

'*Licensed Minister.*—To appoint a licensed minister to give such special religious instruction wherever the number of children in attendance on the Model School belonging to any religious body dissenting from the Established Church is such as to appear to this Committee to require such special provision.

'*Scriptures read daily in School.*—A portion of every day to be devoted to the reading of the Scriptures in the School, under the general direction of the Committee, and superintendence of the Rector. *Roman Catholics.*—Roman Catholics, if their parents or guardians require it, to read their own version of the Scriptures, either at the time fixed for reading the Scriptures, or at the hours of special instruction.

'*Simultaneous Method Classes.*—To arrange the classes in separate rooms or sections of the same apartment, divided by partitions, so as to enable the simultaneous method to be applied to 40 or 50 children of similar proficiency.

'*Gallery.*—To adopt means to assemble a greater number of children for simultaneous instruction on subjects not so technical as to require a division into classes of 50.

'*Instruction in Industry.*—To include instruction in industry as a special department of the moral training of the children.

'*Special Character of Secular Instruction.*—To give such a character to the matter of instruction in the school as to keep it in close relation with the condition of workmen and servants.

'*Physical Training.*—Besides the physical training of the children in various employments, to introduce such exercises during the hours of recreation as will develop their strength and activity.

'*Moral Training.*—To render the moral training of the children at all times an object of special solicitude.

‘NORMAL SCHOOL.

‘*Candidate Teachers to reside.*—To provide apartments for the residence of the candidate teachers.

‘*Class-Rooms.*—To construct the class-rooms so as to afford the candidate teachers an opportunity of attending each class in the Model School without distracting the attention of the children or of the teacher.

‘*Means of Instruction and Training.*—To provide means for the instruction of the candidate teachers in the theory of their art, and for furnishing them with whatever knowledge is necessary for success in it.

‘*Rector: his duties.*—To appoint a Rector to give lectures upon the method and matter of instruction, and on the whole art of training children of the poor. To regulate the reading and exercises of the candidate teachers, and to examine them. To determine the order in which they may be admitted to the practice of their art in the school, and at length intrusted with the conjoint management of classes, and to superintend their ultimate examination, subject to the rules of this Committee.

‘*Religious Instruction of Candidate Teachers.*—The religious instruction of the candidate teachers to form an essential and prominent element of their studies, and no certificate to be granted unless the authorised religious teacher has previously attested his confidence in the character, religious knowledge, and zeal of the candidate whose religious instruction he has superintended.

‘*Chaplain to instruct Teachers belonging to Established Church.*—The religious instruction of all candidate teachers connected with the Established Church to be committed to the Chaplain, and the special religious instruction to be committed (in any case in which a wish to that effect is expressed) to the licensed Minister of the religious persuasion of the candidate teacher, who is to attend the school at stated periods, to assist and examine the candidate teachers in their reading on religious subjects, and to afford them spiritual advice.

‘*Internal Discipline of Normal School.*—The candidate teachers in all other respects to conform to such regulations as respects the entire internal economy of the household as may be issued by the Rector, with the approval of this Committee.

‘*Number of Children in Model School. Boarders.*—To provide accommodation in the Model School for at least 450 children, who should lodge in the household, viz. 120 infants, 200 boys and girls receiving ordinary instruction, and 50 boys and 50 girls receiving superior instruction, and 30 children probably absent from sickness or other causes.

‘*Day School.*—To establish a day school of 150 or 200 children of all ages and both sexes, in which the candidate teachers may realise the application of the best methods of instruction, under the limitations and obstructions which must arise in a small village or town day school.’

APPENDIX D.

From Mr. Moseley's report:

Minutes of the Committee in Council on Education,
1845, pp. 333-334.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS actually under instruction in the CHURCH TRAINING COLLEGES.

Institution.	Accommodation.	Number in Training.	Period of Training.
St. Mark's College	72	53	Three years.
Battersea	About 80	71	One year and a half; minimum period.
Whitlands	74, when alterations are completed	54	Two years; minimum period.
Westminster, Manchester Buildings.	40	40	From 6 to 12 months; 6 months minimum.
Westminster, Smith Square, Girls' Infant School—Mistresses.	56; 29 in the Institution, and 26 in rooms adjoining.	51	From 6 to 12 months; 6 months minimum.
Canterbury	4 Masters. 6 Mistresses.	5 Masters. 4 Mistresses.	There is no prescribed minimum period of training; but the Board give no encouragement to parties who do not remain six months.
York and Ripon	36 Masters. 20 Mistresses.	36 8	"A year is the least time recognized for residence." Exhibitioners kept mostly three years.
Durham	Average time of residence, 6 months. 13 the new Building—20 when erected; and, if necessary, 5 or 6 more.	13
Winchester	19	19	Six months minimum.
Chichester	13, but not conveniently; a Building is likely to be erected for 20 or 25 pupils.	10—13 before Christmas.	Two years.
Brighton	16 Females.	11; several likely to be admitted on the 25th.	One year.
Exeter	20	19	Three years; but may be appointed to Schools sooner, with the sanction of the Committee.
Bristol	12	6	Three years; rule may perhaps be relaxed in particular cases.
Litchfield	26	26	Two years.
Lincoln	No limit; the School, which is for the middle classes, with a Training Department attached, will accommodate 60 Boarders.	1 at present.	Two years; but none of the five who have already left the School have been in it above a year and a half, and some were there for a much shorter period.
Llandaff (Newport)	Not boarded at the School, so there is no fixed number.	2 Masters. 2 Mistresses.	From three to twelve months.
Norwich	3 Masters. 7 Mistresses.	..	Three months for Candidates for situations.
	or 8 on an emergency. Married Teachers find lodgings for themselves, and others whose parents reside in Norwich continue with them.		
Oxford, for Masters	28	14	One year the shortest time.
Kidlington, for Mistresses .	40, or more.	6; average number 10.	Six months the shortest time.
Salisbury	28	26	Six months the shortest, three years longest.
Chester, for Masters	70 at present; but if the commercial Scholars were excluded, there would be accommodation for 110.	41	One year the minimum.
Warrington, for School Mistresses.	35	20	One year minimum, five years maximum.

APPENDIX E.

Comparison of subjects studied in three Church of England colleges and the 'British and Foreign' normal school.

From The Training of Teachers, (R.W.Rich) pp.106-106.

Subjects studied, and Distribution of Time, at Battersea, St Mark's, Chester, and Borough Road

1. BATTERSEA (Minutes of Committee of Council, 1842-3, p. 115):

Subject	Hours of work (per week)	
	1st class	2nd class
	hr.	hr.
Religious instruction	6	6
Geography	3	3
Reading, etymology and grammar	5	8
English composition	2	2
English history	2	2
Arithmetic	2	2
Pure mathematics and mensuration	4	2
Mechanics and natural philosophy	6	5
Pestalozzi	1	2
Music	6	6
(Teaching in village school)	15	15
(Preparation for teaching)	5	5
(Garden work)	16	16

2. ST MARK'S (H. Barnard, *op. cit.* p. 352):

Subject	Hours of work (per week)	
	Top class	Bottom class
	hr. min.	hr. min.
(Chapel)	6 0	6 0
(Evening worship)	3 30	3 30
Scripture and Christian doctrine	2 5	3 40
Church history and Bible literature	2 20	2 40
Latin	6 15	6 0
English grammar, literature, and history	7 10	3 50
Geography	2 30	5 20
Writing	30	4 0
Arithmetic	20	3 30
Geometry	2 50	—
Algebra and trigonometry	2 20	—
Mechanics and natural philosophy	2 0	—
Music	7 10	7 10
Drawing	4 0	4 0
Normal lessons	3 0	—
Private reading	1 30	—
Preparing lessons ¹	—	9 0
(Meals)	8 45	8 45
(Leisure)	6 0	6 0
Practising chapel music	6 0	6 0

¹ This does not mean preparation of lessons to be taught.

3. CHESTERHours of work
(per week)

Subject	hr.	min.	APPENDIX E (cont.)
Scriptural knowledge	8	0	
Evidences of Christianity	1	0	
Church history	1	20	
English grammar	3	30	
English history	1	0	
English literature (including themes and writing from memory)	2	40	
Education (lectures, reading and essays)	12	0	
Arithmetic	5	10	
Algebra	1	0	
Euclid	1	0	
Mensuration	1	0	
Natural and experimental philosophy		40	
Lecture (subject not specified)	1	0	
Writing	1	40	
Geography	2	0	
Vocal music	3	0	
Linear drawing	2	0	
Preparation for lessons	4	30	
(Leisure)	15	0	

4. BOROUGH ROAD (summarised from Tutor's Report on the Upper and Junior Classes, British and Foreign School Society, *Annual Report*, 1845, pp. 41-50):*Upper Class:* Syllabus of Subjects.

English: (1) Grammar, (2) Formation and derivation of words, (3) Composition. No systematic course on Literature.

Geography: Inductive study as far as possible. Etymology of geographical names.

History: Salient events in various countries, chiefly England.

Mathematics: Full and systematic study of principles of arithmetic. "Demonstrative geometry" (individual study).

Natural philosophy: Popular treatment, reference to common instances.

Natural history: Only zoology, including visits to the Zoological Gardens and Museums.

These subjects were studied for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours on three evenings a week, the method adopted being conversational lectures based on the society's lesson books. Each morning from 6 to 8.30 was spent in private study, and there was an hour's lecture on pedagogy each day. Two evenings were devoted to instruction in singing.

Junior Class:

English grammar	3 hours and weekly examination (1 hour).
Geography and history	2 hours " "
Arithmetic	2 hours " "
Geometry	1 hour
Physics	$1\frac{1}{2}$ hours
Reading	1 hour
Elocution	1 hour
Copybooks	$\frac{1}{2}$ hour
Drawing	$\frac{1}{2}$ hour

Students wrote one dictation a week (marked by two students under supervision of tutor) and wrote weekly letter to tutor. Regular Bible study took place, and there was a weekly examination in "Sacred history and Geography".

APPENDIX F.

Some details from Mr. Moseley's 1852 report;
Minutes of the Committee in Council on Education, 1852.

SUMMARY (p. 257).

Name of the College.	Date of Establishment.	Total Number of Students trained since it was established.	Number for whom Accommodation is provided.	Number resident at Time of Inspection, including Queen's Scholars.	Number of Queen's Scholars resident at Time of Inspection.	Percentage of Number of resident on whole Number of Queen's Scholars.	Number of Students who entered during Year ending Midsummer 1852.	Number of Students who left during Year ending Midsummer 1852.	Prescribed Time of Residence in Years.	Average Time of Residence of the Students who left in the Year ending Midsummer 1852.	Certificates at Christmas 1852.		Queen's Scholarships, Christmas 1852.		Amount of public Grant on account of Certificates and Queen's Scholarships at Christmas 1852.	Fee paid annually by each Student.	Duration of annual Vacations in Weeks.
											Number of Candi- dates.	Number of Certifi- cates granted.	Number of Candi- dates.	Number of Schol- ars appointed.			
Battersea*	1840	491	84	14	16	70	13	1 to 2	1 0	67	51	67	12	9	490	2	11
Caermarthen	1848	114	43	4	0	32	13	2 to 3	—	32	11	13	4	7	210	25	10
Caernarvon	1844	84†	18	—	—	15	8	1 1/2	1 3	15	6	—	—	—	210	23	9
Chelsea, St. Mark's.	1841	186	72	15	20	31	18	3	2 1/2	70	50	30	11	7	415	23	10
Cheltenham*	1847	110	77	12	15	41	50	—	1 4	73	51	53	10	—	473	27 or 20†.	—
Chester	1839	506	70	9	20	26	20	1 to 5	1 7	36	15	27	8	3	200	23	9
Chichester	1840	52	18	0	33	8	9	2	1 1/2	21	9	11	4	—	100	50	11
Durham	1811	79	25	—	—	13	10§	1 1/2	1 yr. 6 mo. or 3 mo.	18	10	13	0	—	150	14	10
Exeter	1840	41	23	—	—	10	4	1 to 5	3 4	27	18	13	4	0	220	18†, 20†, 21†, for 1st year, then 20†.	10
Highway (Metropolitan).	1850	15	48	9	18	41	13	Not less than 1.	1 3	26	14	23	9	3	235	—	9
Winchester	1840	115	13	—	—	8	13	—	1 1/2	13	12	13	3	0	215	—	10
Worcester	Apr. 1832	80	5	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	28	5	10	325	23	10
York and Ripon	1841	194	45	11	24	23	20	1 to 3	2 0	41	25	42	9	2	265	23	9
Total		1,740	513	80	—	325	102	—	1 9	438	233	541	94	56	—	—	—

* The returns from Battersea and Cheltenham are made up to Christmas 1852.
 † Besides this number, 18 were trained in 1849 for short periods, 41 in 1850, and 71 in 1851.
 ‡ The students at Caermarthen live in lodgings.
 § Five of these were recommended to withdraw after three months probation, on account of ill-health, or inaptitude for the office of the teacher.
 ¶ Four of these afterwards obtained situations as masters of schools.

APPENDIX F (cont.)

Rev. H. Moseley's Report.

Minutes

PP. 258 and 259.

EXPENDITURE.

College.	Average Number of Students resident.	No. of Masters		Tuition.	Books, Apparatus, Printing, Stationery, Postages, &c.	Rent, Rates, Taxes, &c.	Household and other current Expenses.	Other Expenses not being current Expenses.	Total.
		Constantly employed.	Occasionally employed.						
Battersca	71	3	5	£ 970 0 0	£ 152 16 5	£ 345 3 10	£ 2,301 9 2	£ 307 4 0	£ 4,136 13 11
Caernarthen	37	3	1	600 3 4	34 17 3	20 5 7	900 10 2	-	1,633 16 4
Caernarvon	18	1	2	185 0 0	10 13 0	20 0 0	107 4 10	7 16 4	330 14 8
Chelsea (St. Mark's)	72	4	5	1,205 2 6	364 6 11	217 6 5	2,892 13 4	2,290 19 4	6,050 8 6
Cheltenham	77	4	2	980 0 0	75 6 7	74 6 0	1,129 6 7	874 0 0	3,332 13 11
Chester	37	4	5	768 5 0	44 9 11	32 13 6	931 3 3	124 14 1	1,901 5 9
Chichester	16	1	4	250 0 0	32 0 0	26 8 0	498 5 8	-	*796 15 5
Durham	19	2	2	190 8 6	25 4 11	18 16 1	346 7 0	30 16 0	620 13 0
Exeter	23	2	3	230 5 3	40 13 9	77 3 8	523 5 1	-	871 7 9
Highbury	34	3	6	960 18 6	160 19 2	51 8 2	1,229 12 0	459 6 0	2,863 3 10
Winchester	14	2	3	403 4 0	7 0 0	-	360 2 6	-	773 6 6
York and Ripon	50	3	3	897 10 6	175 1 1	104 10 7	953 19 0	12 10 9	2,144 0 11
Total	468	32	41	7,374 17 7	1,123 9 0	967 15 10	12,223 18 7	4,166 16 6	26,413 18 4

* The expenses at Chichester are calculated on the average of the quarter ending at Midsummer 1852.

INCOME.

College.	Subscriptions and Donations specially for the Use of the College.	Grants from Diocesan Boards or from the National Society.	Fees of Students.	*Government Exhibitions for Queen's Scholars.	*Government Grants consequent upon Certificates obtained by Students.	Exhibitions founded by Diocesan Boards or by the National Society.	Exhibitions founded by private Patrons.	Collections made in Churches specially for the Support of the College.	Special Contributions to the Building Fund.	Fees of the Model or Practising School.	Income arising from other Sources.	Total.
Battersca	£ 1,013 5 0	£ 1,000 0 0	£ 1,106 8 11	£ 310 0 0	£ 365 0 0	-	-	£ 15 2 0	-	-	-	£ 3,890 15 11
Caernarthen	-	706 11 4	397 9 0	785 0 0	215 0 0	-	146 16 0	-	-	-	-	1,633 16 4
Caernarvon	52 4 0	300 0 0	-	-	-	-	10 0 0	-	-	-	-	302 4 0
Chelsea, St. Mark's.	290 15 0	3,100 0 0	1,135 14 0	375 0 0	995 0 0	-	25 0 0	-	113 11 6	135 4 2	122 11 7	6,405 6 3
Cheltenham	558 10 6	-	812 1 0	300 0 0	415 0 0	-	-	-	1,533 14 6	-	-	3,379 5 0
Chester	-	324 16 10	703 2 6	205 0 0	90 0 0	71 17 6	12 10 0	-	95 16 5	32 11 4	23 7 0	1,596 1 7
Chichester	380 0 0	-	180 0 0	130 0 0	60 0 0	-	-	-	-	-	-	685 0 0
Durham	357 19 0	25 0 0	237 1 11	-	175 0 0	-	-	-	-	-	10 11 6	744 12 5
Exeter	380 4 0	170 4 0	280 8 0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84 3 2	914 9 8
Highbury	1,564 6 10	-	674 13 5	205 0 0	65 0 0	-	45 0 0	102 13 0	-	259 10 0	17 4 3	2,663 7 8
Winchester	403 4 6	-	305 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85 17 4	791 6 6
York and Ripon	-	331 16 5	920 10 6	250 0 0	405 0 0	275 0 0	-	-	-	24 0 0	-	2,144 0 11
Total	5,000 8 10	5,958 8 7	6,752 13 9	1,900 0 0	2,765 0 0	346 17 0	230 6 0	117 15 0	1,743 2 5	451 5 6	652 14 10	25,209 6 5

* The Government grants for certificates and Queen's scholarships are those made for the year ending Christmas 1852, and are taken from the Minutes 1851-52, Vol. I. p. 243.

This was a special grant for Welsh exhibitions.

APPENDIX F (cont.)

TABLE of the Number and Proportion per Cent. of Candidates who obtained Certificates in each Training School.

Name of Training School.	No. of Candidates.		1st Class.			2d Class.			3d Class.			Failures.											
			Certificates.		No.	Proportion per Cent.	No.	Proportion per Cent.	No.	Proportion per Cent.	No.			Proportion per Cent.									
			No.	Proportion per Cent.											1st Division.	2d Division.	3d Division.	1st Division.	2d Division.	3d Division.	1st Division.	2d Division.	3d Division.
Battersea	67	51	76.11	1	1.49	2	3.96	5	7.46	5	7.46	3	4.47	6	8.95	9	13.43	13	19.40	7	10.44	16	23.69
Caermarthen	32	11	34.37	—	—	—	—	1	3.12	1	3.12	—	—	1	3.12	—	—	5	15.62	3	9.37	21	65.03
Caernarvon	15	5	33.30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6.66	2	13.32	2	13.32	10	66.66
Chelsea, St. Mark's.	78	56	73.68	—	—	2	2.63	3	3.94	9	11.84	5	6.57	12	15.78	9	11.84	8	10.52	8	10.52	20	25.51
Cheltenham	75	51	68.00	—	—	1	1.33	12	16.00	9	12.00	6	8.00	5	6.65	3	4.00	0	12.00	6	8.00	24	32.00
Chester	30	15	41.66	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	5.55	3	8.33	2	5.55	3	8.33	3	8.33	2	5.55	21	58.33
Chichester	12	9	74.97	—	—	—	—	1	8.33	—	—	2	16.66	1	8.33	2	16.66	2	16.66	1	8.33	3	25.00
Durham	18	16	88.88	—	—	1	5.55	—	—	1	5.55	—	—	3	16.66	1	5.55	0	33.33	4	22.22	2	11.11
Exeter	27	18	66.66	—	—	—	—	1	3.70	2	7.40	—	—	2	7.40	5	18.50	6	22.20	2	7.40	9	33.33
Highbury	28	14	53.84	—	—	—	—	1	3.84	—	—	—	—	3	11.53	2	7.69	2	7.69	6	23.07	12	46.15
Kneller Hall	27	20	74.07	—	—	—	—	2	7.40	3	11.10	—	—	3	11.10	3	11.10	7	25.90	2	7.40	7	25.90
Winchester	13	12	92.30	—	—	1	7.69	1	7.69	1	7.69	—	—	1	7.69	—	—	2	15.38	6	46.15	1	7.69
York	41	25	60.97	—	—	—	—	1	2.43	—	—	—	—	4	9.75	6	14.63	5	12.19	9	21.95	16	39.02

TABLE in which the Results given in the preceding Tables are compared with the Times in which these Results have been attained in different Training Schools.

Name of Training School.	Numbers per Cent. of Candidates in each Training School whose Exercises were marked Excellent, Good and Fair, divided respectively by the average Numbers of Months during which the Candidates had been resident in those Training Schools.																	
	Scriptural Knowledge.	Arithmetic.	Grammar.	Geography.	English History.	Music.	School Management.	Church History.	Model Drawing.	Geometry.	Mensuration.	Algebra.	Physical Science.	Higher Mathematics.	Welsh.	Latin.	Greek.	French.
Battersea	7.11	5.62	5.80	5.05	4.47	2.18	2.48	4.93	0.91	5.50	1.95	3.67	3.00	0.68	—	—	—	—
Caermarthen	1.95	2.15	2.34	1.76	0.98	0.30	0.78	2.73	—	2.02	0.97	1.17	0.30	0.39	1.36	—	—	—
Caernarvon	2.86	5.24	4.70	0.47	0.95	—	6.19	0.47	—	1.00	2.38	1.90	2.38	—	0.95	—	—	—
Chelsea, St. Mark's	3.39	3.07	3.56	2.58	2.63	0.87	2.03	2.63	—	2.34	1.15	2.70	0.71	0.60	—	—	0.10	0.10
Cheltenham	5.44	4.56	5.38	4.30	4.12	0.52	3.75	2.88	—	4.29	3.06	2.10	4.03	2.01	—	0.17	0.17	—
Chester	2.00	4.63	3.86	2.16	2.47	.46	1.23	1.07	—	3.39	2.77	1.23	1.69	0.30	—	—	—	—
Chichester	5.21	5.73	3.65	3.65	3.65	—	3.12	3.64	—	5.72	2.60	3.06	1.50	1.04	—	0.52	—	—
Durham	5.24	3.70	4.32	4.94	2.78	—	3.70	5.25	—	3.40	1.54	0.31	1.54	—	—	—	—	—
Exeter	2.74	2.84	2.47	1.60	1.23	—	0.62	2.22	—	2.71	0.61	0.86	1.10	0.61	—	—	—	—
Highbury	4.14	4.08	5.53	2.18	3.12	0.72	5.53	1.68	—	3.84	0.48	0.72	0.72	0.24	—	—	—	0.48
Kneller Hall	6.26	3.42	5.98	2.85	4.27	0.57	4.84	1.99	—	5.60	1.42	2.27	2.56	—	—	—	—	0.28
Winchester	3.20	3.85	3.85	2.24	1.92	0.96	2.88	2.88	—	3.20	0.96	1.28	1.00	0.64	—	—	—	—
York	2.93	2.68	3.78	2.44	2.80	—	1.95	1.34	—	2.44	1.59	1.70	0.61	0.24	—	—	—	—

From WESLEYAN EDUCATION REPORTS, 1845.

xii

QUALIFICATIONS OF CANDIDATES.

For general information the following particulars, as to the qualifications required in Candidates for training, are subjoined.

It is expected of all Candidates coming before this Committee, that they be truly converted to God, and be accredited members of the Wesleyan Society.

That they possess a competent knowledge of Elementary Theology, and especially of that system of religious doctrine and discipline which is held by the Wesleyan Body, as set forth in the writings of Mr. Wesley, and in the Conference Catechisms.

That they have a correct acquaintance with the leading facts of Scripture History.

That they be familiar with the outlines of English History and Geography.

That they be accurately conversant with the principles of English Grammar and Common Arithmetic.

That they be free from bodily defect or deformity, from any known predisposition to disease, and from pecuniary embarrassment.

That they know the Theory of Music, or, at least, be able to lead the Children in singing, which is now regarded as an important instrument of moral and intellectual training.

It may, in some cases, happen, that individuals who are, upon the whole, suitable for this work, and possessed of adequate capabilities, may yet be defective in some of the above qualifications. In such cases, it is hoped, such local assistance may be given as may, in a short time, enable such persons to come with credit before the Committee.

Any further information needed will be gladly afforded on application to one of the Secretaries,—Jonathan Crowther, 3, Chester Place, Kennington Cross; John C. Pengelly, 24, City Road; and Thomas Vasey, 32, King Square, Goswell Road.

APPENDIX H.

Number of NORMAL SCHOOLS in existence, 1846;

From Letter to Lord Lansdowne, (Feb. 4th., 1847) p. 8,

written by Edward Baines.

I quote the following from the Report of the National Society for 1846, and the Reports of the other Societies named :-

NORMAL SCHOOLS, 1846.		
	Students.	Accommodation.
National Society's Normal Schools :		
Battersea	72	75
St. Mark's College, Chelsea	59	70
Westminster Training Institution	146	—
Whitlands, Chelsea	54	76
Diocesan Training Institutions,		
<i>For Schoolmasters :</i>		
Canterbury	4	4
York and Ripon (at York)	36	36
Durham	13	13
Winchester	19	19
Chester	41	70
Chichester	10	13
Exeter	19	20
Gloucester and Bristol	6	12
Lichfield	26	26
Lincoln	1	—
Llandaff (at Newport)	3	—
Norwich	3	—
Oxford	14	23
<i>For Schoolmistresses :</i>		
Canterbury	4	6
York and Ripon (at York)	8	20
Chester (at Warrington)	20	35
Chichester (at Brighton)	11	16
Norwich	7	7
Oxford (at Kidlington)	6	40
Salisbury	26	30
British and Foreign School Society	103	—
Home and Colonial Infant and Juvenile School Society	156*	—
Brecon Normal School	28	—
Congregational Training Institution : Rotherhithe	—	12
Total	894	—

HERE we have Normal Schools containing about 900 students, with accommodation for about 1,100. In addition to which, the excellent Training School at Glasgow furnishes many teachers to English schools; the British and Foreign School Society has projected Four New Normal Schools in populous districts; and the Wesleyans contemplate the establishment of a Training Institution. The great Normal Schools in London and Scotland are, for the most part, conducted in a manner to vie with any establishments of the kind in the world; and the teachers they are sending forth by hundreds will inevitably produce a great reform in our elementary schools. If there should yet be a demand for more Normal Schools, as I believe there is, they are as certain to be supplied as the wants of our population in food and clothing. To most of the Normal Schools the Government makes grants; but I am confident that the Schools would be maintained by public liberality, if nothing were received from the Government.

* This number instructed during the year.

APPENDIX J.

Second Annual Report of the Congregational Board
of Education, May 1846;
concerning selection of candidates
for teacher training.

Questions to be answered in the hand-writing of every Candidate to be educated by the Board for the office of Teacher.

1. What is your name, your age, your birth-place, and present residence?
2. To what ministers, or other persons can you refer, who are competent from their personal knowledge of you, to bear testimony to your religious character, temper and disposition, and general adaptation to discharge the duties of the office for which you are a candidate?
3. What reasons have decided you in the selection of the office of teacher?
4. What qualifications do you consider to be necessary for the office?
5. Is your health usually sound, or have you been the subject of any serious illness, and of what nature; or have you any chronic disease, or natural defect?
6. Are you married? if so, and you have children, state their ages and number.
7. How have you been employed, and what was the reason of giving up such employment?
8. What education have you had, and where did you receive it?
9. What knowledge have you of English Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography, English History, Drawing, Music, and Singing?
10. Have you been accustomed to teach in Sunday Schools?
11. Have you been engaged in the service of any society, and in what capacity?
12. Are you in debt, or have you any encumbrance that would interfere with your studies? If in debt, state the nature and amount of your liabilities.
13. What is the name and the denomination of the minister you are in the habit of hearing; and are you a member of the church of which he is a pastor?

Prefix the number to your answers which corresponds with the number of the questions.

Every approved Candidate will be received on Two Months' probation; and at the expiration of that period, if accepted, will receive, Twelve Months' Board and Education, free of expense. No person will be continued, however, for that period, if found to be indolent, or neglecting the classes and duties of the School. All teachers who diligently and honourably complete their course of training, will be certificated by the Board.

APPENDIX K.

From Minutes of the Congregational Education Committee.

24

Meeting of Committee

August 31. 1849.

Rev. J. James.. G. Rose Mess^r H. Child
W. Keitt. Miss Whitmore also present

The following Candidates assembled & individually underwent Examination as to their attainments, motives & principles: and were admitted on 2 months probation

	age	members		
1 Emma Monk	20	Yes	Independent	
2 Frances Knight	17	Yes	do	
3 Charlotte Edwards	30	Yes	do	
4 Maria Gosling	19	Yes	do	
5 J. E. Haskard	23	Yes	do	
6 Herenbappuch Sinsdale	18	no	Baptist	
7 R. S. Francis	19	yes	Independent	
8 E. Fletcher	22	yes	do	
9 M. Blanchett	18	no	do	
10 W. W. Giles	30	yes	do	
11 H. E. Hunt	20	no	do	
12 C. G. Thompson	19	yes	angl.	do
13 L. Thresher	24	yes	do	
14 Jane Annings	23	yes	do	

SOURCES CONSULTED

- Adams, F., The History of the Elementary School Contest in England. London: Chapman & Hall, 1882.
- Adkins, T., A History of St. John's College, Battersea. London: National Society's Depository, 1906.
- Arnold, M., Reports on Elementary Schools 1850-1882. Ed. F. S. Marvin; London: H. M. S. O., 1908.
- Beck, G. A., (ed.) The English Catholics 1850-1950. London: Burns Oates, 1950.
- Binns, H. B., A Century of Education. London: Dent, 1908.
- Bowen, D., The Idea of the Victorian Church. Montreal: McGill U. P., 1968.
- Brose, O. J., Church and Parliament. Stanford U. P., 1959.
- Brown, F. K., The Church's Part in Education 1833-1841. London: S. P. C. K., 1942.
- _____, Fathers of the Victorians. Cambridge U. P., 1961.
- Cecil, D., Lord M. London: Constable, 1954.
- Chadwick, O., The Victorian Church. Oxford U. P., 1970.
- Cockshutt, A. O. J., Anglican Attitudes. London: Collins, 1959.
- Cowherd, R. G., The Politics of English Dissent. London: Epworth Press, 1959.
- Craig, A. R., The Philosophy of Training. London: Simpkin & Marshall, (2nd ed.) 1847.
- Cruickshank, M., Church and State in English Education. Macmillans; St. Martin's Press, 1963.
- Dale, R. W., History of English Congregationalism. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907.
- Davies, H., The English Free Churches. Oxford U. P., 1963.
- Gash, N., Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics 1832-1852. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- Hammond, B. and J. L., The Bleak Age. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1934.
- Harrison, J. F. C., The Early Victorians 1832-1851. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1971.
- Jones, M., The Charity School Movement. Cambridge U. P., 1938.
- Jones, L. G. E., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales. Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
- Jones, R. T., Congregationalism in England 1662-1962. London: Independent Press, 1962.
- Judges, A. V., ed. Pioneers of English Education. London: Faber & Faber, 1962.
- Kay-Shuttleworth, J., Four Periods of Public Education. London: Longmans, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1862.
- _____, Memorandum on Popular Education. (1868) New York: Kelley, 1969.

- Kelley, A. M., ed. The Central Society of Education. (Papers, 1837-9) New York: Kelley, 1969.
- Mathews, H. F., Methodism and the Education of the People. London: Epworth Press, 1949.
- de Montmorency, J. E. G., National Education and National Life. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1906.
- Moore, H. K., An Unwritten Chapter in the History of Education. London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Murphy, J., Church, State and Schools in Britain 1800-1970. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Owen, R., Life of Robert Owen. London: 1857.
- Pollard, H. M., Pioneers of Popular Education 1750-1850. London: Murray, 1956.
- Pritchard, F. C., The Story of Westminster College 1851-1951. London: Epworth Press, 1951.
- Rich, R. W., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge U. P., 1933.
- Rigg, J. H., Dr. Rigg's Reminiscences. London: Gulley, 1904.
- Roberts, R., The Life and Opinions of Robert Roberts: (a wandering scholar, 1834-1885) ed. J. H. Davis: Cardiff: William Lewis, 1923.
- Roberts, R. D., ed. Education in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge U. P., 1901.
- Scotland, J., The History of Scottish Education. London: U. of L. Press, 1969.
- Silber, K., The Life of Pestalozzi. London: Routledge, 1960.
- Silver, H., The Concept of Popular Education. London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1965.
- Smith, F., History of English Elementary Education 1760-1902. London: U. of L. Press, 1931.
- _____, The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. London: John Murray, 1923.
- Southy, R. S., The Life of the Rev. Andrew Bell. Vol. 1. Murray, 1944.
- Southy, C. C., The Life of the Rev. Andrew Bell. (Vols. 2 & 3) Murray, 1944.
- Stewart, W. A. C., Quakers and Education. London: Epworth, 1953.
- Stow, D., The Training System. London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 10th ed. 1854.
- Sturt, M., The Education of the People. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Sutherland, G., Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century. The Historical Association, London: 1971.
- Tropp, A., The School Teachers. London: Heinemann, 1957.

Manuscripts:

- "Congregationalism and the Education of the People" A. McLellan, 1963.
(Birmingham Univ.)
- "The History of Homerton College" W. Simms, 1960. (Homerton College)
- "Lord Melbourne's 2nd Administration and the Opposition, 1837-1841."
H. Cameron, 1969. (U. of L.)

REPORTS, TRACTS, LETTERS and other DOCUMENTS.Hansard.Mirror of Parliament.Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education. London:

1839-1853 pub. William Clowes for H. M. S. O.

1853-1854 Eyre & Spottiswode "

Minutes of the Methodist Education Committee; 1836-1856.

Minutes of the Methodist Conference, 1840-1854. Published yearly by
John Mason, London.

Wesleyan Education Reports 1836-1851.

In longhand:

- Reports of the Congregational Board of Education, 1844-1854.
- Minute books of the above, from May 16th, 1845 to August 30th, 1851.
- Minutes, reports, letters, of the Congregational Committee of General
Education, 1843 (Nov. 5th) to April 30th, 1845.
- Minutes of the Conference of the Congregational Union of England and
Wales, at Leeds, Oct. 1843.

Tracts:

- "The School in its Relation to the State, the Church and the Congregation."
Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, London: John Murray, 1847.
- "National Education: The Duty of England." David Stow; London: Hatchard
& Co., 1847.
- "Teaching or Training." David Stow; Hatchard & Sons, 1847.
- "An Alarm to the Nation." Edward Baines; London: Simpkin & Marshall,
1847.
- "The Late Struggle for Freedom of Education." The Congregational Board
of Education, 1847.
- The Watchman (1839 issues in particular).

Letters:

- From Rev. D. Coleridge to Rt. Hon. Sir John Coleridge, 1861.
- From Edward Baines to Lord Lansdowne, February 5th, 1847.
- From Kay-Shuttleworth to The Times, March 12th, 1847.

Letters (cont'd)

From the Congregational Committee of Education to their Churches,
January 4th, 1844.

Commemorative Lecture (22nd Dec. 1937): "The Life and Work of David
Stow." Published: G. P. Inish, Edinburgh, 1938.

Cambridge Historical Journal, XII 1956. "The Religious Difficulties of
National Education in England, 1800-1870." G. F. A. Best.