

**The New Education Fellowship and the
reconstruction of education: 1945 to 1966**

Christopher Clews

List of abbreviations

AEF	American Education Fellowship
IHQ	International Headquarters
ENEF	English New Education Fellowship
HMI	His/Her Majesty's Inspector/ate
LEA	Local Education Authority
NA	National Archives
NEF	New Education Fellowship
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NUT	National Union of Teachers
PEA	Progressive Education Association
TES	Times Educational Supplement
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation
USA	United States of America
WEA	Workers' Educational Association
WEF	World Education Foundation

Declaration

I hereby declare that, except where explicit attribution is made, the work presented in this thesis is entirely my own.

Word count (exclusive of bibliography): 79,980 words.

Christopher James Clews

20 June 2009

Abstract

During the 1920s and 1930s, the New Education Fellowship (NEF), founded in 1919, established itself as an important international force for radical education and educational experimentation. Its membership was drawn from many different countries and included some of the most prominent progressive educators of that period. By 1945, however, the movement was experiencing international decline. Membership had fallen and in many countries the new educational network had ceased to exist. This situation was a result not only of the destruction of the new educational network in Europe during the Second World War, but also of the change in the outlook of educationists and reformers who sought new solutions to the problems of the reconstruction of society and education.

The purpose of this study is to explore the NEF's importance as a disseminator of educational and political ideals after 1945 and its contribution to debates about the post-war reconstruction of education and society, using the considerable but currently little-researched material held at the Institute of Education, University of London. This thesis examines the NEF's network after 1945 and considers how far the NEF successfully extended its membership amongst school teachers and educationists at teacher training colleges. The NEF also sought to develop an international network. The international activities of the NEF, both through links with other organisations, for example, the United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and its membership in those countries where the NEF maintained branches are explored in order to gauge the success of the NEF as a movement with internationalist ambitions.

Contents

Title page	i
List of abbreviations	ii
Declaration	iii
Abstract	iv
Contents	v
Acknowledgements	viii
CHAPTER ONE: The New Education Fellowship	1
Research focus	5
Secondary sources	13
Primary sources and methodology	34
Structure of thesis	43
CHAPTER TWO: Challenges facing the NEF after 1945	46
Membership and Structure of the NEF	47
Finances	51
Ideology before 1945	58
Ideology in 1945	64
The new education in the USA	70
The new education in Europe	77
Conclusion	80
CHAPTER THREE: The NEF 1946–1966: a new ideology	83
Introduction	83
Social change	84

The international response	91
A new ideology	107
The end of an era: the closure of the NEF IHQ	116
Failure to find an identity	120
CHAPTER FOUR: The ENEF's regional network and ideology: 1944–1966	123
Introduction	123
The ENEF's personnel and committees	126
The ENEF's conferences	132
The ENEF's regional membership and network	139
The <i>New Era</i> and publications by English new educationists	145
Administration and membership 1960–1966	153
Conclusion	159
CHAPTER FIVE: The ENEF and educational reconstruction after 1945	161
The war years 1939–1945: educational reconstruction	162
The post-war years 1945–1964: teacher training	167
The post-war years: 1945–1964: schools	174
The post-war years 1945–1964: UNESCO	181
After UNESCO: 1964–1966	184
CHAPTER SIX: The NEF's international network 1945–1966	188
Introduction	188
The NEF IHQ in 1945	190
The NEF IHQ after 1945	193

The national sections of the NEF after 1945	202
International Membership	218
CHAPTER SEVEN: Conclusion: the contribution of the NEF to the reconstruction of education after 1945	223
Introduction	223
1945–1950: revival	227
1951–1963: consolidation	232
1963–1966: decline	236
BIBLIOGRAPHY	247
Appendix 1: Committees of the NEF	279
Appendix 2: Committee of the ENEF	282
Appendix 3: International Conferences	284

Acknowledgements

My journey to the completion of this thesis has taken eight years. It began with research for my Masters in Education dissertation on the New Education Fellowship (NEF). The NEF and its diverse membership fascinated me from that time and I developed a deep interest not only in the organisation but also a curiosity to explore further the activities of those individuals that I had read about during the course of my research. It seemed logical, therefore, that I undertake a thesis and write about the NEF. My desire to continue with this research was further inspired by my discussions with Dr David Crook who has proven to be a valuable source of information and has provided much encouragement on this path.

I am also grateful to those who have helped me considerably during the time of my research. In particular, I must thank the archivist at the Institute of Education, University of London, Sarah Aitchison, for her unstinting help in accessing the materials that exist there, particularly about the NEF and Joseph Lauwerys. I have also found the library at the Institute of Education, in which I accessed numerous articles and books, as well as the postal loan service, exceptionally helpful.

I must also mention some of the other archivists, who have aided me, including at the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre for helping me find materials about Joan D. Browne, the Coventry Teacher Training College and the National Union of Teachers, at Kingston University for materials about Gipsy Hill College, the National Archives for materials about the NEF and the West Yorkshire Research Service for materials about the Bingley Teacher Training College. I have also appreciated the useful email correspondences that I have undertaken with Arjen Boin at the University of Louisiana about 'organisational theory', as well as with

Professor Norman Graves at the Institute of Education University of London and his reminiscences about his contacts with the NEF. I would also like to thank Hanne Willert who has provided me with invaluable material concerning the NEF in Denmark from the private papers of Torben Gregersen. Last but not least I must also acknowledge my long-suffering wife and mother who have understood my need to try and complete this and have given me endless support.

CHAPTER ONE

The New Education Fellowship

The New Education Fellowship (NEF) was a prominent organisation in the progressive educational sphere both before and after the Second World War. Based in London, it was founded in 1921 by Beatrice Ensor (1885–1972) – a theosophist and His Majesty’s Inspector for Schools (HMI) – who became its first President. Two Vice Presidents were appointed: Dr Adolphe Férrière (1879–1960), a French educationist and Dr Elizabeth Rotten, a German involved with the Emergency War Victims Relief Committee and the International Red Cross. Both Férrière and Rotten were also on the Secretariat of the International Bureau of Education along with Pierre Bovet from its foundation in 1925.¹ The goals of the NEF were to promote the new education and to develop a strong international network.² By the 1930s, the NEF had branches in Asia, Australasia, Europe and North America. The NEF’s membership included some of the most important educationists of the 1920s and 1930s.³

The purpose of this study is to understand the NEF’s ideas and assess its importance as a disseminator of educational and political ideals after 1945. The NEF’s network in Britain after this date extended into many educational institutions and organisations, both governmental and non-governmental. The overseas activities of the NEF are also examined through its branches in other countries where it sought to

¹ P. Gordon and R. Aldrich, *Biographical Dictionary of North American and European Educationists* (London: Woburn Press, 1997) pp. 160–1. Bovet, Professor at the University of Geneva, was the first Director of the International Bureau of Education in 1925. Férrière and Rotten both became Assistant Directors. Férrière was a Christian Socialist who gained his doctorate of sociology from the University of Geneva in 1915 and edited a progressive journal called *Pour L’Ere Nouvelle*. Elizabeth Rotten, doctor of philosophy, lived and worked in Germany, edited *Das Wedende Zeitung* and worked for the Swiss International Red Cross.

² National Archives (NA) BT 21/35828/268033, Register of Companies 1932, ‘Aims and Objectives of the NEF’. Also R. Sinha, ‘A Critical History and Evaluation of the NEF from its Foundation in 1920’ (MA dissertation, Sheffield University, 1971), p. 161.

³ Prominent members included for example, Sir Fred Clarke (1880–1952), John Dewey (1859–1952), Lionel Elvin (born 1905), Maria Montessori (1870–1952), and A. S. Neill (1883–1973).

promote its ideals, for example, in Australia, France, Germany, Holland, New Zealand and the United States of America (USA). Within this study, there is an emphasis upon the activities and ideas of the English New Education Fellowship (ENEF), one of a number of regional or national branches of the NEF, and which gained control over the NEF International Headquarters (IHQ) in London during the post-war years.

The new education was a child-centred education reform movement. It aimed to make education more responsive to the psychological and spiritual needs of children. It was based upon aspects of theosophical spiritual beliefs and was also characterised by its antipathy to industrial, capitalist society. The new education, as the ideological expression of the NEF, possessed strong social objectives and sought to reform society through its activities.⁴ It did not confine its remit to education in the way that progressivism did.

The NEF was originally heavily influenced by Ensor's own theosophical beliefs.⁵ The theosophists possessed a radical and revolutionary spiritual purpose that was adopted by Ensor into her educational goals.⁶ Much of the early revolutionary purpose of the NEF and the new education was derived from this movement.⁷ Ensor wanted to ensure that educationists would be able to 'effectively liberate the divine forces within the children so that the child may be strong and reject materialism to favour the supremacy of spirit, conscious and the godhead within'.⁸ She complained

⁴ C. Jenkins, 'New Education and its Emancipatory Interests (1920–1950)' *History of Education* 29(2) (2000), pp. 139–51.

⁵ Institute of Education, University of London, World Education Fellowship Archive (WEF) I/2, 'Calais Conference Report 1921'.

⁶ B. Campbell, *Ancient Wisdoms Revealed: A History of the Theosophical Movement* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980); P. Washington, *Madam Blavatsky's Baboon: Theosophy and the Emergence of the Western Guru* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1993).

⁷ R. Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives 1914–1939* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 26.

⁸ W. Boyd, *Report on the Fifth World Conference of the NEF* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1930), p. 4.

that the world was becoming increasingly 'mechanical and material'.⁹ The new education and the NEF would stop this by introducing a new understanding and contact with the 'universal unconscious' and the 'divine purpose'.¹⁰ After the horrors of the First World War, the NEF had enthusiastically endorsed these spiritual ideals,¹¹ which were explicitly stated at its first international conference in 1921:

The essential object of all education should be to train the child to desire the supremacy of spirit over matter and to express that supremacy in daily life . . . we have fought as well . . . against spiritual blindness, against cowardice and egoism . . . or the result of a harmonious education is an integrated child living a natural and healthy life . . . which is an image of divine reason. His inspiration and aspirations continue one another revolving on the same axis which is the bond between God immanent and God Transcendent, two conceptions of the one and only God. In essence the task of education is to develop the Deity within, so that one day the child may experience the joys of those who attain to the vision of the Universal.¹²

Theosophy was a syncretic religious sect, which combined the teachings of Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity and aspects of Spiritualism. Helena Blavatsky, author of *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*,¹³ claimed to be in communication with a variety of non-material beings from other dimensions called 'Mahatmas'.¹⁴ Commenting upon theosophical beliefs, the *Pall Mall Gazette* noted that:

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ WEF I/29, J. Henderson to Yeatman, 29 April 1963: 'Mrs Ensor . . . is prepared to swear on affidavit to the effect that she founded both concerns and that the New Educational Fellowship was financed and was part of the work of the Theosophical Educational Trust and is continuing its work. She also emphasised that an affidavit should be obtained from Mr Gardner . . . who is also prepared to swear that the NEF is carrying on the work of the Theosophical Educational Trust.'

¹² WEF I/2, 'Calais Conference Report 1921'.

¹³ B. Zirkoff (ed.), *Isis Unveiled: H. P. Blavatsky* (London: Science-Theosophical Publishing House, 1977 (originally 1877)); and H. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine* (London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1993).

¹⁴ C. C. Massey, 'The Theosophical Society', *Light* (London), 18 October 1884, p. 428.

‘. . . Christianity and civilisation are detestable [to the theosophists] . . . [the] great task . . . is to combat a false materialism by the establishment of pure spiritual truth.’¹⁵

The theosophists believed that it was only through education that the soul could be helped to achieve its highest potential. Importantly, however, this education had to be free from any form of corrupted adult values, except, of course, for spiritual ones.¹⁶ This theosophical undercurrent, which pervaded many aspects of the NEF, and, therefore, the evolution of the new education in Britain, was an important reason for the continuing central dichotomy of the NEF.¹⁷ The new education of the 1920s promoted total freedom for the child as an educational philosophy and did not always rest easily with any movement that attempted to promote a spiritual world-view. The spirituality of the theosophists and its ultimate appeal to supernatural agencies was in direct opposition to the precepts of progressivism more generally, the purpose of which was to liberate children from irrational superstitions and to allow them to be free from the idea of ‘original sin’ and the need to interpret the will of divine beings.¹⁸ Through this, the NEF was furnished with a set of spiritual objectives that, during the 1920s and first half of the 1930s, provided the organisation with cohesion in the face of the vagaries of new educational ideals.¹⁹

In other ways theosophy was very much in tune with the radicalism of the new educationists in the 1920s and 1930s. Theosophy was anti-materialist and fitted easily with the new education’s natural dislike of industrial, urban civilisation. Antagonism

¹⁵ ‘More about the Theosophists: An Interview with Madame Blavatsky, *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 April 1884, pp. 3–4.

¹⁶ Selleck, (1972) p. 25. It was this motivation which led the theosophists with Beatrice Ensor to become involved in the creation of a number of schools in the new garden cities of Hertfordshire, for example, St Christopher’s School, Letchworth in 1913.

¹⁷ WEF I/29, B. Ensor to J. Annand, 19 November 1962: ‘The New Education Fellowship was part of the work of the Theosophical Educational Trust and the Trust helped to finance it, when I resigned from the Trust I took over the fellowship.’

¹⁸ R. Skidelsky, *English Progressive Schools* (London: Penguin, 1969), p. 247.

¹⁹ WEF I/35, ‘Johannesburg Section’, undated.

towards modern society and the desire to recreate a rural idyll were ideals that had been prominent amongst middle-class commentators for much of the latter part of the nineteenth century. The First World War merely caused such writers and thinkers to focus more sharply upon the issue.²⁰ The attitude of the theosophists mirrored the strong anti-industrialism present within the early progressive or new education movements at the turn of the twentieth century.

This introduction is divided into four sections. The first explains the importance of the NEF as a focus for study and outlines the themes that are examined in this thesis. The second section reviews the key literature (secondary sources) and the substantive issues that have affected the direction that this study has taken. The third examines the available primary sources relating to the NEF and considers their value to this research. The final section outlines the structure of the thesis as a whole.

Research focus

After 1945, the NEF faced increasing problems.²¹ The new education was in decline in Europe and faced rejection in North America.²² Funding had reduced dramatically, leaving the NEF with limited finances and an inability to pursue its educational goals. Some new educationists doubted that the movement could remain relevant in such a climate or that the NEF could survive in the face of so many problems and Richard Selleck describes the NEF as ‘another victim of fascism’.²³

This thesis assesses the role and importance of the organisation between 1945 and 1966, examines its place within educational and social history during those years,

²⁰ WEF III/219, ‘Brief History of the NEF’, 1960, pp. 17–18: ‘The fellowship embraced people who perpetually sought to understand the place of man in the universal scheme of things and to sink themselves in the great adventure of uplifting mankind.’

²¹ Skidelsky (1969), p. 243.

²² A. Zilversmit, *Changing Schools, Changing Practices: Progressive Education Theory and Practice 1930 to 1970* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993), p. 109.

²³ Selleck (1972), p. 25.

and seeks to understand how far the NEF maintained its role as an important force in education. To date, the large amount of primary evidence relating to the NEF has not been used to understand the involvement of the organisation in the reconstruction of education after the Second World War.²⁴ This thesis examines this material using a historical perspective and contrasts the NEF's ideas and activities against the background of prevailing and changing ideologies. This approach provides an opportunity to explore the progress of a single organisation in the political and social context of the period between 1945 and 1966. The NEF relied heavily upon the voluntary work of individuals. A chronological approach makes it possible to identify the contribution of these individuals to the organisation during this period.²⁵

Celia Jenkins (2000) has sought to explain the class background of those involved with the NEF and the infiltration of its ideas into mainstream education using a Foucaultian framework. Her study, however, ignores the chronological context of the organisation, its activities and personnel.²⁶ Her explanation of the motivations of those who worked within the organisation rests too heavily upon their class and too little upon other motivations and attitudes that they, as individuals, may have had. As a result of this, she is unable to identify the contributions of specific individuals to the development of the organisation nor, as a result, to identify how the NEF and its ideas might have influenced education. By ignoring the roles and ideas of those involved with the NEF it is difficult to ascertain their importance within the NEF. This approach also makes it difficult to chart the organisation's holistic development. This is a study of the progress of the NEF as an organisation. It also

²⁴ Selleck (1972), p. 25 commented on the NEF's progress up to 1939; B. Wallace, in 'An Examination of the Thought Expressed by the NEF' (M Phil dissertation, University of London Institute of education, 1986), explored the Theosophical origins of the NEF between 1920 and 1930.

²⁵ R. Lowe, 'Postmodernity and Historians of Education: A View from Britain' *Paedagogica Historica* 23(2) (1996), pp. 307–23.

²⁶ Jenkins (2000), pp. 139–51.

seeks to explore the roles of individuals who were active within the NEF. It is considered that no study of an organisation like the NEF can be effective without identifying those individuals who played key roles in helping it develop. It is important to understand the activities and concerns of those individuals where possible. An organisation is guided not only by the political and social context that it exists within but also by the preconceptions and attitudes of those who are active within it. As a result of this, the contributions of those individuals who worked within the NEF are explored in this thesis. This does not imply that only certain individuals, for example presidents of the NEF or prominent educationists within the organisation, are valid for consideration. The example of the NEF shows those individuals who work within an organisation in other roles, for example secretaries, committee members, active individual members or those who are contributing financially, who can as greatly affect the development and success or otherwise of an organisation, particularly in the case of a voluntary organisation such as the NEF. This thesis, however, is based upon the belief that according to Evans (2000) 'objective historical knowledge is both desirable and attainable'.²⁷ This thesis seeks to use the materials within the NEF (WEF) archive and elsewhere to develop an empirical understanding of the NEF and its development as an organisation.²⁸

The approach taken explores the role of the NEF and the new education in both a national and international context, in line with the internationalist ambitions of the NEF after 1945. The NEF's membership was extensive both in Britain and elsewhere but, to date, there have only been brief accounts of the development of its network in Australia, New Zealand and the USA.²⁹ In Britain, the NEF sought to propagate its

²⁷ R. Evans, (2000) *In Defence of History* (London: Granta Books, 1997) p. 252.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

²⁹ In Australia, Y. Larsson, *World Education Fellowship: Its Origins and Development with Particular Emphasis on New South Wales* (London: Australian Studies Centre, 1987); in New Zealand, J. Abiss,

ideas in various schools, teacher training colleges and universities and those institutions (where the NEF and its membership were particularly active) are examined in order to understand its impact after 1945.³⁰

Another important part of the NEF's network was its involvement with UNESCO after 1948. This thesis explores the significance of this relationship in the development of the new education as a genuinely international movement. UNESCO provided funding for the NEF from 1948 until 1964, allowing the post-war NEF to be financially stable during a time of uncertainty. The activities that the NEF undertook under UNESCO auspices are examined through a comparison of the aims and objectives expressed by the NEF and UNESCO and from the perspective of those individuals who were members of both organisations.³¹

The NEF provided an opportunity for a diverse range of groups and individuals to involve themselves in debates about educational policy who might not otherwise have been able to achieve this. Primary and junior school staff and, in particular, female staff at these schools were well represented in the NEF.³² The role of female educationists within the movement is considered here through an analysis of the contributors to the NEF's journal, the *New Era*, from the attendance lists of NEF conferences and participation in other NEF activities.

This thesis also considers the important ideological contribution of the new education and the NEF to the debates about the reconstruction of society and education after 1945.³³ Concepts and ideals of democracy, citizenship and social

'The New Education Fellowship in New Zealand: Its Activity and Influence in the 1930s and 1940s', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 33(1) (1998); and in the USA. Zilversmit (1993).

³⁰ Zilversmit (1993) p. 109.

³¹ Fred Clarke, Lionel Elvin and Joseph Lauwerys.

³² C. Jenkins, 'Professional Middle Class and the Social Origins of Progressivism: A Case Study of The NEF 1920 to 1950' (PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London 1989), p. 14.

³³ H. Dent, *Education for Democracy* (London: NEF, 1942) and *A New Order* (London: NEF, 1942).

justice gained prominence in educational and social policy after 1945.³⁴ Many of these ideas had been part of the NEF's beliefs from the 1920s, but the fellowship has rarely been credited with helping to formulate them. The new educationists believed strongly in the importance of democratic education. This was interpreted as meaning that schools and society should be freed from the control of an elite and that all members of the community, including students, should be given a say in decisions.³⁵ Citizenship was another prominent idea that found root within the new educational movement. For the new educationists, it was defined as the need to inculcate students with the skills to become responsible members of their communities and to work actively against injustice and social inequality.³⁶ These ideals sprang from the NEF's strong socially revolutionary approach towards education, originally encouraged by Beatrice Ensor. The political events of the 1940s gave these ideals a new practical purpose: the NEF now sought to promote international democracy and world peace.³⁷

The class origins of those who worked with the NEF between 1920 and 1950 have been explored in some detail.³⁸ Frank Parkin (1968) argues that middle-class organisations gained success for radical social ideas through the links they possessed and that, in return, they benefited from gaining control of social reform.³⁹ The wider social contribution of the new education has been ignored, however.⁴⁰ This thesis considers what sort of values the NEF promoted after 1945 and whether it successfully adapted its anti-industrial ideals to the needs of a post-1945 urban

³⁴ 'Children Out of Schools' *TES*, 26 March 1949, p. 199; and 'Making Citizens of the World' *TES*, 9 December 1949, p. 863.

³⁵ W. Carr and A. Hartnett, *Education and the Struggle for Democracy: The Politics of Educational Ideas* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1996), p. 40.

³⁶ J. Demaine and H. Entwistle, *Beyond Communitarianism: Citizenship, Politics and Education* (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 67.

³⁷ Jenkins (2000), pp. 139–51.

³⁸ Jenkins (1989), p. 15.

³⁹ F. Parkin, *Middle-Class Radicalism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968).

⁴⁰ D. Rubinstein, *Capitalism, Culture and Decline in Britain 1750–1900* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 24.

society.⁴¹ The progress of the NEF is explored in the context of its efforts to recreate itself as an organisation devoted to social reform⁴² and it is used as a case study to test the idea that middle-class and predominantly voluntary movements could play a significant role in creating radical changes in education and society.

One important area of change for the new education movement was the dominance of the ENEF after 1945. Its control over the movement became extensive, but has not been explored until now. The collapse of the European progressive network in the 1930s produced an increasing range of competing organisations and a growing international hostility to groups with socially inspired agendas, especially in the USA. This caused the NEF IHQ in London to become increasingly isolated, both financially and ideologically. As a result, the ENEF gradually came to dominate the movement and its activities: the membership of the NEF, attendance at functions, and readership and bias of the *New Era*, were almost entirely English. European educationists complained that the NEF no longer represented their concerns and needs and declining membership numbers in on the continent confirmed this sentiment. In contrast, the English new educational network flourished during this period,⁴³ and credit for the survival of the new education movement after 1945 lay not with the NEF as a whole but, more specifically, with the ENEF. This thesis explores whether the success of the English branch was at the expense of the NEF's claim to be a truly international organisation.

The NEF was forced to adapt to the dramatic changes that took place in the sphere of education in the period after 1945. The evolution that took place in the

⁴¹ B. Jackson and D. Marsden, *Education and the Working Class* (London: Penguin, 1966). p. 195. Jackson and Marsden recorded that a working-class respondent in Huddersfield condemned as 'crackpot' socialists such as Laurin Zilliacus, the NEF chairman.

⁴² R. Barker, *Education and Politics 1900–1951: A Study of the Labour Party* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), p. 81; and B. Simon, *Education and the Social Order 1940–1990* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1991) pp. 271 and 342.

⁴³ Jenkins (2000), pp. 139–51.

organisation's ideology and its activities can be categorised into five main stages. In the 1920s the organisation possessed a strong vision of what it sought to achieve, thanks to the fervency of its creator, Beatrice Ensor. This was combined with her ability to attract many of the leading educationists of the day to the organisation bringing to it a network that belied its small-scale nature and membership. This also gave the NEF a position at the leading edge of progressive and new educational experimentation internationally, thanks to the work of those such as Maria Montessori, founder of the Association Montessori Internationale in Amsterdam, Holland and Carleton Washburne, Superintendent of Schools in Winnetka, Illinois, USA, creator of the Winnetka plan. This was the first stage in the growth of the organisation. This did not endure, however, and by the 1930s the NEF suffered from an enormous loss of confidence in the ability of its approach to make a positive contribution to society. The rise of fascism and the failure of the new educational ideology to adapt to this successfully led to a crisis in the organisation. This led to the second stage of its evolution characterised by a failure of vision and the rejection of its former ideology. The third stage, the starting point for this study, came in the 1940s, by which time the NEF was seeking to involve itself in the reconstruction of education and also attempting to redefine its role and ideology. This redefinition came in the form of Theodore Brameld, Lecturer in Education at the University of Minnesota, USA, and Laurin Zilliacus, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, USA, both of whom used their positions on the NEF committee to make the NEF a more radical and political organisation, rejecting its experimental past and its links with private progressive schools.⁴⁴ The main dilemma for the NEF at this stage was that the committee's efforts to broaden the membership

⁴⁴ L. Zilliacus, 'Our Part in a World at War', *New Era* 21 (January 1940), pp. 22–6.

was continually defeated by the increased involvement in education of national governments and a whole range of other interest groups. The fourth stage occurred with the consolidation of the NEF's power base within universities and teacher training colleges. This also marked the high point of its post-war membership which began declining after the initial enthusiasm of the 1940s. The 1960s, the last stage, coincided with a loss of confidence in the ability of the movement to be able to contribute to educational and social issues and the entrenchment of the NEF into its core base of support within teacher training colleges.

The litmus test of the viability of the NEF after 1945 was its ability to widen its network and not remain confined to a small clique of followers. Some of the NEF's membership was actively involved with many aspects of state education after 1945, both as a result of existing links and new ones forged on behalf of the NEF. This included the involvement of members with comprehensive education, continuing or adult education, the restructuring of teacher training, health and welfare services available for children and equality of educational opportunity. Equality of educational opportunity was defined for the NEF as creating an educational system that was accessible to all people according to merit and regardless of social class or gender.⁴⁵ Social justice and social democracy were important features of new educational thinking after 1945. The NEF committee used these terms to reflect their belief that society should be reconstructed to end disparities of wealth, poverty and unequal access to resources, including education. Theodore Brameld used the term 'social justice' whereas, at the Australian Conference in 1946, Joseph Lauwerys, Reader in Education at the University of London Institute of Education,⁴⁶ and the Acting

⁴⁵ 'Human Relationships– Re-establishing a Social Pattern', *TES*, 30 September 1949, p. 672.

⁴⁶ M. McLean (ed.), 'Joseph Lauwerys: A Festschrift', *Educational Library Bulletin* 22 (1981), University of London Institute of Education, p. 3.

Chairman of the NEF, used the term 'social democracy' to imply a similar concept.⁴⁷

These are the definitions for these terms used within this thesis.

Secondary sources

To date, most authors writing about the new education assume that the path of the NEF after the Second World War was similar to the route it took during the 1930s. These conclusions are based upon studies of the NEF as it existed in the first half of the twentieth century. Such works concentrate upon the eccentricities of the NEF's founder, Beatrice Ensor, and her theosophical and spiritual beliefs. Links are also drawn between the NEF and the late nineteenth-century, anti-industrial, middle-class movements.⁴⁸

Writings about the NEF and the new education can be divided into three categories as follows: first are the specialised histories of the NEF; second, are general works about progressivism and the new education but not concerned with the NEF; third, are writings upon the international aspects of education during this period, for example, the role of UNESCO. To complete this review of the literature, theoretical approaches of key writers are examined.

Writings about the NEF

A number of studies have discussed the origins of the NEF, but few have commented upon it after 1945. The most important of the authors who have examined the NEF of later years are considered here. These can be divided into two categories. First are general works that consider the NEF within the context of its origins; these are the writings of Maurice Ash (1969), William Boyd and Wyatt Rawson (1965), Maurice

⁴⁷ WEF III/203 T. Brameld, 'A New Policy: Address to the Cirencester Conference 1947', p. 3. Institute of Education University of London, Joseph Lauwerys Archive (DC/JL) WEF Conferences Pamphlet 'Extracts from Articles by some Conferences Speakers September to October 1946', Extracts from speech given by J. Lauwerys.

⁴⁸ Selleck (1972), p. 33.

Punch (1977), Rabinda Sinha (1971) and William Stewart (1968). Following from this are writings that analyse specific aspects of the NEF. These include Jane Abiss (1998), Celia Jenkins (1989), Yvonne Larsson (1987) and David Turner (1993). Abiss and Larsson have provided important analyses concerning the post-1945 development of the NEF and the new education in Australia and New Zealand respectively. These are used as a focus for understanding the international network and ideology of the new education.

In the first group, William Stewart (1968) has made a strong argument for the decline of radical educational ideology after 1945.⁴⁹ Stewart argues that there had been a rejection of the child-centred approach to education⁵⁰ and that the post-1945 NEF could no longer be considered a child-centred movement.⁵¹ Joachim Liebschner (1991) offers a similar account of progressive education.⁵² This argument is accepted in the present study as a starting point for understanding the NEF.⁵³ The new education changed radically after 1945. Stewart considered that this implied a failure of the NEF. In this thesis, however, a distinction is made between the new education as a movement and the activities of the NEF itself. The decline of the new education as a child-centred movement and its evolution into a more mature and thoughtful ideology are explored in the following chapters.

Maurice Ash (1969) provides the most detailed commentary upon the NEF and the new education, considering its history during the early years of its existence.⁵⁴ He believes that the NEF did not have the same importance in the 1940s as it had

⁴⁹ W. Stewart, *The Educational Innovators (Vol. 2): Progressive Schools 1881–1967* (London: Epworth Press, 1968), p. 237.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

⁵² J. Liebschner, *Foundations of Progressive Education* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1991), p. 123.

⁵³ Stewart (1968), p. 226.

⁵⁴ M. Ash, 'Dartington Hall Studies in Rural Sociology' in ed. M. Ash, *Who are the Progressives Now? An Account of an Educational Confrontation* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 49.

possessed in the 1920s and 1930s, arguing that it failed to advance its ideas beyond a small circle of followers and that, ultimately, it proved unable to promote the new education after the Second World War. In addition to this, he asserted that the organisation and the movement ceased to be of importance after 1945 when it rejected the radical approach and became involved with UNESCO,⁵⁵ although he does not provide any evidence for this assertion. Stewart (1972) made a similar assertion that the NEF was undermined by its involvement with UNESCO and educational reconstruction, although he did not examine NEF's records of these activities.⁵⁶ Sinha, in his unpublished thesis, (1971) argues that the NEF became part of the mainstream educational process during the 1930s and 1940s.⁵⁷ This is a claim that is examined in the context of the NEF's actions after 1945.

Maurice Punch (1977) argues that the NEF had depended too greatly upon a few supporters during the 1930s and 1940s,⁵⁸ in particular, relying heavily upon independent progressive schools many of which abandoned the new education after 1940.⁵⁹ He agrees with the claim made by William Boyd and Wyatt Rawson that, after the Second World War, the NEF's network declined in importance when it rejected the private progressive schools and became involved with state schools.⁶⁰ This switch to the public sector, however, provided the NEF with an opportunity to retain its relevance as an educational organisation at a time when the new education was struggling to survive as an ideology, a view considered in the following chapters of this thesis. While there was, indeed, a rejection of the radical new educational

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ W. Stewart, *Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750–1970* (London: Macmillan, 1972), p. 353.

⁵⁷ R. Sinha, *A Critical History and Evaluation of the NEF from its foundation in 1920* (1971), p. 161.

⁵⁸ M. Punch, *Progressive Retreat – A Social Study of Dartington Hall School 1926–1957 and some of its Former Pupils* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 158.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 159.

⁶⁰ W. Boyd and W. Rawson, *The Story of the New Education* (London: Heinemann, 1965), p. 185.

ideals of the 1920s, this allowed the movement and the organisation to adapt themselves to the prevailing ideals of the post-1945 period.

Punch blames the eventual failure of the movement in England upon the dispersal of diluted progressive ideals into mainstream education that had the effect of reducing the relevance of radical progressive organisations and institutions. Punch also identifies the diversion of the progressives into non-educational issues as a factor leading to the failure of new educational ideals.⁶¹ This argument does have validity although Punch did not consider the wide range of links that the NEF had with a variety of institutions, organisations and people.⁶² Radical progressivism had been in decline since the 1930s and the NEF was not responsible for this. Its involvement with the state education system and its emphasis upon social issues were attempts to retain relevance after 1945 and are not viewed in this thesis as an admission of defeat. Punch criticised the NEF on the basis that it had allowed itself to become diverted from its radical goals, yet he contradicts his own argument by concluding that the main reason for its decline was its inability to adapt to social and political conditions. Punch also argues that the variety of educational statements amongst new educationists in Britain and the USA meant that the NEF was unable to provide a genuine focus for the progressive movement.⁶³ While this is true, it is also the case that the NEF never sought to provide such a focus. Ensor had realised that it was an impossible task to reconcile the ideas of all branches of the progressive movement and did not even attempt this. Rather, the NEF prided itself on being a forum for debate.

In a 1993 article, David Turner pursues this argument. He believed that the NEF created a network through which it played an important role in the development of

⁶¹ Punch (1977), p. 4.

⁶² Ibid., p. 160.

⁶³ Punch (1977), p. 8.

educational ideas: through administrators at various educational institutions; through the *New Era* itself; through teachers who subscribed to its ideals; and through its international links.⁶⁴ Turner's uncritical acceptance of the NEF's own claims concerning the breadth and nature of this network is questioned in this thesis. He does not draw a distinction between the NEF's network before and after the Second World War. He assumes that propagation of the NEF's ideas – via the *New Era*, universities and through teachers themselves – was equal in coverage and educational objectives. Turner is of the opinion that schoolteachers formed part of this network but, in fact, the NEF, according to its records, had great difficulty attracting this category of membership in contrast to, for example, representatives of higher education institutions. The NEF's network, and its development after the Second World War, has been neglected in current literature (Turner focuses upon the pre-1945 organisation). The nature of this network after 1945 is examined in this thesis and provides a key to understanding the evolution of the NEF and the new education.

Yvonne Larsson (1987) has written about the NEF and its role in New South Wales, Australia.⁶⁵ Her work discusses the contribution of the NEF and its members to Australian education. Larsson does not consider the role or nature of the new education and the NEF, nor does she examine the long-term problems that the new education faced after 1945. She concludes that the NEF did have an impact, albeit with some limitations, upon educational policy in Australia. However, to form this conclusion, Larsson uses as evidence the creation of only two educational institutions during the 1940s, but did not consider the long-term progress of these institutions, most importantly whether or for how long these institutions retained new education

⁶⁴ D. Turner, 'The NEF: The Growth of Progressive Education', *New Era* 74 (December 1993), pp. 71–5.

⁶⁵ Larsson (1987), p. 17.

ideas. It is important to compare Larsson's assertions against the evidence from both the NEF membership and from other institutions, schools, teacher training colleges and governmental bodies involved with the NEF. However, her argument is presented here, alongside the evidence of such institutions, to show that there was a clear cross-pollination of ideas.

Jane Abiss (1998), in her article claims that 'much of the legacy of the "new education" movement is now taken for granted in the areas of curriculum and pedagogy'.⁶⁶ However, crucially, she maintains that in New Zealand, after the initial enthusiasm during the 1930s, the movement began to decline during the 1940s. She argues that 'much of the activity of the NEF in New Zealand appears to have depended on the enthusiasm of key educationalists' and 'sympathy with the movement did not necessarily translate into active support'.⁶⁷ Another problem faced by the NEF in New Zealand lay in the fact that it found itself rivalled by a variety of educational and political pressure groups that limited its impact. The question of the political affiliation of the NEF is also implicitly raised by this argument but not considered by Abiss. The NEF in New Zealand clearly sought links with the left-wing political movements of that country. The political affiliations of the international new educational movement are explored in this thesis in order to understand further how these both helped and hindered it.

In her unpublished PhD thesis, Jenkins (1989) explores the NEF in the period between its foundation in 1920 and 1950 and the gradual infiltration of its ideas into mainstream education.⁶⁸ She chose to adopt a Foucaultian framework rather than

⁶⁶ J. Abiss, 'The New Education Fellowship in New Zealand: Its Activity and Influence in the 1930s and 1940s' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 33(1) (1998) pp. 81-93.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁶⁸ Jenkins (1989), p. 14.

taking a historical approach for understanding the development of the NEF.⁶⁹ Her study was concerned with the social status of those involved with the NEF and she did not seek to create a historical account of the organisation or to place it within the educational, political or social context of the period. Her main focus was on the years prior to 1940. In a recent article, Jenkins summarised her belief that the NEF's main area of importance during this period was in the primary school, stating that: 'Certainly in England, it was successful in introducing more progressive, child-centred education reforms into the state sector, especially at primary level where its universal application was endorsed.'⁷⁰ She also argues that the NEF was at the forefront of attempts to promote international democracy and world peace⁷¹ and that the new education was not successful at influencing state secondary education,⁷² although Jenkins did not pursue these assertions.

Kevin Brehony (2004) in his article has examined the contribution of the NEF conferences to the field of education between 1921 and 1938, a time period which is outside that of this study. He makes the interesting claim that the NEF's international conference in Nice in 1932 marked a turning point in the nature of the organisation from one based upon radical educational experimentation to one that was increasingly dominated by educationists from universities.⁷³ This theme forms an important part of the argument in this thesis. After 1945 this involvement with and domination of the NEF by teacher training colleges and universities continued and significantly affected the development and progress of the organisation.

⁶⁹ M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Tavistock, 1972).

⁷⁰ Jenkins (2000).

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Jenkins (2000). In her article Jenkins identified the NEF's influence in the primary school.

⁷³ K. J. Brehony 'A new education for a new era: the contribution of the conferences of the New Education Fellowship to the disciplinary field of education 1921-1938', *Paedagogica Historica* 40(5) (2004), pp. 733 — 755.

Abiss, Jenkins and Larsson have examined only small areas of NEF activity. Their conclusions, however, demand further investigation. This study assesses whether after 1945 the NEF played an important part in the development of educational policy in those countries in which it had active memberships. It also considers the factors that might have caused differences in educational and political attitudes towards the NEF and the new education in Australia, Britain, France, Germany, Holland, New Zealand and the USA. Abiss and Punch have suggested that the NEF was in decline at this time. The following chapters consider how far there was a decline of the NEF's ability to function as an organisation, how far it was able to involve itself with the development of social and educational policy during the period under review and whether this situation existed in all areas in which the NEF's network had previously extended.

Progressive education

Four further works contain accounts of the new education movement and progressivism during this period. James MacDonald (1972) and Arthur Zilversmit (1993) both explore the nature of the progressive movement in the USA, making specific references to the Progressive Education Association (PEA) which became the American Education Fellowship (AEF) in 1944. Stephen Brown, Mary Finn and Susan Semel (1999) have also provided commentaries, focusing upon progressivism in general rather than the new education.

Zilversmit (1993) has charted the decline of the progressive movement after 1945, arguing that, after the Second World War, many communities did not have sufficient resources for school systems and were therefore less keen upon any form of experimentation.⁷⁴ In addition to this, during the 1950s, there was increased

⁷⁴ Zilversmit (1993).

antagonism towards socialist ideals. Progressivism, with its internationalist and social message, was an easy target.⁷⁵ According to Zilversmit, the radical, political aims of the progressives caused many American communities to react negatively towards them.⁷⁶ This led to the extinction of many progressive educational systems including the Winnetka experimental school system, created by Carleton Washburne.⁷⁷ Washburne was Director of Education for Northern Italy, Deputy to the British Educational Advisor to the Allied forces and, from 1946, Advisor to the Government of Cambodia. He became Chairman of the NEF in 1945 and President in 1947. After his return to the USA in 1948, he became Chairman of the Department of Education and Director of Teacher Education at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York.⁷⁸

Semel (1999) has made a similar claim: that it was the social agenda of the progressives in the state school system in the USA that caused them long-term difficulties. During the 1960s and 1970s, it was believed that progressive-inspired social policies in schools were the cause of lower academic standards.⁷⁹ MacDonald (1972) provides a further explanation for the collapse of the AEF. He believes that there was a split between those who saw progressivism as a reformist movement dedicated to the reconstruction of society and those who sought to retain it as an educational doctrine.⁸⁰ Patricia Graham (1967) has suggested that it was declining interest in the PEA and financial mismanagement that caused the organisation's

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 168.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 107.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 50.

⁷⁸ Sinha (1971), p. 76.

⁷⁹ S. Semel, 'Introduction' in, *Schools of Tomorrow: Schools of Today: What Happened to Progressive Education?* eds. S. Semel and A. Sadovnik (New York: Lang, 1999), p. 14.

⁸⁰ J. Squire, 'Introduction' in *A New Look at Progressive Education*, ed. J. Squire (Washington DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972), p. 10.

closure. She also argued that the PEA/AEF had an ambivalent relationship with the NEF as a result of the latter's social policies.⁸¹

Brown and Finn (1988) have also provided a brief commentary concerning the failure of progressivism in the USA based upon the articles of the discontinued journal of the PEA/AEF, *Progressive Education*.⁸² The articles contained within this journal provided an account of the issues and problems that concerned the AEF before its closure in 1955. Brown and Finn made a strong case for the journal's importance to the development of educational policy in the USA. The authors pointed to the contributions to the journal from a range of eminent and well-connected educationists. However, they did not consider whether the collapse of the journal marked the end of progressivism and the new education in the USA, or whether educationists sought other avenues to express their views. American educationists, active in the NEF, were still present at its international conferences and committees throughout this period and most held posts at universities and educational institutions in the USA. In this study, a comparison is made between the situations in England and the USA. It is argued that England became the focus of new educational inspiration and activity and, in turn, reshaped the movement elsewhere.

After 1945, progressive educationists faced a variety of challenges depending upon their nationality. The NEF had a wide international network and had sections in a number of countries. This meant that new educationists confronted the full vagaries of the international post-1945 political and social climate. The fate of the NEF in these countries was tied to that of progressivism more generally and, in addition many of the educationists linked to the NEF were also prominent within the progressive

⁸¹ P. Graham, *Progressive Education: A History of The Progressive Education Association* (Columbia, New York: Teachers College Press, 1967).

⁸² S. Brown and M. Finn, *Readings From Progressive Education* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1988), pp. 93 and 160.

educational movements in their home territories. For this reason, the circumstances that faced these educationists are indicative of the problems that the international movement encountered during these years.

International relations and progressivism

A number of other books provide useful general material and discussion about the increasingly hostile international situation that faced progressive educators in the USA. Ronald Evans (2004) comments upon the extreme hostility that the progressive movement faced after 1945.⁸³ Charles Silberman (1970) confirms the attempts to reconstruct the curriculum in the USA along much more conservative lines,⁸⁴ showing that by 1945 even eminent educationists such as Carleton Washburne, the NEF President from 1947, and Harold Rugg were open to criticism. In the latter's case Mortimer J. Adler from the University of Chicago led an attack on Rugg's educational views accusing them of verging on the 'totalitarian'. Adler stated that Rugg and Washburne were 'extremists who would abolish all authority on the part of the teacher'. Harold Rugg was Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, USA, between 1920 and 1951 and a member of the PEA until its demise in 1955.⁸⁵

Herbert M. Kliebard (2004) also examines the rejection of more progressive ideology in the USA during these years.⁸⁶ He describes the efforts of Boyd Henry Bode, amongst others, to try and revamp the PEA and attempt to push it to the forefront of protecting democracy, making progressivism a political as well as an educational movement. It was this attempt, however, that was fundamentally to

⁸³ R. W. Evans, *The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004), p. 74.

⁸⁴ C. E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education* (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 110.

⁸⁵ Gordon and Aldrich (1997).

⁸⁶ H. M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958* (New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 197.

undermine the progressive movement in the USA. Claire V. Korn (1991) discusses the successful eight-year study undertaken by the PEA from 1930 which managed to persuade a number of elite private and state universities to waive their entrance requirements for 30 experimental schools.⁸⁷ Richard J. Altenbaugh (1999) comments that, ultimately, the PEA and American progressivism failed after this time due to a tension between those wanting radical social change and those involved in practical school reform and that it was this tension that caused dissipation of the organisation's focus.⁸⁸ Lawrence A. Cremin (1957) is in agreement with the theory that it was the attempt to politicise progressivism that paralysed the movement. This was a condition from which it never recovered.⁸⁹

The USA was, however, also the originator of the NEF's focus upon social reconstruction, and American influences upon the organisation will be highlighted in this thesis. Rugg and Washburne, in particular, in spite of later criticisms of their ideas within the USA, were two such educationists. According to Ellen Condliffe Lagemann (2002), Harold Rugg was instrumental in encouraging the PEA executive board to adopt a programme of experimental study in 1929 leading ultimately to the its involvement in the eight-year study referred to above. According to Condliffe Lagemann, Rugg thought this was preferable to the PEA becoming an organisation that merely discussed ideas. This debate also spilled over into the NEF, which was also split about its purpose, either as a forum for discussion or a centre for actual educational research and practice.⁹⁰ Joy Palmer (2001) discusses Rugg's career and

⁸⁷ C. V. Korn, *Alternate American Schools: Ideals in Action* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 100.

⁸⁸ R. J. Altenbaugh, *Historical Dictionary of American Education* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1999), p. 304.

⁸⁹ L. A. Cremin, 'The Progressive Movement in American Education: A Perspective', *Harvard Educational Review* 27 (1957), pp. 251–70.

⁹⁰ E. Condliffe Lagemann, *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Educational Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 139.

great influence upon American education before 1940.⁹¹ Like Washburne, however, Rugg also faced vitriolic attacks during the 1940s. These are charted by Peter Carbone who discusses the effect upon Rugg's morale of the removal of his textbooks from many American schools in 1942 due to opposition to them from the American Legion.⁹² Ronald W. Evans (2007) further explores these attacks on Rugg in the context of the censure of social studies in the USA.⁹³ Progressive education within the USA was an important factor in the development of the ideas of the NEF and attacks upon progressive educationists in the USA during the 1940s and 1950s were to have an equally great impact upon the progress and development of the organisation after 1945.

The USA, however, while the most significant part of the NEF's network was not the only area that the NEF had connections. During the 1940s, progressive educationists in Canada were also attempting to encourage the adoption of progressive ideas within the school system and the implementation of their ideas has been charted by Robert S. Patterson in his 1986 article.⁹⁴ Neil Sutherland in his article (1986) explores this theme also and considers that progressive ideas achieved only a limited impact in Canada.⁹⁵ As a result of this Canada never developed into an important part of the NEF's network.

Australia, however, did develop a large new educational network during the 1940s and later, thanks to the enthusiasm for all aspects of educational and social

⁹¹ J. Palmer, *Fifty Modern Thinkers on Education: From Piaget to the Present* (New York: Routledge, 2001), p. 14.

⁹² P. Carbone, *The Social and Educational Thought of Harold Rugg* (North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1977), p. 253.

⁹³ R. W. Evans, *This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and the Censure of Social Studies* (Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, 2007), p. 46.

⁹⁴ R. S. Patterson, 'The Implementation of Progressive Education in Canada 1930–1945', in *Essays on Canadian Education*, eds. N. K. Kach, R. S. Patterson and I. DeFaveri (Calgary: Detselig, 1986), pp. 79–85.

⁹⁵ N. Sutherland, 'The Triumph of Formalism: Elementary Schooling in Vancouver from the 1920s to the 1960s', *British Columbia Studies* 69–70 (Spring/Summer 1986), pp. 175–210.

reconstruction during these years. There are a number of books which discuss the growth of progressivism in Australia. This growth was a boost for the NEF at a time when the movement was under attack in the USA. Australia did not, however, provide the same level of ideological support that American educationists had. W. F. Connell (1980), writing about British influence on Australian education shows that the relationship was more one in which British ideas found their way to and influenced Australian educational policy in the years after 1945.⁹⁶ He also draws attention to the even deeper connection between Australia and the USA. The conferences held in each of the state capitals under the auspices of the NEF in 1937 were, in fact, organised by the Director of the Australian Council for Education and funded by the Carnegie Corporation in New York, which, of course, also funded the NEF IHQ in London. In addition to this, Andrew Spaul (1992) writing about the impact of the Second World War on the secondary curriculum shows that while the USA adapted much of its curriculum during the early 1940s to reflect a much more patriotic approach to education, Australia was more circumspect in its response.⁹⁷

Another important region in which the NEF's sought to expand its network, and one in which educational and social reconstruction became paramount after 1945, was Europe. Immediately after 1945, the NEF most successfully recreated its network in Belgium, France and Holland. By 1945 the network that had existed prior to 1940 had mostly been destroyed. Guy Neave (1992) explores the impact that German occupation had upon education systems in Belgium, France and the Netherlands during this period and the attempts in those countries to recreate their education

⁹⁶ W. F. Connell, 'British Influence on Australian Education in the Twentieth Century', in *Australia and Britain: Studies in a Changing Relationship*, eds. A. F. Madden and W. H. Morris-Jones (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1980), pp. 162–79.

⁹⁷ A. Spaul, 'World War II and the Secondary Curriculum: A Comparative Study of the USA and Australia', in *Education and the Second World War*, ed. R. Lowe (London: The Falmer Press, 1992), pp. 159–76, Chapter 11.

systems afterwards.⁹⁸ His assessment is that, while there was a lot of discussion about educational reform, on the whole, the common factor between these three countries was that they moved back towards the education systems that had existed prior to 1940 based heavily upon hierarchical principles and ideas. Henri Wallon, a psychologist and active member of the NEF, and Paul Langevin, an eminent Belgian physicist, were, however, instructed to create a commission to overhaul education in Belgium. Their ideas were, according to Neave, heavily influenced by more liberal and progressive thought, advocating a 'common school' and putting forward the idea that students should have regular psychometric testing and move through the school system accordingly. The relationship between the NEF and these countries is explored in this thesis as an indicator of the ability of the organisation successfully to expand its network back into Europe after 1945. The impact of the attacks upon progressivism in the USA was important in the development of the NEF after 1945 and is also examined.

UNESCO

There are no detailed studies of the NEF's relationship with UNESCO. Only Boyd and Rawson (1965) have provided any information about UNESCO, the NEF and educational links. James Sewell (1975), although not mentioning the NEF, wrote the main account of UNESCO's interests in education. Both writings are considered here.

In their history of the new education, Boyd and Rawson briefly describe the links between UNESCO and the NEF but make few observations about the relationship beyond anecdotal assertions.⁹⁹ They draw attention to the shared

⁹⁸ G. Neave, 'War and Educational Reconstruction in Belgium, France and the Netherlands, 1940–1947', in Lowe, (1992), pp. 84–127.

⁹⁹ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 151.

membership, particularly between the ENEF and UNESCO, and the dominance of UNESCO objectives upon NEF activities.

Sewell (1975) provides a useful account of the workings of UNESCO and ideas in his book about UNESCO and world politics, charting the organisation's evolution and the international ideal, the aim of which was to encourage social and educational reforms to transcend national boundaries.¹⁰⁰ Sewell shows that UNESCO used its position to impose these goals upon affiliated organisations but does not, however, mention the NEF. Sewell also discusses some of the key individuals involved with UNESCO's education department and their personal ideas, but does not explain how such ideas might have altered UNESCO's educational outlook. These key players included people, such as Fred Clarke, Lionel Elvin and Joseph Lauwerys, who were also members of the NEF. The movement for a socially aware and united international movement of teachers found support amongst educationists at this time, due in part to encouragement from UNESCO.¹⁰¹ The main issue concerning the present study is how far the international agenda and the UNESCO links aided the new education and gave it a base of support at a time when it found rejection elsewhere. The dichotomy of a movement attempting to become more internationally prominent and expand its international network while, at the same, time prevailing ideologies opposed these trends, forms a focus of this thesis.

Theoretical approaches

The development of the NEF after 1945 can be explained by applying some of the concepts of organisational theory as forwarded by authors P. DiMaggio and W.W. Powell (1991). Their thesis is that, when forced to choose, organisations will select

¹⁰⁰ J. Sewell, *UNESCO and World Politics – Engaging in International Relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), p. 217.

¹⁰¹ D. Stewart, 'Towards World Unity of Teachers', *Phi Delta Kappan* (31) (1949), pp. 89–91.

options that preserve and enhance organisational legitimacy and that this is more important than internal efficiency and organisation.¹⁰² P. Haunschild and A. Miner (1997) in their article advance this theory and argue that, in addition to this, when organisations face uncertainty, as the NEF did during this period, they will seek to imitate and ally themselves with other more successful organisations.¹⁰³ These theories provide an explanation for the development of the NEF and the way in which it adapted itself and survived during this period.

Arjen Boin (2003) in his conference paper on public institutions comments upon why some organisations become ‘institutionalised’ and ‘legitimised’, in other words develop institutional characteristics and gain support and trust from those who deal with them.¹⁰⁴ His theory has relevance beyond public institutions and can be applied to the NEF as a developing organisation facing many of the same challenges that a public institution might face in its development. Boin focuses upon the leadership and shared goals that the organisation develops as important factors in its success or failure. Boin builds upon the theory of M. C. Suchman who in his 1995 article argues that for an organisation to develop, gain legitimacy and be successful it must possess either a distinct identity or a particular way of working and it must also establish a high degree of trust from those who deal with it.¹⁰⁵ Boin concludes, therefore, that ‘the process of institutionalization thus consists of building a distinct identity that is appreciated, accepted and trusted by stakeholders’.¹⁰⁶ Applying this framework, the NEF, in order to become successful as an organisation after 1945 needed to establish a

¹⁰² P. J. DiMaggio and W. W. Powell, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991), pp. 1–38.

¹⁰³ P. Haunschild and A. S. Miner, ‘Modes of Interorganizational Imitation: The Effects of Outcome Salience and Uncertainty’, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42(3) (1997), pp. 472–99.

¹⁰⁴ A. Boin, *The Emergence of Public Institutions: Towards a Dynamic Theory of Institutional Birth and Development* (paper prepared for ECPR Conference, Edinburgh, 31 March–2 April, 2003).

¹⁰⁵ M. C. Suchman, ‘Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches’, *Academy of Management Review* 20(3) (1995), pp. 571–610.

¹⁰⁶ A. Boin and T. Christensen, ‘The Development of Public Institutions: Reconsidering the Role of Leadership’, *Administration & Society* 40 (3) (2008), pp. 271–97.

coherent ideology or purpose and to gain trust from those people and organisations with which it dealt. However, if it failed to achieve this, it could seek to achieve legitimacy by subordinating itself to more successful organisations.¹⁰⁷

Boin (2008) identifies three stages in the development of a successful organisation.¹⁰⁸ The first is emergence, the creation or establishment of the organisation; the most important factor in establishing long-term survival is the basis upon which it was founded, the funding and support received and the organisation's purpose. The second stage is organisational birth and institutionalisation. This is the stage in which the organisation gains contacts and develops an organisational identity. The final stage is based upon the development of strong and sustained leadership. Boin advances three hypotheses that help explain why some organisations are successful and others fail. The first is that a young organisation with a substantial degree of formal autonomy is most likely to succeed. The second is that an organisation that is considered to be reliable is more likely to be successful. The final hypothesis is that an organisation which invests in strategies to deal with crisis management is likely to benefit from these critical events if they are dealt with effectively. In the current study, the evolution of the NEF after 1945 is examined within the context of this theory.

Organisational theory is used in this thesis as a framework to interpret the evolution of the NEF in two different ways. In the first it is used as a method for analysing the archival material regarding the NEF and to explain the organisation's progress. In the second it is used to help guide the investigation of the material itself. The validity of using organisational theory to explain the development of the NEF was confirmed by contrasting the activities and work of the organisation as the

¹⁰⁷ W. Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations* (London: Sage, 2001), pp. 47–70.

¹⁰⁸ Boin (2008), pp. 271–97.

material emerged against that predicted by the theory. The value of organisational theory as a way of understanding the progress of the NEF became apparent only after a period of initial research into the organisation and the realisation that it provided a useful theoretical explanation for the development of the NEF.

Much has been written about the decline of progressivism and radical educational ideologies in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War.¹⁰⁹ Few authors have used the evidence of specific movements to test their conclusions. In his book about political thought in the 1950s, Daniel Bell (1985) provides a framework for interpreting this decline. He argues that after 1950 there was a marked rejection of movements with strong social or ideological bases.¹¹⁰ Bell's theory provides a useful explanation for why radical ideologies faced so much hostility or disinterest after 1950. Bell argues that the Second World War and fascism marked the end of interest in socially reformist movements. Bell focuses upon the USA alone, but his theory is examined in this thesis in the context of the international new education movement. In the USA, the new education faced total rejection. In Europe, however, the movement did not face the same level of hostility. In Britain, the NEF reversed the decline of the movement. It is clear that Bell has provided a theory that can be used to shed light upon the difficulties faced by the new education, both in the USA and elsewhere. However, this thesis considers the extent to which his theory of ideological decline applied in Britain and Europe where there existed a different attitude towards such ideologies. Indeed, Bell's theory does not fully explain the differing responses

¹⁰⁹ K. Brehony, 'What's Left of Progressive Primary Education', in *Rethinking Radical Education*, eds A. Rattansi and D. Reeder (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1992), pp. 196–221; also W. Taylor, 'Prospects for Progressive Pedagogy in England's Schools in the Late Twentieth Century', *New Era* 75 (1994), pp. 7–11.

¹¹⁰ D. Bell, *The End of Ideology – On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 285.

towards such ideologies internationally where other factors contributed to the difficulties and successes of the NEF.

Organisational theory, however, does not provide an entire explanation for the evolution of the NEF. Organisational theory shows how organisations might react to varying circumstances, but does not take into account the important role played by the activities and ideas of those individuals who work within an organisation such as the NEF, either in paid or voluntary capacities. This account of the NEF is also partly the story of those individuals who dedicated themselves, often without financial gain, to the organisation, either in order to promote specific agendas or to share their ideas with other educationists. David Tyack (1970) explores this debate in his article on the history of American education. In this article he argues that the history of education has tended to favour recording the ideologies of institutions and has ignored those of the individuals who were involved with them. The exploration of the NEF in this thesis, therefore, is also an account of the stories of those who were involved with it at all levels and who contributed to its development.¹¹¹

R. Murray Thomas (1998) offers three further useful theories for explaining the development of the NEF and its work during these years.¹¹² Murray Thomas suggests that when new ideas are introduced into a system there are three possible responses: the first is that the new system will quickly translate the new ideas into practice; the second is that reformers and conservatives will vie for control and potentially divide the movement; the third is that shortage of funding and facilities will mean that initial reformist advances will cause traditional patterns of behaviour to re-emerge and

¹¹¹ D. B. Tyack, 'New Perspectives on the History of American Education', in *History of Education: Major Themes Volume 1*, ed. R. Lowe (London: Routledge Taylor & Francis, 2000) pp. 43–60, Chapter 4. Article originally published in *The state of American education*, ed. H. J. Bass (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970).

¹¹² R. Murray Thomas, *Conducting Educational Research: A Comparative View* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1998), p. 93.

prevent any significant changes. The PEA and the progressive movement in the USA fall into the second category – internal division and conflict over the future path of the movement combined with concerted external attacks eventually caused its downfall. The NEF IHQ, however, can be interpreted within the framework of the third ‘inertia theory’. Initial enthusiasm and acceptance of a more radical social agenda was increasingly scuppered by funding and organisational problems that hindered the work of the organisation.

Network theory also provides a useful explanation for the progress of the NEF. According to Eckhardt Fuchs in an article in *Paedagogica Historica* (2007) networks are direct or indirect relationships between ‘relatively equal’ organisations that cross national boundaries.¹¹³ In addition to this, according to Fuchs in a further article (2007) these relationships can be formal or informal and tend to provide a flow of information between organisations that share similar beliefs or values.¹¹⁴ Michael Omolewa (2007) uses network theory to examine UNESCO as an example of an organisation that possessed such an international network after the Second World War.¹¹⁵ The NEF aspired to develop such a network of its own during the period under review and network theory is used to understand the development of the organisation’s international links.

During the 1940s in Europe and Britain, education and politics became imbued with idealism. The desire existed amongst the new educationists to recreate society through education. The focus was upon social and educational reconstruction.¹¹⁶ Education became a vehicle for social change. This thesis examines the effects of this

¹¹³ E. Fuchs, ‘Networks and the History of Education’, *Paedagogica Historica* 43(2) (2007), pp 185-197.

¹¹⁴ E. Fuchs, ‘The Creation of New International Networks in Education: The League of Nations and Educational Organizations in the 1920s’, *Paedagogica Historica* 43(2) (2007), pp. 199-209.

¹¹⁵ M. Omolewa, ‘UNESCO as a Network’, *Paedagogica Historica* 43(2) (2007), pp. 211-221.

¹¹⁶ A. Kazamias, *Politics, Society and Secondary Education in England* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1966), p. 303.

changing political and ideological climate upon the new education movement and considers how far the NEF's progress shows that initial idealism and enthusiasm for reconstruction was later replaced by a rejection of such ideals, as Bell argued was the case in the USA in 1945.

Primary sources and methodology

Chief archives

The main source of material used throughout this thesis, but in particular in chapters one, two and six, concerning the NEF's conferences, projects, memberships, finances, personal correspondence to and from the IHQ, and minutes of meetings are located at the Institute of Education, University of London. These contain the full NEF (WEF) archive from 1921. The material contained within these is used within this thesis to examine the problems that the organisation faced after 1945.¹¹⁷ This material shows how the NEF adapted to cope with the realities of the situation after 1945 and its attempt to find a new role.

The WEF archive provides valuable evidence about the people who were involved with the organisation in the form of copious letters; both sent and received, and the personal notes and comments by various secretaries and committee members about matters that affected their work, and the activities, of the organisation. This material provides a very personal insight into the workings of the organisation and the feelings of those involved with it and is provides a frank account of the organisation's successes and failures. The material also presents a point of view that is not merely associated with those in prominent positions in the NEF, for example the President or committee members but reveals much evidence of the day-to-day working of the

¹¹⁷ Institute of Education, University of London, NEF (WEF) archive. In this thesis the name University of London Institute of Education is used to refer to the Institute before 1987. It became the Institute of Education, University of London in June 1987. R. Aldrich, *The Institute of Education 1902-2002: A Centenary History London: Institute of Education, University of London 2002*, p. 219.

organisation. The archive contains a large amount of correspondence with other organisations, NEF members and financial supporters, transcripts of conference speeches and details of attendance at conferences. The NEF secretaries, in particular, were conscientious in saving their individual documents and correspondence, often including material that was critical of the NEF or its work. This presents the researcher with a useful picture of the workings of the NEF's secretaries and committees during this period.

This is also a limitation of the material. It represents only that saved by certain individuals who were active within the NEF. The material kept by the NEF secretaries was copious but has omissions; committee minutes, financial records and official documents are not well represented. As a result of this, it is very difficult to gain a clear insight into the workings of the committee or the links of the NEF with other organisations. This information has to be supplemented, therefore, from other sources, for example bulletins contained within the NEF's journal, the *New Era*. There is also difficulty in gaining a true picture of the extent of the membership of the NEF. There are three main reasons for this omission. First, some material was lost when the IHQ was bombed in 1944 losing most of the early material of the NEF. Second, the material retained only represents material that was considered important by the NEF secretaries. Third, the NEF kept poor records and IHQ did not maintain much membership or financial information.

There is much information regarding the national sections of the NEF, however. The founding charters of all the existing and newly created national sections of the NEF are held at the NEF (WEF) archive. This material also includes a wealth of detail about the conferences, meetings, activities and membership of all the national sections. Reports of the NEF's international conferences and dealings with these

branches are also occasionally detailed in these records. The material, both from the IHQ and the national sections, rarely contains minutes of committee meetings, a surprising omission considering the wealth of other documents available. The National Archives (NA) provide further information and documents about the NEF and its national sections which is used to supplement evidence about the activities, membership and ideologies of the organisation. The material about the NEF, therefore, represents a very personal rather than official view of the organisation. As a result of this, the researcher has needed to guard against accepting without question the opinions and perspectives provided by those within the organisation. As Richard Evans (2000) and Roy Lowe (1996) both state, the task of the historian is to be aware of the social purpose, implications and context of such material.¹¹⁸

The ENEF also forms an important part of this study of the NEF. There exists a wide range of material concerning the ENEF's activities during the 1940s and 1950s. Records held at the Institute of Education, University of London, show that the ENEF took over many functions and activities previously carried out by the IHQ.¹¹⁹ The ENEF organised conferences, undertook projects and maintained links with the English membership. During the 1960s, the ENEF had a number of different and short-lived secretaries and there was a period when there was no secretary at all. At this time a number of documents regarding the work of the ENEF and the English membership were mislaid. Supplemental information regarding the activities and early years of the ENEF between 1949 and 1951 and between 1967 and 1968 may be found at the National Archives at Kew.¹²⁰ Additionally, papers held at the National Archives show that the ENEF received grants to fund its activities from a variety of

¹¹⁸ Evans (2000) p. 80 and p.89; Lowe (1996) p. 323.

¹¹⁹ Institute of Education, University of London, WEF Archives, 'ENEF Files'.

¹²⁰ National Archives (NA), 'ED 121/429'.

sources. Information about the ENEF is gained from its regular bulletins of events and conferences, as well as articles in the *New Era* by English members, which during the 1950s and 1960s became a mouthpiece for ENEF views and activities. This material is used in chapters four and five.

Journals

This archival material about the NEF is supplemented by the organisation's journal, the *New Era*. The articles within the *New Era* are useful in showing the role of the NEF's membership in attempting to reinvent the movement's ideology. They also reveal the vigorous discussion of new educational ideology and NEF policy from a wide variety of perspectives and individuals. The articles and correspondence in the pages of the journal reveal the wide variety of people interested in the new education and the work of the NEF. Articles and letters were contributed not only by those in senior positions at universities and teacher training colleges and prominent educationists, but also by schoolteachers and administrators of education and as a result provides a broad spectrum of opinions and views, by both members and non members, about the new education and NEF. This material is used in chapter four to develop an understanding of the activities and ideas of the English new educational network.

Further information about specific individuals mentioned in the *New Era* is gained by cross referencing their names with the NEF's committee lists, attendance lists of conferences and comments made about individuals in secretarial correspondence. Through this it is also possible to cross-reference some individuals with other political and educational organisations that they were involved with, either as a result of their work with the NEF or for other reasons.

Information regarding the educational ideas of individuals or international institutions with links to the NEF is sometimes available in the official journals of those institutions, for example, the *Teachers College Record*, published by Columbia University, where both Carleton Washburne, the NEF President, and Laurin Zilliacus, the NEF Chairman, were on the staff. Other journals which are useful in detailing contemporary educational concerns or which also contain some material about NEF activities and members are the journal *Progressive Education*, the official journal of the Progressive Education Association (PEA), the *Times Educational Supplement* (TES) and *World Yearbooks of Education*.¹²¹ *Progressive Education* details the work of the progressive movement in the USA until the closure of the PEA in 1944 and usefully supplements the records of the AEF also held in the WEF archive. This material is used, in particular, in chapter two.

Institutions and organisations with links to the NEF

There were particular organisations and institutions that had a disproportionate involvement with the work and ideology of the NEF. A large number of staff at the University of London Institute of Education held important positions in the NEF and, as a result, this institution played a significant role in the development of the NEF.¹²² The links between UNESCO and the NEF were also important for the movement, providing it with financial support and ideological momentum. It was no coincidence that the NEF's objectives often reflected those of UNESCO. Membership lists from the NEF, reveal that important members on the NEF's committees and membership were also involved with UNESCO in various capacities. The NEF gained a position as

¹²¹ G. B. Jeffery and F. Clarke (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1949* (London: University of London, Institute of Education, 1949); G. B. Jeffery and J. A. Lauwerys (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1950* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1950); J. A. Lauwerys and N. Hans (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1951* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1951).

¹²² Institute of Education, University of London, Joseph Lauwerys Files, (DC/JL).

a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) affiliated to UNESCO as a direct result of these links when its small size may otherwise not have permitted such a relationship. UNESCO funded the NEF and, in return, the NEF undertook a variety of projects and activities. There is much useful material about the NEF's work with UNESCO within the NEF archives that forms the basis of the research used in this thesis.

Another useful source of material, used to examine the network and development of the NEF's ideas in chapter five, has been the National Union of Teachers (NUT) archive held at the University of Warwick Modern Records Centre (UWMRC). The NUT archives while not containing direct reference to the NEF do reveal much about educational issues and discussions during this period and the strong correlation between the activities and ideas of the NEF and those of the NUT.¹²³

The ENEF's network also extended into a variety of teacher training colleges and university education departments. This material, sourced from relevant university archives of the National Archives is used in chapters four and five, to supplement material about the organisation's links with those institutions and the context for the ENEF's involvement with teacher training in England. This includes, in particular, material about the following teacher-training colleges and universities which existed during this period and had links with the ENEF, the Bingley College, Borthwick College, Coventry College, Gipsy Hill College, University of Birmingham, and University of London Institute of Education. The useful Wakefield Research Service, supplied documents concerning the Bingley College. Unfortunately, rarely did any of the material about these colleges provide specific information about the ENEF or NEF even when named individual members held posts at these institutions. The exception

¹²³ University of Warwick Modern Records Centre (UWMRC), 'Coventry College Files'; 'NUT Archives'; 'University of Birmingham Files'.

to this were the office diaries for the Gipsy Hill College for the years 1948 and 1949, which reveal that the Principal was actively involved with the NEF at that time. Unfortunately such clear evidence of involvement with the NEF is rare and evidence for this has been mostly gleaned from the NEF (WEF) archive.¹²⁴

The NEF had strong historic links with a variety of private progressive schools. These schools used the *New Era* to advertise themselves, often with extensive claims that their educational ideologies were specifically inspired by the new education. The staff at these schools also regularly used the *New Era* to advance their views on various educational issues. The National Archives hold informative records of inspections and other official dealings with some of these schools, which reveal useful information about changes in their educational ideologies.

Individuals with links to the NEF

Oral evidence was sought to supplement the written accounts of the NEF and its associated sections. Unfortunately, due to the time period examined, many of those directly involved with the organisation during this period are either deceased – for example, William Boyd, Beatrice Ensor, Carleton Washburne, Clare Soper and Laurin Zilliacus – elderly or uncontactable; gaining first-hand accounts from these people about the work of the NEF between 1945 and 1966 is therefore difficult. Correspondence has been possible with only two individuals – Norman Graves and James Porter – who were members of the NEF towards the end of or after the period that this study covers and as such, were unable to provide information about the period covered in this thesis and as such was not used directly. They did, however, provide some interesting recent perspectives of the movement and its activities. Numerous attempts were made, unsuccessfully, to contact Wyatt Rawson and Joan D.

¹²⁴ Kingston University, Surrey, 'Gipsy Hill College Files'.

Browne. Material about individuals is found mainly in the WEF archival material, which contain much correspondence and personal notes regarding key individuals within the organisation both about them and. In addition to this, the Joseph Lauwerys files held at the Institute of Education, University of London provide further useful information about the NEF, particularly concerning the section in Australia. The 'Moot' Files also held at the Institute of Education, University of London have also provided material about Fred Clarke, who was a member of the NEF committee, and some of his ideas regarding the reconstruction of education after the Second World War.¹²⁵ Joan D. Browne's personal files held at the UWMRC provide material about her interests but nothing regarding her involvement with the NEF.¹²⁶ Email correspondence was entered into with Dr Arjen Boin, Associate Professor at the Public Administration Institute at the Louisiana State University, USA, concerning his organisational theory, which has proved very useful in developing the application of this to the NEF.

The dilemma regarding researching individuals involved with the NEF committees and their activities lies in the fact that, on the whole, there is very little or often no discussion about their involvement with the organisation in their writings even though many of these figures wrote prolifically. An example of this is Lionel Elvin, who was President of the ENEF as well as being Director of the University of London Institute of Education, but who does not mention the NEF in his writings. H-Childhood and H-Ed website forums were also used to request material relating about individuals discussed in this thesis and who were on the NEF committee, for example, Theodore Brameld and Carleton Washburne, on the 16 and 17 November 2006. On 4 September 2008 another request was made for information about other key NEF

¹²⁵ Institute of Education, University of London, The Moot, (DC/MOO).

¹²⁶ UWMRC, 'Joan D Browne Files'.

committee members, Rupert Best, Torben Gregersen and K.G. Saiyidain. This request led to an invaluable correspondence with Hanne Willert who has access to the personal papers of Torben Gregersen held at the Danish National Archives, Copenhagen and who was able to provide a number of useful documents concerning the Danish Section of the NEF.¹²⁷

The dilemma with oral evidence concerns the extent to which such material provides the historian with an objective view of the events or experiences described. This problem is discussed in Elton and Evans (2002) who question whether oral evidence is necessarily superior to written evidence.¹²⁸ A lot of the material relating to the NEF is provided by personal or professional letters, of which there is a plentiful supply, rather than minutes of meetings, of which very few were retained. However, as Lummis (1988) notes, the issues that arise for historians analysing written material are similar to those experienced in the use of oral evidence. Letters written by members of the NEF committees and executive often provide much personal opinion that would not normally be provided in official NEF documentation and reveal much of the individual stories behind those involved with the organisation. But it is necessary to be careful that such very personal views about the work of the NEF and other members do not unduly influence the researcher in the quest of objective study of the organisation.¹²⁹ The purpose of this study, therefore, is to bring to life the story that is contained within the material carefully filed by the Secretaries, in particular Clare Soper, and others who worked tirelessly and often unrecognised by those were more prominent educational names within the NEF. This study is designed to show

¹²⁷ The Danish National Archives, Copenhagen, Papers of Torben Gregersen (*Torben Gregersens privatarkiv*) (TG 7336)

¹²⁸ G. R. Elton and R. Evans, *The Practice of History* (London: Blackwell, 2002); P. Thane and A. Sutcliffe, *Essays in Social History Vol. 2* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 248.

¹²⁹ T. Lummis, *Listening to History: The Authenticity of Oral Evidence* (Pennsylvania: Rowman & Littlefield, 1988), p. 12.

that written material which often reflects the day-to-day running of an organisation such as the NEF can be just as revealing about the development of educational ideas in such an organisation as much as those who are more prominent and well known. This is not just a history of the NEF as an organisation but a social history of those who were involved with it on a variety of levels.

However, the value of such letters and materials is that they do provide, to some degree, a 'voice' for those who were involved with the NEF where it is not possible to gain direct oral evidence. These letters also reflect the views of those who might be forgotten in an analysis of the NEF, those who were involved with the organisation at a grassroots level, often in a voluntary capacity, and who were often female. Clare Soper, the first Secretary of the NEF, and Yvonne Moyse, who was Secretary of both the NEF and ENEF during the 1960s, in particular, provide a wealth of correspondence allowing an analysis of their experience of and insights into the NEF and educational and social issues of the day and, also, a valuable perspective of the NEF from a female point of view. This study of the NEF, therefore, is not intended merely to reflect the involvement of eminent educationists who were most prominent within the organisation but also those who were present in other capacities. This study reveals, in fact, that the survival of the organisation was due more to the work of the former than the links and contacts of the latter.

Structure of thesis

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. This first chapter has served as an introduction and review of primary and secondary material upon the new education and the NEF. Existing writings concerning the new education and the NEF have also been considered.

The second chapter examines the NEF and its situation in 1945. The problems that the organisation faced and the opportunities that became available to it at the end of the Second World War are put into the context of its structure, membership, finances and changes in its ideology as a result of its experiences during the 1930s and early 1940s. The third chapter explores the activities and changing ideology of the NEF between 1946 and 1966. Social justice, equality of opportunity and citizenship became increasingly important concepts in education at this time. This chapter considers how far the NEF and the new education were prominent in these movements and the extent to which they played a part in the development of these concepts in the educational consensus. Additionally, the relationship between socialism and the NEF are explored.

Chapters four and five focus upon the ENEF between 1945 and 1966. The ENEF became, after 1945, a prominent proponent of the new education in Britain and increasingly gained control over the activities of the international NEF movement. The importance and network of the ENEF is considered in these two chapters. This involves examining all aspects of the English new education movement, local branches, and how far this network extended into educational institutions and schools, both private and state. In chapter four this network of affiliations is examined. Its structure, membership, ideology and the problems it faced between 1945 and 1966 are also explored. In chapter five the importance of the ENEF and its ideas, both regionally and nationally are considered.

Chapter six explores the NEF's international network. This chapter is a comparative exploration of the NEF's network in those regions where it was active. These include Australasia, Britain, India, Europe and the USA. The progress of the new education and the NEF in these different countries is compared in order to

formulate a more comprehensive understanding of the progress of the international new education, the problems it faced and the reasons for these. Issues arising from this study are how and why progress differed and the factors that may have contributed to this. The differences in post-1945 educational and social policies in various countries and the effects of these upon the NEF in these areas are examined. Through this exploration theories concerning these variations are forwarded in order to advance understanding of the NEF as an international movement during this period. Chapter six also examines the NEF's involvement with international organisations, with a particular focus upon its links with UNESCO. The chapter considers whether the NEF's involvement with these organisations was beneficial to the movement in its attempt to increase its international network or whether it was a dilution of its new educational ideals.

Chapter seven forms the conclusion and advances a new framework, based upon organisational theory, for understanding the new education and the NEF.

CHAPTER TWO

Challenges Facing The NEF after 1945

The events of the Second World War seemed to mark the end of the new education and the failure of the NEF's hopes to create a better society. The NEF faced increased scepticism towards progressivism and its former base of supporters, middle-class Europeans and Americans, had turned against its ideas. The politicisation of the NEF meant that it experienced rejection in the USA, where the AEF was experiencing growing financial and organisational problems and had been accused of having communist sympathies, seriously undermining its credibility as an educational organisation.¹

In Europe, by 1945, the new educational network had also been destroyed. Many of the progressive schools that had been linked to the NEF no longer existed – having been suppressed during the fascist occupation of Europe – and European educationists no longer seemed interested in the offerings of the movement.² An additional problem lay in the fact that the international mood had moved away from radical ideology and concepts of spirituality and inner transformations.³ The first issue facing the NEF, therefore, was how to revive its moribund network, if such a revival was in fact possible. The second was to reconsider the policies that had guided the movement. This chapter considers the NEF's response to these dilemmas.

The first main response was that many prominent members of the NEF began to think the previously unthinkable. They argued that the new education, as it had existed prior to 1945, was no longer relevant. The concept of the new education as a child-centred movement, it was argued, had not been successful in coping with the

¹ Zilversmit (1993), p. 110.

² WEF III/209, 'Report', 1944.

³ Bell (1988), p. 285.

political and social changes of the 1930s and 1940s.⁴ From the later 1930s, the pages of the *New Era* also reflected this debate with articles considering the form that the new education should take and the values it should promote.⁵ The new education movement failed to anticipate the fascist threat in Europe and the outbreak of the Second World War. The policy of non-interference and benign tolerance of all views had not worked and the NEF had been left tarnished by its lack of response to totalitarian regimes. The almost total destruction of the NEF's network and organisation by 1945 meant that, in the terms of organizational theory, the NEF was effectively an 'embryonic organization' which was seeking to recreate itself, its network and its ideology in the post-war years.⁶

This chapter explores the NEF's situation in 1945, examining the problems and challenges that it faced at this time and its ability to deal with them. These issues are examined in the context of the NEF's membership and structure, finances, ideology and the situation in the USA and Europe in the 1940s. The desire to rebuild post-Second World War society along more just and democratic lines resonated with the ideals of the NEF. The ideals of democracy and social change— while always present within the new educational ideal — had not always been much heeded by the new educationists of the 1920s and 1930s. Now, it seemed, was an ideal opportunity to make the movement relevant.

Membership and structure of the NEF

From 1943, the International Headquarters of the NEF was based at 1 Park Crescent, London, following war damage to the offices in Tavistock Square during the previous year. It was from Park Crescent that the NEF's activities were organised. From 1921

⁴ WEF III/209, 'Report', 1944.

⁵ Editorial, 'Dare We Indoctrinate the Child?', *New Era* 15 (1934) p. 160; J. H. Nicholson, 'Education for Democratic Citizenship', *New Era* 15 (1934), p. 151.

⁶ Boin and Christensen (2008), pp. 271–97.

to 1951 the Secretary of the NEF was Clare Soper. She was succeeded by James Annand who held the post until 1963 and was followed by Yvonne Moyse who was Secretary until 1974.⁷ Soper and Annand were the longest-serving secretaries and had the most impact upon the organisation during the period under review. They were responsible for the control of the finances, organisation, membership and conferences. The headquarters also had the unenviable job of ensuring that lines of communication remained open between the various national groups of the NEF.⁸ These groups were in various countries and, although affiliated to the NEF and bound by a founding charter based upon the organisation's principles, they were semi-autonomous. These national groups were located in countries as diverse as Australia, France, India and the USA and were required to send an annual subscription to the NEF. They had their own committees and some of them published their own journals. NEF membership was possible through national branches or, alternatively, individuals could become direct members via the headquarters in London and receive the NEF's journal the *New Era*. This latter option was the less common method of membership.

In 1945, the Chairman of the NEF was Carleton Washburne, who became President in 1947. Ensor was still Honorary President. Vice Presidents were Adolphe Férière, Dimitry Katzaroff (of the University of Sofia, Bulgaria) and Elizabeth Rotten. Joseph Lauwerys was appointed Acting Chairman. The committee was mostly made up of men and women who had been involved with the NEF for many years. They represented a considerable range of educational expertise from a variety of international educational institutions and members were from Australia, Belgium, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Holland, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA. There was a strong European representation on the committee of important

⁷ ENEF 16, 'Note on Secretaries', undated.

⁸ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 December 1946.

European educationists. These were Mlle Hamaide (of L'Ecole Nouvelle, Brussels, in Belgium), Dr Henri Wallon (lecturer at the Collège De France, and reputed left-wing intellectual), Dr Kees Boeke (Head of Bilthoven Children's Community in Holland) and Jean Piaget (of the Institut Jean Jacques Rousseau in Switzerland).⁹ The remaining committee members also had links with prominent educational institutions and other organisations. The English were represented by David Jordan, lecturer at Goldsmith College, London, and James Hemming, Advisor in Psychology and Education to the NEF, who was also President of the British Humanist Association. William Boyd, Lecturer in Education at the University of Glasgow, represented Scotland.¹⁰ The USA was represented by Theodore Brameld, Edna White and Laurin Zilliacus. Brameld had formerly been a committee member in the PEA. He was new to the NEF committee and a key figure in the movement to reform its ideals. White was Director of the Merrill Palmer School, Detroit, USA. Zilliacus was Chairman of the NEF from 1947 until his death and guided many of its policies with his social ideals.¹¹ The only representative who was not either European or from an English-speaking country was Professor K. Saiyidain, Educational Adviser to the Indian government and lecturer at the University of Delhi and who became President of the NEF in 1951.¹² The committee, therefore, represented a potential powerhouse of educational contacts. Most of these members, however, were heavily involved in other concerns that left them little opportunity to deal consistently with the business of

⁹ Jenkins (1989), p. 407.

¹⁰ J. Hemming, *The Betrayal of Youth – Secondary Education Must Change* (London: Marion Boyar, 1980), p. 1. Also, see Jenkins (1989), p. 402, who describes him as a 'psychologist' and 'research officer in psychology'.

¹¹ WEF III/219, 'Report on Death of L. Zilliacus', 1959.

¹² WEF I/37, 'Committee List 1944'.

the NEF. This situation prevented the organisation from establishing a strong and sustained leadership, which hindered the development of a legitimate identity.¹³

The committee membership remained very stable throughout the late 1930s and into the 1940s. The only main difference was the withdrawal of three former committee members who were no longer interested in serving; Fred Clarke, Wyatt Rawson, who was the former Director of Studies at Cranborne School and worked part-time for the NEF IHQ, and Harold Rugg, lecturer at the University of Chicago and later at the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Rawson and Rugg cited various misgivings concerning the lack of direction of the NEF.¹⁴

By 1945, problems had arisen with the structure of the NEF. The loose affiliation of regional branches meant that many of them had lost contact with the headquarters, particularly in Europe, due to the Second World War, but also including the USA. By 1945, fewer of the surviving branches sent membership dues, claiming that low membership numbers now made this impossible. Another significant problem with such a diverse and international membership was that it proved difficult keeping ideological uniformity. Many regional groups, particularly in Europe, now wanted to refocus their energies upon their own needs and were less interested in the ideals of the NEF. Gradually, the international nature of the committee began to decline and, increasingly, the NEF headquarters was forced to turn to its English membership for support. Soper complained that,

I really have no HQ cttee at the moment . . .the situation at the moment is as follows: Fred Clarke resigned, Hamley continually ill. Hartley, ill old and resigned, Rawson too far away to come to meetings . . . Lynch deceased . . . I have of course a nice little guiding cttee but they . . . are all

¹³ Boin and Christensen (2008).

¹⁴ 'Biographical Note', *New Era* 34 (April 1953), pp. 74–77.

English representatives of English organizations doing international work.¹⁵

The lack of any formal structure and the declining international interest of many educationists in the NEF became a major problem for the IHQ in expanding its network outside of England.

The loss of an active committee structure was a serious problem and in the mid-1940s the NEF was drifting with no clear purpose or aims. The running of the headquarters was left to a few individuals. This restricted the NEF's ability to plan long-term projects and threatened its continuing existence. Projects, conferences and the other organisational matters that devolved to the headquarters were dealt with in a very haphazard way. Most of the decisions and worries of the organisation were left entirely to the secretary.¹⁶ The main legacy for the NEF from this was its lack of new ideas. As Beatrice Ensor's involvement with the NEF declined, so too did her pioneering and radical ideals.¹⁷ The same names appeared at every election. Fewer new people were becoming involved at an international level. As a result of all these factors, the NEF headquarters found itself increasingly out of touch with its branches and the political and educational situation at large.¹⁸

Finances

The hostile attitude in the USA towards international organisations had an immediate and negative impact upon the NEF's finances after 1945. The financial problems that dogged the NEF for most of the post-1940 period had become more noticeable by the mid-1940s. The NEF had relied heavily upon the USA for financial support. This had come to replace the funding from the theosophists, in the shape of the Theosophical

¹⁵ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 December 1946.

¹⁶ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 29 December 1947.

¹⁷ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 5 November 1948.

¹⁸ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 December 1946.

Educational Trust, which had supported the NEF during the 1920s. The theosophists, funded by wealthy followers of Helena Blavatsky, not only set up the NEF, but also financed its early conferences, particularly the 1921 Calais Conference. They also supported the running costs of the headquarters in Tavistock Square until the late 1930s.¹⁹ Beatrice Ensor had established the national headquarters in London in 1921 funded by the Theosophical Educational Trust and later with a large grant from the Rockefeller Foundation in the United States. By 1943, the Theosophical Educational Trust had ceased to be a viable financial concern, unable to exist in the more cynical world of post-1945 education and politics and survived, impoverished, in the hands of only a few theosophical devotees.

By the mid 1940s, however, it was becoming clear that the funding from the USA was also drying up. In 1946, the Rockefeller foundation, which had almost single-handedly funded the NEF for the preceding few years, informed Clare Soper that it no longer supported the social objectives of the NEF and was not willing to provide further financial assistance.²⁰ Soper also noted on 18 May 1946 that while 'the Colombia Foundation has renewed its grant for another year', it did so with great reluctance.²¹ This uncertainty severely curtailed the ability of the NEF headquarters to make long-term plans. Activities were shelved, as the matter of day-to-day survival became uppermost. The effect of this was that the NEF was unable to make a strong case for its relevance or undertake sufficient work to promote the new education internationally, as it would have wished. The immediate circumstances of the NEF were such that they would not favour expansion or promotion of the organisation or even the development of new ideas.

¹⁹ WEF I/1, Undated biographical note signed by Ensor concerning her early involvement with the new education.

²⁰ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 18 May 1946.

²¹ Ibid.

Clare Soper wrote regularly about these financial concerns to Laurin Zilliacus. She was worried that there were only a few days of monetary reserves in the bank account. Most of her correspondence was devoted to the immediate task of keeping the NEF running.²² One problem lay in the fact that, where national branches had survived, for example, Australia and New Zealand, 'their memberships are so small and their subscriptions so small that it doesn't amount to very much.'²³ Additionally, the *New Era* was also unable to provide any financial help for the NEF headquarters as, 'its subscription list is very small . . .'.²⁴ Soper approached various financial advisers to help her make money from the stock market but did not find a positive response.²⁵ The problem faced by the NEF was that the committee was not able to devote much time to financial concerns, resulting in a situation in which Clare Soper was left to deal with the difficulties herself.

The NEF kept very poor records of its finances. This was one of the reasons for its inability to keep track of them and also a reason for its continuing financial difficulties. In the end, the main purpose for the NEF linking itself with UNESCO in 1948 was to request money rather than for any higher ideological purpose. Clare Soper estimated that the NEF needed £2000 a year in order to survive. She hoped that UNESCO could provide this.²⁶ At the end of the 1940s, the cost of funding the headquarters in London was estimated to be £4000 annually. Only £750 came from section subscriptions, and an even smaller £500 came from membership. Grants provided £500, donations £500 and UNESCO gave a subvention of £750. It was clear

²² WEF I/II, Soper to Zilliacus, 3 September 1946.

²³ WEF I/II, Soper to Zilliacus, 13 September 1946.

²⁴ WEF I/II, Soper to Zilliacus, 2 June 1946.

²⁵ WEF II/171, Soper to Berliner, 16 December 1947.

²⁶ WEF V/271, 'Statement of Finances', 1946.

therefore that the NEF operated on a continuous shortfall. Year by year, the surplus was funded by one-off donations from other people and organisations.²⁷

In 1946, Soper told UNESCO that the NEF had 17,000 members spread across 22 countries. Despite this large estimated membership, few of these actually provided much in the way of subscriptions. Most of those active within the organisation, and paying money towards their membership, came from Britain. According to Soper, the membership had, in fact, declined from the 1930s when the NEF had possessed a membership of 21,000.²⁸ Unfortunately, many of the figures concerning membership quoted by the NEF were speculation. No central membership records were maintained, except for those few people who paid their subscriptions directly. The ENEF did, however, keep more detailed membership records. This showed that, as far as England was concerned, in the 1940s, the NEF mainly appealed to educationists connected to educational institutions such as universities and teacher training colleges. The NEF held less appeal to those that the organisation most sought to join, teachers, parents and those involved with or interested in education at a regional level.²⁹ Membership in England had declined rapidly during this period.³⁰ The quest to involve a wider range of people within the organisation was one that guided many of the NEF and the ENEF's activities after 1945. Without a membership more representative of the many other groups of people actively involved with education, the NEF risked remaining the isolated bastion of high educational ideals that it had become in the 1930s. Widening membership of the NEF was also necessary from a purely financial viewpoint.

²⁷ WEF V/279, 'Financial Statement', 1949.

²⁸ WEF V/271, 'Statement of Finances', 1946.

²⁹ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum', 1964, p. 8.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

After 1945, conferences were still as popular as they had been prior to 1940 and attracted a wide attendance. Now, however, this was mainly from Britain and English-speaking countries, and only more rarely from other European countries, reflecting the changing demographics of the membership. Very few educationists from the USA were present at any of these conferences after 1945. Ironically, the Copenhagen conference of 1953 attracted more Australian and British representatives than European.³¹ Professions listed by attendees at conferences between 1945–53 were mostly as lecturers or primary school teachers. Secondary school teachers or other educationists were noticeable by their absence. Conferences were well attended but did not bring in any profits for the NEF itself, mostly being run on a deficit.³²

The NEF had traditionally relied upon donations from wealthy supporters. One of these, Edgar Berliner, who was the ‘financial plenipotentiary of the NEF in the US’ was appalled at the state of the finances and the way that the organisation arranged its financial affairs.³³ Berliner wrote to the NEF’s President, Carleton Washburne, at Columbia University in Washington DC, USA, chiding him for his apparent lack of interest. Washburne responded that:

You speak of the tendency of the NEF to cease active fund raising efforts as soon as they see a little light ahead . . . I agree that what you say is true . . . for a very good reason, that the only people who have been able to give full-time to the NEF have been Peggy [Volkov] and Clare [Soper]. Neither of them is a fund raiser and both of them are excessively busy . . . I took up in Cirencester in 1947 the importance of getting someone in England who would take this responsibility but I had neither the knowledge of personnel nor the time in England to try and find the right person and Peggy and Clare were quite unsuccessful in finding such a one. Joe Lauwerys should as Deputy Chairman have gone in search of

³¹ WEF 215, ‘Membership of Copenhagen Conference’, 1953.

³² Ibid.

³³ DC/JL WEF Conferences ‘Memorandum’ J. Lauwerys to R. Best October 8 1946.

someone who would take this responsibility but he either failed to do so or failed to find the right person.³⁴

Washburne concluded that he was unable to do anything to help the organisation. This was due to the fact that his work at the university took up his entire time. The NEF, therefore, had a President based in the USA who only had postal contact with the headquarters. By his own admission, he was unable to provide any support whatsoever for this role.³⁵ In fact, the surviving correspondence shows that Soper rarely attempted to communicate with Washburne, often preferring to discuss more important issues with either Berliner or Zilliacus, also in the USA. Although Beatrice Ensor was still the Honorary President, she was based in South Africa and had little contact with the NEF. Berliner commented that the NEF and other amateur organisations like it only ever saw the short-term and only sought funds at the very moment that bankruptcy loomed. This was neither a long-term strategy for survival nor would it allow the NEF to become an effective and pioneering educational organisation.

The financial situation had become so dire by 1946 that Clare Soper invested her life savings to keep the NEF afloat.³⁶ Berliner expressed his shock that the NEF had been reduced to this, stating that ‘. . . your finances have drifted from bad to worse’.³⁷ Soper wrote again that: ‘Money situation here still down . . . we have £600 in the bank . . . when that is finished we close down.’³⁸ In the same year Soper had written to UNESCO that ‘. . . we need to tide over the next year or two’.³⁹ Berliner was generally very critical of the entire NEF committee, also singling out the

³⁴ WEF II/171, Washburne to Berliner, 17 October 1949.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 4 October.

³⁷ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 12 November 1947.

³⁸ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 1 January 1948.

³⁹ WEF V/271, Soper to UNESCO, circa 1948.

Chairman, Zilliacus. Soper commented that while he 'never works for us in ways that help financially, he brings a great deal to our members . . .'.⁴⁰

Soper attempted to raise money for the NEF through an ill-fated attempt to create a NEF book club. Berliner responded to a glowing report upon the state of the club from Soper, that 'almost any operation can be made to look profitable if you charge all the expenses, i.e. pay all the expenses out of funds having nothing to do with the operation'.⁴¹ In fact, few of the books were sold and the venture left the NEF headquarters even more heavily in debt.⁴² By 1948, Soper was forced to stop taking a salary for her work at the headquarters and supported herself from her own savings.⁴³ In 1950, James Annand noted that none of the enterprises started by Soper had been in any way financially successful.⁴⁴

Berliner stated that, while he was willing to provide some money, he did not wish to become the sole financial supporter of the NEF. He stated:

. . . it is very unfair to the fellowship to be depending on someone who is 6000 miles away . . . a few months ago I advised you to cease counting on me in the matter of raising funds . . . to dump [the problem] in your laps.⁴⁵

This letter drew no response from the IHQ and Berliner wrote again to Soper about his frustrations with the NEF's inability to be more financially responsible.

. . . I tried to draw from you and Mr Lauwerys from whence you thought the (further) support of the NEF should come . . . If I may say so I think that one of the great differences between us is that you like to run along until you get into trouble and then find your way out whereas I prefer to try to anticipate what may happen.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ WEF II/171, Soper to Berliner, 29 July 1949.

⁴¹ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 2 February 1948.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 19 January 1948.

⁴⁴ WEF II/168, Annand to Reuler (USA section), 19 January 1950.

⁴⁵ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 11 December 1947.

⁴⁶ WEF II/171, Berliner to Soper, 23 March 1948.

Such a comment neatly reflected the situation that was to cause problems for the NEF in all its activities. It is significant that Soper kept no records of the, in her own admission, significant amounts given to the NEF by Berliner. This reflected the lax attitude towards financial accounting held by the NEF.⁴⁷

The financial problems of the NEF by the mid-1940s marked a significant turning point in the outlook and nature of the organisation. Previously it had been able to rely upon a variety of people and groups for monetary support. In an era of political suspicions, a declining active membership and competition with a wide variety of other single-issue movements, the NEF found itself sidelined. The attempt to cope with this change in fortune was a significant factor in the evolution of the NEF and a symptom of the organisation's failure to gain legitimation as a valid institution capable of being financially independent.⁴⁸ Financial difficulties made the future of the organisation less secure but forced it to try and attract a wider audience.

Ideology before 1945

Spiritual ideals, specifically theosophical ones, heavily influenced the NEF during the 1920s and into the 1930s. These have been discussed in chapter one. Theosophy, in particular, exerted an enormous influence upon the NEF of the 1920s and 1930s.⁴⁹ From the later 1930s onwards, the NEF's ideology began to change dramatically. Spiritual ideas that had seemed useful expressions of new educational ideals after the First World War were no longer considered relevant by 1945. A gradual transformation of the NEF's purpose had begun in the early 1930s. Lauwerys expressed this uncertainty over the development of new educational ideas during the 1930s, stating that:

⁴⁷ WEF II/171, Soper to Berliner, 11 February 1948.

⁴⁸ W. Richard Scott (2001), pp. 47–70.

⁴⁹ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 64.

... we find ourselves non-plussed about how best to act because we are unclear about what are the requirements in personal development which permit formative interaction. In the thirties, we had two strands of certainty – The Christian strand and the Freudian strand, some members drawing on one source or the other, but finding common ground in the concept of the liberation child. . . . The common value in so far as we have one is belief in the forces of creation and that their release in individuals leads to a higher order of human experience.⁵⁰

Two main strands emerged to dominate the movement's actions and ideals after 1945. The first was a desire to find a new justification for the new education as an educational philosophy. The second was to find a purpose for the NEF that would allow it to play a useful part in society.

The other theme that emerged was, in fact, not a new one. This was the belief that psychological theories of education and society provided a genuinely rational and scientific method for interpreting the new education. Psychological theories had begun to replace spiritual ones as explanations for the new education from the 1920s.⁵¹ Men and women who had become involved in the progressive movement, but were not necessarily educationists, gradually introduced such ideas. These included such eminent names as Edouarde Claparede (1873–1940), Ovide Decroly (1871–1932) and Maria Montessori (1870–1952).⁵² Such men and women brought into the new education a fresh appreciation amongst progressives for psychology as a tool in education and a more scientific approach towards the new education. Montessori herself, a member of the NEF and active in the new education movement until her exile to India in 1942, addressed the NEF in 1929 and stated that the new

⁵⁰ ENEF 6, Lauwerys to Henderson, 19 February 1964.

⁵¹ Selleck (1972), p. 42. Selleck saw the new education as a specifically spiritual tradition, based upon Beatrice Ensor's religious convictions. In this tradition, the child was able to evolve towards a higher state of existence and awareness, because the educator did not intervene in the process.

⁵² Gordon and Aldrich (1997), pp. 88–9.

psychology was bringing to education 'a new era of positive science of education'.⁵³ She added that psychological testing had shown that it was only when adult-created obstacles were removed from the child that a healthy and happy child could develop to his or her full spiritual and intellectual potential.⁵⁴ New educationists hoped that psychology would give the new education an intellectual and scientific credibility that some felt it lacked.⁵⁵ A newer cadre of membership hoped that such rationalisation of the new education would provide a moral justification for the NEF's work.⁵⁶ This new approach was defined as a quest '... to change ... society so as to make it more open, more responsive to the needs of ... [citizens with] balanced personalities'.⁵⁷

There was continued resistance to this psychological and scientific movement within the NEF from supporters of Ensor's spiritual ideals. William Boyd was firmly against any attempt to repackage the new education as a rational and purely intellectual movement and used his position on the committee to try and ensure that Ensor's ideals were kept pure.⁵⁸ He felt that the continued evolution of the new education in a scientific direction was a betrayal of early NEF ideals.⁵⁹ He singled out Carleton Washburne for criticism as an example of the failings of this approach.⁶⁰ Boyd was concerned that the new education did not have any form of cohesive ideology to cement these various so-called 'scientific' strands.⁶¹ He considered that, potentially, the split caused by these ideals competing with Ensor's spiritual ones could undermine the development of the new education and allow it to splinter into various factions. He believed, for example, that the British educators took a more

⁵³ Boyd (1930), p. 106.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 354.

⁵⁵ Selleck (1972), p. 42.

⁵⁶ L. Elvin, *The Place of Common Sense in Educational Thought* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977), p. 68. Elvin discussed the place of religion and morality in the school curriculum.

⁵⁷ WEF I/35, 'Note Italian Section', 1946.

⁵⁸ Boyd (1930), p. 453.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 413.

⁶⁰ W. Boyd, 'The Community as Educator', *New Era* 22 (January 1941), pp. 1-4.

⁶¹ Boyd (1930), p. 376.

spiritual viewpoint, based heavily upon the ideas of Beatrice Ensor, while the Americans favoured a positivist attitude, seeking to fit education into a scientific framework.⁶² In 1939, Fred Clarke had also argued against any dilution of spiritual ideals, claiming that a post-war society needed more, not less, spirituality. In his case, he was referring to Christian rather than theosophical ideals.⁶³ Clarke was part of the 'New Jerusalem' movement that became prominent during and immediately after the Second World War. This movement was one that sought an idealistic and spiritual reconstruction of education and society. Clarke's involvement with the Moot, a discussion group devoted to the introduction of Christian ideals into society, was one result of this. It was through NEF members such as Clarke and Harold Dent that the idealism of the 'New Jerusalem' movement became prominent within the organisation.⁶⁴ However, neither Boyd nor Clarke found the support for their spiritual views of education that they hoped and, by the early 1940s, it was clear that the NEF's ideology was moving firmly away from this interpretation of the new education. Divisions over the ideology of the NEF at this time were responsible for hindering the development of the organisation at a time when it sought to promote itself as an effective force in educational and social reconstruction.

The first serious attempt to unite both approaches to the new education, as both a socially revolutionary and psychologically based movement, occurred at the NEF's first major conference after 1940. This was the 1942 conference held at Caxton Hall, London, which focused on the creation of a children's charter of rights. The aim of this conference was to debate the concerns of educationists regarding the situation of children and their welfare in the post-war world. At this conference, vigorous debate

⁶² Ibid., p. 376.

⁶³ DC/MOO, File 2, Documents dated 21 August 1939 from Fred Clarke.

⁶⁴ M. Barber, *The Making of the 1944 Education Act* (London: Cassell, 1994), pp. 6–7.

focused upon psychology and the child's 'personality'. There was pressure to include a statement of spiritual ideals within the final version of the charter by some of those on the committee who demanded the inclusion of the word 'sacred' within the statement about the personality of the child. Those who favoured a psychological view of the new education opposed this.⁶⁵ A compromise was reached between those present in which the sentence specifying the aims of the NEF read: 'We believe that the personality of the child is sacred, and that the needs of the child must be the foundation of any good educational system.'⁶⁶ The discomfort of those who opposed the inclusion of these spiritual terms in the charter was strongly conveyed to Clare Soper in a number of letters of criticism. Soper later wrote to Joseph Lauwerys noting this opposition and that much of it had come from American educationists present at the conference.⁶⁷ Fred Clarke commented that the charter was 'too wordy and argumentative'.⁶⁸ The confusion and compromises on this issue hindered the NEF's attempts to establish a clear ideological framework at this time. The charter, however, can be seen as a watershed in the evolution of the NEF's thoughts. The inclusion of a heavily political and social element in the discussions and the vigorous attempt by committee members to exclude mention of spiritual or religious ideals from the charter showed even at this stage that non-spiritual ideals were beginning to dominate over its former spiritual approach.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ WEF IV/235, 'Children's Charter Statement of Aims', 1942.

⁶⁶ Ibid: '1) We believe that the personality of the child is sacred, and that the needs of the child must be the foundation of any good Educational System. 2) The right of every child to proper Food, Clothing and Shelter shall be accepted as a first charge on the resources of the nation. 3) For every child there shall always be available Medical Attention and Treatment. 4) All children shall have equal opportunity of access to the nation's stores of Knowledge and Wisdom. 5) There shall be full-time schooling for every child. 6) Religious training should be available to all children.

⁶⁷ WEF IV/235, Soper to Lauwerys, 18 May 1942.

⁶⁸ WEF IV/235, Clarke to Soper, 14 August 1942.

⁶⁹ WEF IV/235, 'Children's Charter Statement of Aims', 1942.

This split between the psychological approach and spirituality has been credited as one of the main reasons for the failure of American progressivism.⁷⁰ The issue seems not to have proven as divisive amongst British new educationists, perhaps for the reason that the NEF did, in fact, provide more unity there than anywhere else.⁷¹ This new approach was to guide much of the NEF's thinking after 1940, when new educationists sought to turn the movement from the vague spirituality of Ensor into a movement that would be recognised for the quality of its research and investigation into educational and social issues.⁷²

Ironically, despite the protestations of those who claimed to seek the continuation of Ensor's spiritual legacy, Ensor herself always possessed a strong interest in the 'new' psychology. Ensor credited educational thinkers such as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel and Dewey, as well as thinkers such as Jung and Freud, with helping her formulate her new educational creed.⁷³ Ensor credited Montessori's scientific approach to education as an important influence upon the development of her ideas. Ensor's speeches reveal that the new education, for Ensor at least, was a curious amalgam of psychology and spirituality. They also revealed that she was keen to allow those with a psychological and scientific approach to the new education to co-exist with the spiritual purists.⁷⁴ It is also clear that Ensor had strong sympathy for the 'new' psychology that was beginning to find favour within educational circles. This stance also gained an echo in the statement of aims as printed in editions of the *New Era*.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ MacDonald (1972), pp 1–13.

⁷¹ Punch (1977), p. 4.

⁷² Boyd (1930), p. 351.

⁷³ Ibid., p .2.

⁷⁴ WEF III/219, 'Notes on the NEF', undated.

⁷⁵ *New Era* – Aims of the NEF printed at front of each issue: '1) To bring together people in all branches of education, therefore breaking down departmental and national barriers; 2) To bring those professionally interested in education into touch with parents and employers; 3) To afford opportunities

The other important movement that had an impact upon the NEF from the second half of the 1930s, was one that began to develop within the new education in response to the political events of these years. This sought to use education, particularly the new education, as a basis for social change.⁷⁶ Those in favour of this approach believed that the NEF should seek to ensure that democracy and social justice were at the forefront of its ideals, both within the classroom and in the wider society. The justification for this approach lay in Ensor's early focus upon revolutionary change and freedom. Ensor had believed that an important role of the NEF was, in fact, to promote social revolution and justice in society.⁷⁷ Ensor spoke of the 1917 Russian Revolution as an event that should be emulated in other countries; her hope was that the new education could create such a revolution within Britain.⁷⁸ By 1945, those who considered that this was the most suitable path for the NEF had begun to gain prominence within the organisation. Lauwerys wrote that: 'There is a need to try and find out about the future of civilization so that we can identify the sort of society the child will live in and what we will need . . .'.⁷⁹ The new education movement was to be about creating a fair, just and democratic society.

Ideology in 1945

The world situation in 1945 seemed to provide an ideal opportunity for the NEF to make a difference. In addition to the more practical task of rebuilding war-damaged school buildings, there was also the task of cleansing the school system of all – what

of meeting in conferences, seminars and discussion groups at both national and international levels; 4) To promote, through these means and through its publications, international understanding, unprejudiced thinking and good feeling; 5) To remain alive to developments in psychology, sociology and philosophy which impinge on education and to apply knowledge so gained to the learning situation in schools, teacher training colleges and other adult education groups, as well as to the nurture of children in the home; to endeavour to foresee educational trends of the future; 6) To plan activities and take part in researches which will help its members in their own countries to do their work as educators more effectively with greater job and satisfaction.'

⁷⁶ Boyd (1930), p. 315.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 2.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 86.

⁷⁹ ENEF 6, Lauwerys to Henderson, 19 February 1964.

the new educationists considered to be – the out-dated prejudices and repression that had existed in the pre-war educational system.⁸⁰ The immediate concern for the new educationists was the re-education of those in formerly Nazi or fascist-occupied countries and the reformation of the school and university systems across Europe.⁸¹ Socially, the new educationists would encourage ‘equality of access to educational resources’ and ‘equality of educational opportunity’.⁸² This they interpreted to include the raising of the school-leaving age, the extension of secondary education and technical and vocational education. In addition to this, it was considered necessary to widen access to higher education for working-class students, to create a more even distribution of the ‘financial burden’ and a ‘fuller recognition of regional differences’.⁸³ Both Fred Clarke, who was director of the University of London Institute of Education between 1936 and 1945, and Joseph Lauwerys were instrumental in persuading the NEF committee to consider these issues.⁸⁴

The focus upon democracy after 1945, as opposed to social revolution, came from the USA, rather than the ideals of Ensor. There was a feeling that progressivism and, in particular, the new education had failed during the 1930s, with the inability of educationists to stop the outbreak of war.⁸⁵ It was at this time that the NEF was influenced by American educationists who believed strongly that education should be used to promote democratic values. Those American educationists active within the

⁸⁰ ‘First Bulletin on Reducing Costs’, *TES*, 2 December 1949, p. 844.

⁸¹ F. Clarke, H. R. Hamley et al. *The Yearbook of Education 1948* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1948), p. 11.

⁸² ‘Human Relationships – re-establishing a Social Pattern’, *TES*, 30 September 1949, p. 672, explaining the need to help people cope with new social changes through educational provision for adults.

⁸³ Clarke et al. (1948), p. 12.

⁸⁴ Gordon and Aldrich (1997), pp. 52–3.

⁸⁵ Congress on Education for Democracy, *Education for Democracy: The Proceedings of the Congress on Education for Democracy* (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 15, 16, 17 August 1939).

NEF were at the forefront of this movement.⁸⁶ Washburne was one such believer in these ideas.⁸⁷ He became President of the NEF in 1947, an appointment clearly marking this new direction of the NEF towards such an approach in the new education. Harold Rugg regularly had articles published in the *New Era* on this topic.

Social justice as a concept provided the NEF with a purpose that it believed could make it relevant to the situation in 1945 and after. The most important coup for those who sought this purpose for the NEF was the ability to gain the support of those members who had always been uneasy with the NEF's theosophical ideals. Harold Rugg, for example, was one early member who remained a keen supporter of the child-centred approach rather than Ensor's spiritual ideals.⁸⁸ By 1939, he had adapted his ideas from advocating total freedom for the child to encompass the growing belief that democratic values should be promoted in the schoolroom.⁸⁹ In 1948, he considered this dilemma for progressives between these two approaches in his article in the American journal *Progressive Education* entitled 'Progressive Education – Which Way?'⁹⁰ The purely child-centred approach survived mainly in the NEF through the involvement of Peggy Volkov. She was the editor of the NEF's journal, the *New Era*, from 1937 to 1964. Volkov was interested in the education of young children and the creation of 'children's communities' using traditional progressive methods.⁹¹ She was a continuous defender of many new educational ideas that had ceased to be popular by the 1940s among many more prominent NEF members.⁹² Ensor herself was aware of this opposition to her spiritual beliefs and always sought

⁸⁶ H. Rugg, *Democracy and the Curriculum* (London: University of London Press, 1939).

⁸⁷ Sinha (1971), p. 76.

⁸⁸ Gordon and Aldrich (1997), p. 100.

⁸⁹ H. Rugg and A. Shumaker, *The Child Centred School – An Appraisal of the New Education* (London: George G. Harrap, 1928), p. 55; H. Rugg, *Democracy and the Curriculum* (London: University of London Press, 1939), p. vi.

⁹⁰ H. Rugg, 'Progressive Education – Which Way?', *Progressive Education* 25(4) (February 1948), pp. 35–7 and 45.

⁹¹ P. Volkov, *Children's Communities* (London: NEF, 1941).

⁹² P. Volkov, 'Progressive England', *Progressive Education* 24(1) (1946), pp. 34–5.

to downplay the theosophical links in order to gain a wider support for her educational ideas and the NEF.⁹³ Ensor noted in her personal papers that discretion was prudent as many educationists were 'rather afraid of our theosophy'.⁹⁴ Those who sought to return to a more child-centred ideology were, however, not very successful within the movement and there was little support for this approach by 1945.

Before 1940, this debate was confined to a minority of educationists. By the mid 1940s, the nature of the debate concerning freedom and democracy had altered.⁹⁵ It was considered that it was not sufficient merely to promote such ideals within schools but to become more greatly involved with wider political issues.⁹⁶ The *New Era* reflected this with various educationists seeking to use its pages to encourage a greater interest in social justice.⁹⁷ The new educationists used the term 'democracy' widely in their debates and in a different sense from its previous usage by new educationists in the 1920s and 1930s. Previously there had been the implication of a school system free from the authoritarian tyranny of the headteacher and where the pupils had a significant say in the running of the school.⁹⁸ Other new educationists were more concerned that students should be trained to respect democratic government.⁹⁹

⁹³ In 1915, Beatrice Ensor formed the Theosophical Fraternity in Education. The membership was confined to theosophists. In 1916, she decided to devote herself to the theosophical cause and resigned as a school inspector. Edmond Holmes was sympathetic to Ensor's educational aims and allowed the group to combine their meetings with his own, the New Ideals in Education. This they continued to do until 1920 when Ensor severed her links with Holmes. This, perhaps, was the first of a number of schisms that Ensor's new education was to face. The reasons behind this decision have gained different explanations according to the varying sources. Jenkins ('Professional Middle Class') claims that the membership of the Theosophical Fraternity was sufficient to allow it to exist as an independent organisation. However, there is insufficient evidence about membership of the group to support this explanation. Sinha (1971), has claimed that, in fact, Holmes objected to the theosophical elements that Ensor had introduced. See also Selleck (1972).

⁹⁴ Jenkins (1989), p. 27.

⁹⁵ Rubinstein (1993), p. 24.

⁹⁶ Jenkins (2000), pp. 139–51.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Carr and Hartnett (1996), p. 40. Wilfred Carr and Anthony Hartnett have suggested a definition that has come the closest to the NEF's interpretation which involves popular control over institutions.

⁹⁹ Similar definitions have been given by other authors, e.g. A. Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987), p. 48.

References to democracy within the *New Era* possessed two meanings. The first was often merely as a counter to fascism.¹⁰⁰ The second usage implied an educational philosophy defined by freedom of choice, respect for one's fellows and the establishment of educational and social hierarchies in which all had some representation.¹⁰¹ Citizenship was also an important term that became part of NEF terminology after 1945.¹⁰² Citizenship in education was promoted as a way of teaching students to pursue social justice and actively to seek reform of their communities.¹⁰³ This was intended to be the practical side of the promotion of democracy in schools. Although new educationists had always advocated that students should be involved in the running of educational institutions, the promotion of citizenship, as envisaged by the 1940s, would involve students being taught about social justice and society, rather than merely allowing them to experiment. NEF members had been involved with a variety of organisations promoting citizenship from the 1930s, including the Association for Education in Citizenship formed in 1934 and the League of Nations Union.¹⁰⁴ Laurin Zilliacus was instrumental in the promotion of this form of citizenship and democracy in the new education and a participant in the work of the Association for Education in Citizenship. As early as 1935, he had produced a book, *Education for Citizenship*, arguing that there was no such thing as total freedom and argued against the former freedom of experimentation that new educationists had advocated in schools.¹⁰⁵ This was followed in 1940 by a

¹⁰⁰ Lord Allen of Hurtwood, 'The New Threat to the Child', *New Era* 16 (1935), p. 4.

¹⁰¹ H. Rugg (1939), p. iv.

¹⁰² 'Making Citizens of the World', *TES*, 9 December 1949, p. 863.

¹⁰³ J. T. Smith, 'The Beginnings of Citizenship Education in England', *History of Education Society Bulletin* (69) (May 2002), pp. 6–16.

¹⁰⁴ Association for Education in Citizenship, *Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935); New Education Fellowship, *Education for Complete Living: The Challenge of Today* (proceedings of the NEF conference, Australia, 1 August–20 September 20 1937); Centre for Contemporary Educational Studies, *Unpopular Education – Schooling and Social Democracy in England Since 1944* (London: Hutchinson, 1982), p. 53.

¹⁰⁵ L. Zilliacus, *Education for Citizenship* (Association for Education in Citizenship, 1935), p. 10.

strong appeal in the *New Era* to new educationists to take an active part in the fight against fascism and, in 1946, in *Progressive Education*, by a call for a union of educators to promote this vision of education internationally.¹⁰⁶ J. W. (Billy) Tibble, Professor of Education at Leicester University and NEF committee member, was also prominent in demands for education to reflect these ideals. Tibble was particularly concerned with the reform of teacher education.¹⁰⁷

By the 1940s, an active pressure group of the NEF's membership sought to influence the direction of its ideals and activities. The situation in 1945 was one that encouraged the emergence of a new direction from the apathy and loss of confidence that had beset the movement since the late 1930s. A new direction was provided by attempting to make the new education into a rational movement based upon measurable scientific values and one that was also relevant to contemporary issues through its social emphasis. Such ideals were not, in fact, totally new. New educationists from the late 1920s had debated psychology and Ensor herself had expressed the revolutionary purpose of the NEF in 1929. Their remit had been confined to encouraging mental and spiritual inner transformations, rather than seeking to change society around them through direct and positive action. Now, those new educationists who had supported more radical action were being given the opportunity to make themselves heard and to act upon their ideals. The next problem for the NEF was the question of whether the rest of the movement would accept this radical transformation of its values.

¹⁰⁶ L. Zilliacus, 'Our Part in the World at War', *New Era* 21 (January 1940), pp. 22–6; L. Zilliacus, 'A World-Wide Union of Educators', *Progressive Education* 24(2) (1946), pp. 54–7.

¹⁰⁷ J. W. Tibble, *The Future of Teacher Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 100.

The new education in the USA

The USA had been the major provider of both financial and intellectual support for the NEF during the 1930s. The PEA, founded in 1919, provided the NEF with a source of inspiration through its publications, membership and those American educationists who were willing to experiment with the boundaries of the new education and progressivism. These included figures such as John Dewey, Harold Rugg and Carleton Washburne who had been involved with both the NEF and the PEA during the 1930s. There seemed every reason to believe that this support would continue. The PEA, under the leadership of Rugg, affiliated with the NEF in 1932 as the American branch of the NEF.¹⁰⁸ Rugg was also voted onto the NEF's committee. This confidence in the health of progressivism in the USA was confirmed by the international conference held by the NEF in Ann Arbor, Michigan with Dr William Kilpatrick, President of the PEA, as Chairman in July 1941.¹⁰⁹ This was the first conference of the NEF held in the USA and proved to be an outstanding success, attracting an estimated attendance of 2000. The focus of this conference was the reconstruction of education after the war. American new educationists had been alarmed by the lack of response by the NEF to fascism. This conference therefore created a series of statements concerning the importance of promoting democracy in the classroom and through the curriculum.¹¹⁰ Other educational conferences concerned with educational reconstruction followed, for example, the conference of the Institute on Educational Reconstruction, held at New York University on 24 April

¹⁰⁸ P. A. Graham (1967), p. 97.

¹⁰⁹ W. Kotschnig, *Slaves Need No Leaders; An Answer to the Fascist Challenge to Education* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp. 252–3.

¹¹⁰ WEF IV/235, 'Conference Report Ann Arbor, Michigan', 6–12 July 1941.

1942.¹¹¹ The American new educationists seemed to be a vital force within the movement.

However, this optimism was not sustained and the New York conference was not followed by further support for the movement. The NEF had expected that, as European progressivism declined, the USA would continue to play an important role in the new educational movement. This did not occur. It became clear by the mid-1940s that there was, in fact, an ideological gulf between the outlook of the British new educationists and those in the USA. Educationists there no longer sought any contact with foreign organisations preferring to take a more isolationist view in their dealings with other groups.¹¹² Suspicion of international movements such as the NEF, with its social ideals, proved a hindrance to gaining support in the USA.¹¹³ These problems were revealed in 1944 when the PEA, itself facing both a major financial crisis and declining support, was dissolved. The NEF, however, wishing to retain a foothold in the USA, funded the establishment of another branch there, the AEF, putting it into the same subordinate position as the NEF's other international branches.¹¹⁴ However, even this proved short-lived. The political situation in the USA was now firmly against the new education and on 25 June 1955 the AEF President, Gordon Hullfish, disbanded the organisation.¹¹⁵ It was noted, by him, that, although the AEF had around 2600 members on its records, nearly 2100 of these were educational institutions that subscribed to the journal *Progressive Education* and were not individuals. The journal itself was handed to the John Dewey Society. However, its new publisher also found difficulty filling its pages with articles or gaining enough

¹¹¹ Kotschnig (1943), pp. 252–3.

¹¹² WEF I/2, Lauwerys to Annand, August 1955.

¹¹³ Graham (1967), p. 98.

¹¹⁴ T. Brameld, 'A New Policy for the AEF', *Progressive Education* 25(3) (November 1947), pp. 258–62.

¹¹⁵ Graham (1967), p. 143.

of a readership in the USA to keep it financially viable. The last edition was published in 1957 and marked the final decline of the NEF's ambitions in the USA.¹¹⁶

The NEF, however, in particular, the Secretary Clare Soper, was still oblivious to these future developments in 1945 and still believed that the USA could provide support for the international movement. There also existed a wide-spread ignorance of the prevailing political situation by those who served the NEF. As communications with American educationists became weaker Soper came to rely upon a few select contacts in the USA. One of these was Laurin Zillicaus. He viewed her NEF book club as little more than an opportunity to promote his socialist ideals in the USA rather than, as Soper did, a way of making money. His advice upon the sort of material that should be promoted as representing NEF ideas in the USA was also, therefore, equally partisan. Soper mildly rebuked him for one such choice:

Guide to Soviet Education . . . my thought re this was that in every w. democracy there are a number of people prejudiced against the Soviet Union – and that perhaps it was not wise to start off with a book that would tread on some corns . . . but Zilliacus in his last letter says he thinks the book will ‘make’ us in the USA. So we must follow his advice – he must know the position better than I do.¹¹⁷

In fact, the selection of material to promote the NEF in the USA was so inappropriate that after a short while no publisher there would touch any of the NEF material that Soper forwarded.¹¹⁸ The decline of the book club in the USA revealed the poor level of interest that existed there in the new education at that time. It also revealed the vast gap between the ideals of the NEF in Britain and those of educationists in the USA.

¹¹⁶ Graham (1967), p. 143.

¹¹⁷ WEF II/171, Soper to Berliner, 16 December 1947.

¹¹⁸ WEF II/171, Annand to Brameld, 11 June 1948: ‘We have heard today from Mrs Walsh that he cannot take our book “Russia goes to School” . . . he writes as follows . . . “we cannot undertake this book for it really would not do over here. The American mood is certainly against it . . . so we have now successively been forced to decline the first three choices of your book club”.’.

As communications between the NEF and the American new educationists declined, Soper complained that

. . . America has done nothing for Headquarters throughout the whole of the war years . . . we have not had a penny from the American section (the section belonging to the richest country in the world) and Sections are supposed to send something every year.¹¹⁹

In 1948, James Annand was forced to ask Theodore Brameld:

Does the AEF-PEA still exist? We get no answers at all to our letters whether we write to the office or to DeBoer. If it doesn't really exist as a section of the NEF anymore, ought we take some steps to create another nucleus?¹²⁰

The lack of communication between the NEF and the AEF was not just due to the NEF's politics or general hostility to progressivism. Long-running personality problems between the NEF and the AEF membership and within the AEF undermined the new educational movement there. Vinal Tibbetts, Superintendent of Schools in Manhassen, Long Island, USA, was also President of the AEF at this time. There seems to have been little liking for him by the NEF headquarters. They considered Tibbetts unreliable and unsympathetic to NEF aims. He and the AEF rarely acknowledged NEF headquarter's missives or correspondence. Clare Soper commented to Zilliacus that '. . . it is no use depending on Tibbetts'.¹²¹ At a later point, Soper complained to Zilliacus that 'Tibbetts has not written one word.'¹²² Other correspondence deals with NEF frustration at the lack of communication with Tibbetts.

¹¹⁹ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 21 November 1946.

¹²⁰ WEF II/171, Annand to Berliner, 5 November 1948.

¹²¹ WEF I/II, Soper to Zilliacus, 1 July 1946.

¹²² WEF I/II, Soper to Zilliacus, 24 July 1946.

The problem in the United States also seems to have been one concerning a rift between the ideals of the NEF and the American educationists.¹²³ Laurin Zilliacus, the NEF's contact there, was an ardent socialist. He often wrote to Clare Soper about his antipathy for the USA and capitalism.¹²⁴ He wrote to her at one point that 'The . . . [American educationists] have no respect for existing organisations [i.e. the NEF].'¹²⁵ He became embroiled in controversy; accused of promoting Marxism, he was condemned as a 'crackpot socialist'.¹²⁶ As a result of his outlook, he set himself and the NEF in opposition to the more conservative political climate in the USA after 1945. Zilliacus, in line with his socialist political views, had no doubt as to why the AEF was proving itself to be so difficult. He wrote scornfully to Soper, after attending the World Conference of the Teaching Profession in New York, that,

. . . the Americans . . . [are] more right wing than the majority of the other delegates, and the question naturally arises do they want a real world organisation or merely a projection on the teaching plane of the political split into two blocks[?]. . . Dr [William] Carr [Associate Secretary of the National Education Association's Education Policies commission] admitted to a delegate after the conference that [the Russians] had not received a 'strict' invitation. This did not prevent [him] from giving the impression to the conference that the Russians had been invited but had as usual refused . . . The NEF will presently receive an invitation to join. My own feeling is that we should hold off . . .¹²⁷

¹²³ WEF I/II, Zilliacus to Soper, 18 May 1946. This provoked the response from Clare Soper that 'are they showing signs of breaking away from the NEF?'

¹²⁴ WEF I/II, Zilliacus to Soper, 26 July 1946. Soper requested that he should try and inveigle himself into the AEF so that it could be brought back under NEF control. Zilliacus replied that although he was well known as an educationist in England and by the NEF headquarters and had worked with the NEF for many years, it seemed unlikely that he could do much about the recalcitrance of the AEF.

¹²⁵ WEF I/II, Zilliacus to Soper, 8 May 1946.

¹²⁶ B. Jackson and D. Marsden, *Education and the Working Class* (London: Penguin, 1966), p. 195.

¹²⁷ WEF I/II, 'Confidential Report to the Executive Board', 3 September 1946.

Zilliacus was also of the opinion that the NEF should not involve itself with any of the other American educational groups until 'they really do get . . . more leftist organizations to join them'.¹²⁸

The lack of interest from the USA, even from well-known educationists who had been involved with the PEA, such as Frank Redifer and Harold Rugg, who were no longer in contact with the NEF headquarters, showed how weak the relationship now was.¹²⁹ American educationists no longer considered the NEF worthy of response or of involvement or had their own problems to deal with at this time, in the case of Rugg defending himself against hostile political attacks.¹³⁰ Zilliacus sought out both Redifer and Rugg and was told by them that they were no longer interested in the NEF and ' . . . have been very critical of the timidity and lack of program . . . and do not know . . . whether the NEF is the right place for them'.¹³¹ Soper had hoped that Redifer would create a new NEF branch to rival the AEF so that they could bypass these problems altogether.¹³² Soper seems to have been unaware of the problems facing American educationists at this time and was puzzled by their lack of enthusiasm for the work of the NEF. Rugg seems to have later changed his mind about his non-contact with the NEF after contact with Zilliacus who reported that 'the link with the NEF was strongly emphasised by . . . Rugg and he roused much positive response . . . there seemed to be general optimism . . . They decided to alter their

¹²⁸ WEF I/2, Zilliacus to Soper, 25 October 1946.

¹²⁹ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 November 1946: 'Do you think you ought to nominate another American? Washburne and Ryan are the only two on the list. Redifer and Rugg have not bothered to reply to my note asking them if they wished to continue on the Executive Board . . . Tibbetts won't do.'

¹³⁰ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 24 July 1946. Upon trying to find an American delegate for its Australian conference, little headway was made. Finally Clare Soper wrote to Zilliacus that: 'Brameld is the only person going from the States and he would only go if he could get air passage both ways – which has landed the poor Australian Conference into another £600 – with not one penny from the AEF.'

¹³¹ WEF I/2, Zilliacus to Soper, 6 December 1947.

¹³² WEF I/2, 'memo' enclosed in letter from Clare Soper to Laurin Zilliacus, 18 June 1947.

name again, incorporating officially as the NEF (US section)'.¹³³ However, this proved to a brief respite only. One member forwarded his opinion that,

In 1930 Progressive education reorganised the whole of education in America. During the war, we could not have meetings and since the war we have not put the pep into it . . . and now we are in a state of indecision as to what in the twenties was good to hold on to . . . Maybe we just think we are dead.¹³⁴

The decline of American progressivism and its failure elsewhere created a strong feeling of despondency amongst the new educationists of the 1950s. Although the AEF did not officially disband until 1955, it was clear that there was little hope for the future of the new education in the USA. A number of members doubted whether the new education would survive against new and hostile political and educational forces. A large number of American new educationists no longer considered that there was any future for progressivism and even they were questioning its tenets and asking themselves 'What is the new education today . . . what has happened to progressive education?'¹³⁵ The experiences of the NEF in America confirm the theory advanced by Daniel Bell (1988) that, in the USA at least, organisations with radical, social ideologies and internationalist agendas were no longer politically acceptable there.¹³⁶ The same theory, however, does not apply to an examination of the experiences of the NEF in Europe. In those European countries in which the NEF was active, the organisation faced rejection, but for entirely different reasons. Here, there was instead a rejection of ideologies that seemed to ignore regional differences and impose a single solution, rather than a dislike of radical, social ideologies, as was the case in the USA.

¹³³ WEF I/2, Zilliacus to Soper, 6 December 1947.

¹³⁴ WEF III/209, 'Report', 29 July 1953, p. 4.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹³⁶ Bell (1988), p. 285.

The new education in Europe

By 1945, it was clear that the heyday of European progressivism had also passed. Previously, the NEF had been able to count amongst its membership and those who had attended its conferences some of the most illustrious names in the European progressive movement. The NEF during the 1930s, under Beatrice Ensor, had always prided itself on its European credentials. It was no accident that Ensor held the founding meeting of the NEF in Calais in 1921 and that Férrière and Rotten were named as co-founders. Ensor's aim had always been an organisation that drew from the best of the European educational and intellectual elite. By the mid-1940s however, there was little contact with Europe.

The new educationists had believed that they could continue to exist under fascism and had not actively sought to oppose it during the 1930s. This had two effects. The first was that the European new education movement had effectively been destroyed and it was now necessary to rebuild it. Secondly, this mild appeasement of fascism had cast doubts about the new education movement amongst the new generation of European educationists. It was also considered that the new education was, in fact, only an English movement, representing English concerns and that it had very little to do with the needs of educational and social reconstruction in Europe. This was a presumption that the NEF found itself having to fight against. It did this by trying to prove that it was a relevant social movement. By attempting to become more actively involved with such issues, the NEF caused the rift with the USA to widen further. This European criticism was defined best in a combined statement given to Peggy Volkov in 1953 at the first post-Second World War conference to focus upon the criticisms of the NEF's European membership.

A feeling emerged that the Fellowship had not developed as it should . . . because the problems of Europe are very different from those of the Anglo-Saxons – their general cultures are different – and that there had been evidence to show that the Anglo-Saxons did not understand the problems of the people living in Europe, furthermore that a main problem was to get a true international element into the organisation. It was felt that at present we had a headquarters in London, supported by other Anglo-Saxon countries with a benevolent attitude towards continental sections instead of an international fellowship and a constant exchange to and fro of ideas and persons . . . there should be more frequent meetings of international bodies such as this meeting of Section representatives.¹³⁷

This was an international organisation that had a wide, but thinly spread, membership and with little apparent success in gaining further members in many of the countries where branches existed. The Danish section representative admitted that he had only 30 members in his section. It seemed, complained Torben Gregersen, the Danish representative, that the new education had lost its ability to move the hearts of educationists and had lost its place in the new world that was being created.¹³⁸

This decline in both Europe and the USA had a wider impact upon the international new educational community and the NEF, creating a general feeling of despondency which permeated the movement elsewhere. There existed a strong belief that the new education was in terminal decline and was no longer relevant. The failure of the movement in the USA was taken by many new educationists as the fate that awaited the NEF elsewhere. American educationists were themselves quick to agree with this pessimistic assessment.¹³⁹ The main problem for the NEF in 1945 was that it had relied heavily upon American educationists for support during the 1930s. As that support was no longer forthcoming, the NEF had to adapt itself quickly to the new

¹³⁷ WEF III/209, 'Report', 29 July 1953, p. 3.

¹³⁸ WEF III/208, 'Report by Dr Gregersen', July 1953.

¹³⁹ WEF III/209, 'Report from Copenhagen Conference', 29 July 1953, p. 3.

situation that existed in the 1940s. It was for this reason that, in the period after 1945, that the NEF looked towards other sources for its inspiration and support – UNESCO and the ENEF.

The NEF saw its renewed purpose as one of becoming more involved with international issues, even where this had no particular educational justification. The subordination of the NEF's purpose to that of UNESCO was an important factor in the changing nature of the organisation after the Second World War. This involvement was given a boost as a number of important NEF members were involved with UNESCO. Lionel Elvin, President of the ENEF from 1958 to 1973, was also Director for the Department of Education at UNESCO between 1950 and 1956.¹⁴⁰ He was also Director of the University of London Institute of Education, between 1958 and 1963.¹⁴¹ Joseph Lauwerys was also active in UNESCO. The change in the NEF's direction was shown in its involvement with a number of projects initiated by UNESCO. In particular, the NEF committee was interested in those projects that were concerned with international understanding, human rights and world peace.¹⁴² The first major project, in 1948, entitled 'The Teacher and World Peace', clearly showed the changing focus of the organisation. Also in 1948, the NEF became involved with a project concerned with the teaching of human rights and, in 1949, 'Teachers' Prejudices' and 'Education for International Understanding'. These projects reflected the increasing tendency for the NEF to imitate UNESCO concerns and ideals. This relationship is explored in chapter six.

There was one other important consequence of the issues that had arisen by the mid-1940s that was dramatically to affect the development of the movement. After the

¹⁴⁰ L. Elvin, *Encounters with Education* (London: University of London, Institute of Education, 1987), p. 104. Here he discusses his work with UNESCO between 1950 and 1956.

¹⁴¹ ENEF 11, 'Note', undated.

¹⁴² 'Rate of Advance', *TES*, 9 December 1949, p. 861.

perceived failures of the new education during the 1930s and 1940s, there developed a strong movement within the NEF to adapt the very nature of the new education. There was a growing belief that it was the new education itself that had been at fault.¹⁴³ The European new educationists were the most critical of it as an ideology, claiming that it had in fact been flawed from its conception in 1921. Blame was laid upon the individuality of the progressives in the 1920s and 1930s. It was considered that they had been too obsessed with developing theories of education and had ignored important issues that had concerned society. It was also stated by some that 'in the twenties progressive leaders were individually minded; now we have to add the needs of society to individual development'.¹⁴⁴ Gregersen concluded that: 'The Calais words were very nice, but there was something wrong with them.'¹⁴⁵

Conclusion

The period of the 1940s revealed that the NEF and its membership possessed a keen enthusiasm for the task of reconstructing society and education, both in Britain and internationally. There was a strong belief that, in spite of the problems of the war years, there now existed an opportunity for the NEF to play its part in this task. The stable structure and high-level membership of the NEF provided it with a sound base from which to do this. The challenge, however, was to ensure that the NEF's committee was able to keep together the increasingly fragmenting and disunited movement. The loss of financial and ideological support in the USA was a severe blow to the NEF's morale, more so even than the loss of European support. In particular, the poor financial situation showed that high ideals and prominent links

¹⁴³ WEF III/208, 'Report by James Hemming', 29 July 1953: Hemming stated that 'It emerged also (from the conference) that we were still talking in terms of the progressive education of the twenties and that to some extent we were still tied up with the thinking of the twenties, still using the same terms and discussing the same problems. We should be looking to a more genuinely dynamic concept of education.'

¹⁴⁴ WEF III/208, 'Report from Copenhagen Conference', 20 July 1953.

¹⁴⁵ WEF III/208, 'Report by Dr Gregersen', July 1953.

could not alone protect the organisation from the potential oblivion that increasingly loomed during the 1940s. The NEF was forced to come down from the lofty position it had inhabited during the 1920s and 1930s. This pattern of financial instability and weakness was one that would repeatedly challenge the NEF's ability to follow through its desire to become actively involved with post-1945 society. The irony of the situation was that the movement was now keen to become a part of the reconstruction of education and society at a time when it was potentially least able to do so. This was a dilemma that it needed to overcome to ensure the relevance of the new education after 1945.

The NEF revealed a changing attitude towards its function as an educational organisation. The role of the NEF of the 1920s and 1930s had been as a disseminator of radical, progressive ideals, mixed with Ensor's strong spirituality. The 1940s saw the NEF moving towards a new interpretation of its purpose as an organisation, as an upholder of social justice in society, a trend first evident at the 1942 Children's Charter project. There were also problems that the NEF found difficulty accepting. In particular, the NEF could not see the fact that it represented more of an English outlook than a European or genuinely international one. This realisation only came much later. The NEF did not recognise that the increasing fragmentation of the NEF up to 1945 was not a problem that would be easily overcome. However, the changes that occurred to the movement and the issues which the NEF was forced to consider as a result of these problems were not purely negative developments, as they seemed in 1945. The NEF was forced to make new affiliations and to reconsider its ideology. The period immediately after the Second World War provided the NEF with both the period of its greatest self-doubt and also its greatest opportunity to bring its ideals to a wider audience. The NEF failed to establish a clear identity during the early period of

its re-emergence as an organisation. Immediately after 1945, the lack of funding, weaknesses in its the structure, the lack of strong and sustained leadership and a clear purpose meant that the NEF did not gain sufficient trust and support and had, therefore, not 'institutionalised' itself successfully. This would severely hinder the ability of the organisation to achieve its later goals.

CHAPTER THREE

The NEF 1946–1966: a new ideology

Introduction

This chapter examines the NEF between 1945 and 1966. It explores the NEF's ideology and how it evolved in the context of the international conferences and other activities undertaken during these years. There is a focus upon the discussions that took place and the dilemmas that faced the organisation, its membership and committee after 1945. At the start of this period, the NEF was hopeful that it could make a positive contribution to the reconstruction of education. There were a series of problems to overcome, however, before it could achieve this.

First, were the problems arising from the increasingly dispersed nature of the membership and the lack of a clear organisational structure. These were exacerbated as the unity that had held the European and American educationists together in their opposition to fascism in the 1940s declined. Second, the NEF was also searching for an ideology that could reunite all sections of the movement and give it a renewed purpose.

There were three main phases in the ideological development of the NEF during this period. The first, immediately after 1945, was the desire to aid in the reconstruction of education and to find a philosophy that fitted in with international ideological developments. This caused the NEF to become involved with political and social issues. This phase is explored in the first section of this chapter. The second phase saw the rejection of the new education as a child-centred educational movement by the international membership. This is examined in the second section, which focuses upon the international response to the NEF, the changes in its ideology, and

its social agenda after 1945. The third phase saw the NEF attempting to find an ideology that would bind the international movement together. This is examined in the third section of the chapter. The final section of the chapter considers the problems that faced the International Headquarters and the impact upon the organisation of the closure of the NEF's offices in London in 1961.

Social change

The main issue for the NEF after 1945 was whether it would be able to fulfil its desire to gain a role in the post-Second World War reconstruction of education. Many new educationists believed that it was the failure of the pre-war education systems of those countries involved with the war that had been responsible for the rise of hostilities in the 1930s.¹ As a result of this, a more interventionist approach was being justified in new educational thought and authors writing in the *New Era* were arguing for the need to promote 'social training'.² The NEF's ideology had always possessed a strong emphasis upon social change. During the 1930s, this (as discussed in chapter two) had been focused upon promoting social transformation through educational and spiritual means. By 1945, under the influence of American and British educationists, such as Theodore Brameld and Laurin Zilliacus, the NEF had adopted a greater emphasis upon democracy and citizenship. After 1945, the NEF conferences were dominated by discussions concerning social change, which, for the NEF, now included a greater emphasis upon social equality and justice than upon citizenship and democracy.³ Some of the NEF's membership sought to make the NEF a tool for the promotion of radical international social change. This involved debates about economic inequality,

¹ Clarke, Hamley et al. (1948). Also F. Clarke, *Education and Social Change* (London: Sheldon Press and Macmillan, 1940).

² WEF III/209, 'Report' by Ellen Reeves, June 1940, p. 139. Also Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Education Group, *Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England since 1944* (London: Hutchinson, 1981), p. 47.

³ F. Clarke, *Freedom in The Educative Society* (London: University of London Press, 1948), p. 20.

the possible nationalisation of industry, welfare reforms, human rights and world peace. Unlike previous discussions concerning social change that had taken place up to 1945, the debates after this date no longer looked to the USA for inspiration but, rather, to socialist ideals. While, as Daniel Bell (1988) states, there was a rejection of radical ideology in the USA, this was not the case in Britain where the NEF was based.⁴ The NEF sought to involve itself actively with debates about promoting radical social ideology after 1945.⁵ This did, however, put the organisation in opposition to the prevailing international climate outside of Britain and caused various problems for the development of an international network.

Two members of the NEF committee, in particular, were instrumental in encouraging the NEF to focus on radical social ideals. Significantly both were working in the USA at the time: Theodore Brameld, who was American himself; and Laurin Zilliacus, who was Finnish. Both of these educationists advanced radical social solutions towards the problems that the world faced after 1945. They had arrived separately at similar visions for society and education. They believed that the role of the NEF should be to promote these ideals. Both men were employed at educational institutions in the USA, but, facing increasing opposition to their ideas there, sought other avenues to express themselves, suggesting that while the political climate in the USA was hostile to radical political ideas, those who sought to forward such ideas chose to do so within international organisations that they considered would be more sympathetic to them.⁶ Both men were also responsible for encouraging the NEF to go down a path that ultimately proved very divisive for its international network.

⁴ D. Bell (1988), p. 285.

⁵ NA ED 136/606, 'Conference for the Democratic Reconstruction of Education' – Leeds Modern School, 1944.

⁶ A. Anderson, 'Protecting the Right to Teach Social Issues', *Progressive Education* 26(1) (October 1948), pp. 23–7.

Theodore Brameld was Professor of Education at Minnesota University between 1941 and 1947, then at New York University until 1958. Laurin Zilliacus was Professor of Education at Teachers' College, Columbia University. Both men were on the NEF committee and, therefore, the organisation seemed for them the perfect vehicle to promote their views. As the political and educational situation became more conservative in the USA after 1945, many of those American educationists who sought to oppose this development began to look towards Europe and to Britain, in particular, to express their sentiments.⁷ It was, therefore, not only European educationists who rejected the USA as a model for educational and social reconstruction.

Brameld and Zilliacus were representative of a new force within the NEF after the Second World War. They were educationists who had continually opposed the organisation's spiritual ideals, but were not seeking to retain a child-centred focus either. They sought, instead, to use the NEF to promote their vision of the new education as a socially revolutionary movement. Such ideals found active support particularly amongst the English sections.⁸ This, new approach it was believed, would provide the NEF with a valid and relevant purpose after 1945 as part of the reconstruction of society and education.

Theodore Brameld possessed a strong sympathy towards socialist ideology.⁹ He believed that education should be used to promote social and political change. Brameld was pursued by controversy about his political views, which did not fit in with the prevailing conservative outlook of the USA during the 1940s and 1950s. His

⁷ L. A. Molinaro, 'Progressive Education at Mid-Century', *Progressive Education* 29(2) (November 1951), p. 38.

⁸ WEF V/279, 'Memorandum on the New Education', circa 1958.

⁹ T. Brameld, *The Climactic Decades – Mandate to Education* (New York: Praeger, 1970); T. Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy – Divergence and Convergence in Culturological Perspective* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston, 1971).

move from the University of Minnesota to the University of New York in 1947 was motivated by accusations made against him in Minnesota that he was promoting Communism.¹⁰ Zilliacus was also a keen socialist, strongly supporting ideals of equality and redistribution of wealth. He was the son of a Finnish father and an American mother.¹¹ He was educated at Bedales School, Petersfield, which gave him a strong sympathy for progressive ideology, and then at Yale University, USA. Zilliacus' political ideals were forged by his experiences as a young man in Russian-occupied Finland.¹² Like Brameld, Zilliacus was pursued by controversy over his political ideals. He believed that it was only through 'radical, social and economic change' that the world could be changed.¹³ Zilliacus explained that his views on politics and education had been forged by his experiences during the First World War. 'For me,' he stated, 'political and social consciousness came brusquely with the horrors of 1914–1918 . . . the growing awareness of the intolerable condition of insecurity, poverty, and political impotence of the great mass of people.'¹⁴ He expressed his pleasure that 'the world is going left';¹⁵ his support for socialism was an expression of his opposition to the dominance in world politics of the USA and its capitalist ideology.

Clare Soper was instrumental in encouraging Brameld and Zilliacus. She invited both of them to address the 1947 NEF Conference to outline their visions for the organisation. The conference was aimed at 'young teachers and other educationists interested in modern problems and in educational developments in other countries' and that year was held in Cirencester at an agricultural college. Her role in inviting

¹⁰ C. Kridel, 'Brameld, Theodore Burghard Hurt', <http://www.anb.org/articles/09/09-01058.html>; American National Biography Online. February 2000.

¹¹ NA – HO 144/5815, 'Nationality and naturalisation 1918', born 1894, died 1959.

¹² L. Zilliacus, 'Our Part in the World at War', *New Era* 21 (January 1940), pp. 22–6.

¹³ WEF I/2, 'Memorandum on the Post-War Policy of the NEF', L. Zilliacus, 1947.

¹⁴ Zilliacus (1940), p. 23.

¹⁵ WEF I/2, Zilliacus to Soper, 12 November 1948.

speakers shows the important influence that NEF secretaries could have upon the organisation. The 1947 conference was held in association with the Council for Education in World Citizenship and the National Association of LEAs. Both Brameld and Zilliacus focused upon the theme of democratic reconstruction and citizenship. In their speeches they made dramatic attacks upon the capitalist system.¹⁶ Brameld blamed the problems of the world upon the capitalist economic system, with its inherent instability and depressions. He argued that the NEF needed to be at the forefront of promoting social change, believing that 'education is always chiefly a reflector of social order . . . an apologist . . . rather than a critic, leader and recreator'.¹⁷ Brameld believed that the role of the educationist should be to question and challenge the unfair disparities of wealth that existed in the world. He believed that until this was done any discussions about democracy and citizenship were pointless.¹⁸ He tried to convince the NEF members at the 1947 conference that, '[Educationists] must . . . empower education, as never before with vision and strength on behalf of a peaceful and humane world for the masses.'¹⁹ The answer, therefore, to the problems of society lay in using education as a weapon in the name of social justice and reform.²⁰

Brameld and Zilliacus sought a wholesale reinvention of the NEF's ideology. Both men believed that the existing pre-1945 ideology needed to be adapted to make

¹⁶ T. Brameld, 'Economic Goals and Democratic Education', *Progressive Education* 30(3) (January 1953), p. 66.

¹⁷ WEF III/230, 'A New Policy: Address to the Cirencester Conference 1947'.

¹⁸ T. Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy – A Democratic Interpretation* (New York, World Books Co, 1955), T. Brameld, *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston, 1955); T. Brameld, *Education as Power* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston, 1965); T. Brameld, *The Use of Explosive Ideas in Education- Culture, Class, and Evolution* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965), p. 12; R. S Peters 'Democratic Values and Educational Aims', *Teachers College Record* (1979) 8(3), pp. 467–81.

¹⁹ WEF III/230, 'A New Policy: Address to the Cirencester Conference 1947'.

²⁰ T. Brameld, *Ends and Means in Education – A Mid Century Appraisal* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 8.

it relevant to the new post-war situation.²¹ They also wished to encourage the NEF to abandon its traditional reliance on psychology and spirituality. Zilliacus believed that while the NEF had once 'stood for . . . the child-centred school', now it should seek to promote a 'social and world-minded teacher' and to 'help make citizens' of children.²² These views of Brameld and Zilliacus gained support from those present at the 1947 conference and showed that there was still a desire for radical ideological solutions to pressing post-1945 problems of educational and social reconstruction, at least in Britain. Their views also fitted in with the political mood prevalent in Britain during this time, where the focus was now upon economic and social issues that were believed to be the urgent needs of post-1945 society.²³ Zilliacus took up the theme again at the 1949 international conference, also held at Cirencester.²⁴ It was not by chance, therefore, that the forum for this debate had moved firmly back towards Britain. The USA was no longer fertile ground for the ideas expressed by Brameld and Zilliacus and after 1945 became increasingly hostile to such radical social ideas. Britain, rather than the USA, now seemed to be the safer place for those such as Brameld and Zilliacus to express such ideas.

Brameld and Zilliacus also wished to see the NEF become a truly international movement devoted to promoting political and social change in all the countries where the organisation had a presence. This social approach was taken up by the NEF committee and was reflected in the 1950 Statement of Principles.²⁵ The committee agreed that the NEF needed to be concerned with issues of world peace and human rights as the practical outcome of the new purpose that they sought for the

²¹ L. Zilliacus, 'A World-Wide Union of Educators', *Progressive Education* (1946) 21(1), pp. 54–7.

²² WEF III/230, 'Memorandum on the Post-War Policy of the NEF', L. Zilliacus, May 1947.

²³ S. Ranson, 'From 1944–1988: Education, Citizenship and Democracy. Part I Transforming the Government of Education', *Local Government Studies* 14(1) (January 1988), pp.1–19.

²⁴ 'The NEF Conference at Cirencester', *TES*, 12 August 1949, p. 556.

²⁵ WEF III/207, 'NEF Statement of Principles 1950'.

organisation. In response to this, a project 'Teacher and World Peace' was started in 1948 and was followed by a conference on the same topic in 1949. The NEF committee initiated projects in response to discussions at conferences upon themes that were considered important enough to pursue and in most cases these were linked to funding from external organisations. The NEF also sought to become involved with international activities that focused upon human rights. This was the theme of four projects that the NEF undertook between 1948 and 1952 and consumed a large amount of the organisation's time and finances. Zilliacus defined the NEF's purpose 'to promote peace through education . . . I should like to see the NEF's policy planned principally to meet this challenge . . .'.²⁶ Theodore Brameld argued that the NEF had a duty to put pressure upon the richer countries in the world because he believed that it was the most actively capitalist nations that could help the most but, in fact, did the least and 'hypocritically paid lip service to internationalism'.²⁷

Apart from the influence of Brameld and Zilliacus, another important reason for the NEF's focus upon human rights was as a result of its links, after 1948, with UNESCO, and the latter's focus upon the United Nations International Declaration of Human Rights. The NEF became affiliated as an NGO with UNESCO and received funding to pursue a variety of projects on UNESCO-directed themes. The decision to become more actively involved in this area was not purely based upon Brameld and Zilliacus' suggestions, financial needs forced a closer link with UNESCO and its work. (The relationship between UNESCO and the NEF is explored in chapter

²⁶ WEF III/230, 'Memorandum', L. Zilliacus, May 1947. K. Zilliacus, *I Choose Peace* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1949).

²⁷ WEF III/230, 'A New Policy: Address to the Cirencester Conference 1947'. Brameld also reiterated this view in: T. Brameld, *The Teacher as World Citizen - A Scenario of the 21st Century* (Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications, 1976), p. 20.

seven.)²⁸ Two projects followed from this: in 1951 one based upon the 1948 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, 'Human Rights'; and in 1952 'Teaching Human Rights'.²⁹

After 1945, the NEF attempted to reinvent itself entirely. It no longer sought merely to be an educational organisation promoting new educational ideals. The NEF's membership now expected it to take an active part in the reconstruction of society. Many of the ideas that found favour within the NEF after this time were taken from elsewhere. They were combined, however, with the NEF's uniquely individualistic approach.³⁰ Ideas concerning social and political reconstruction, equality and redistribution of wealth gained a slightly different focus when adapted by the NEF. These concepts were attached to the NEF's traditional suspicion of industrialisation and capitalism and its focus upon individual development. Reconstruction for the new educationists was more than merely physical and social but part of a wider development of the human psyche and spirit. By the 1950s, however, the involvement with radical political ideals was causing problems for the NEF's attempts to promote itself as an international organisation. This theme is explored in the next section.

The international response

The more overtly socialist stance of the NEF and its policies after 1945 caused the organisation difficulties. In particular, as the international political situation became increasingly tense and polarised, the NEF's attempts to forge its own ideology encouraged attacks upon the movement. In keeping with its perceived role as a truly

²⁸ E. B. Castle, *Education and World Citizenship* (Hampton: Council for Education in World Citizenship, 1948), p. 20.

²⁹ WEF IV/241, 'Report, Teaching Human Rights', 1952, pp. 11 and 12.

³⁰ NA ED 121/128, Council for Education in World Citizenship, Deputation to the Board of Education 1942-43.

international movement, the NEF did not seek to take sides but this neutral stance merely made its loyalty seem suspect to international observers. The NEF faced a variety of problems in its attempt to promote itself internationally. In the USA, hostility was caused by the NEF's political and social stance. In Europe, the concern was not that NEF's new approach was too radical, but that the NEF's ideals represented an overly narrow focus upon the new education as an English ideology responding to English social issues that did not reflect European problems.

The radical and uncompromising stances taken by Brameld and Zilliacus did not alleviate the international hostility that the NEF faced but, in fact, exacerbated it greatly. In particular, Zilliacus' refusal to dilute his views caused continuing problems for the organisation. And the pair's vociferous criticisms of the USA and its economic system were not well received. Zilliacus caused further problems for the NEF in what should have been the sympathetic environment of the 1947 NEF conference in Australia.³¹ His radical speeches at the conference about the failings of the capitalist system in the host country caused the NEF much negative publicity in the Australian press where he was accused of being a closet Communist. Zilliacus vigorously denied this. The charges were given credence for Zilliacus' accusers by the fact that his brother Konni Zilliacus, a Labour MP, had made clear his support for socialism and the need to work with, rather than against, Communist Russia, after a visit and three-hour conversation with Joseph Stalin.³² As a result of this controversy Clare Soper, who was normally his greatest supporter, persuaded Zilliacus to leave Australia earlier than he had planned in order to minimise the poor publicity.³³

³¹ Y. Larsson (1987), pp. 53–64.

³² NA FO 371/66487, M. Padev (Bulgarian Legation) to Watson (Foreign Office), 12 December 1947, regarding trip to Russia by Konni Zilliacus MP.

M. Parkinson, *The Labour Party and the Organisation of Secondary Education* (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 36.

³³ WEF I/2, 'Memorandum on the Policy of the NEF', 1947.

Zilliacus may certainly have been a socialist but he was not, however, the supporter of the Soviet system that he was charged with being and which his brother was.³⁴ He had direct experience of what he considered to be Russian 'imperialism' in Finland and called it a 'horror in the world, a police state' and described himself, instead, as a 'militant democrat' with a strong social conscience and a desire for the equality of working class.³⁵ Such subtle distinctions were not heeded, however, in the heightened suspicion that existed internationally during this period and the controversy caused in Australia by Zilliacus showed that, in fact, the NEF and its representatives did not understand the international political situation.

The NEF also faced greater problems than those represented by Zilliacus' outspoken views. Brameld, too, faced hostility. In his case, suspicions about his political affiliations were raised in the reports of both the *Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace* (released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington DC, April 1949) and by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security of 1953.³⁶ His ideas were vigorously attacked in both these reports and in the writings of other conservative anti-Communist authors. His ideas were also criticised at the highest level in the USA. The Republican Representative of Michigan Paul W. Shafer publicly condemned Brameld and his ideas as a Communist threat to the USA in his speech to the House of Representatives in 1952.³⁷ These condemnations were provoked by Brameld's article 'Karl Marx and the American teacher' that had been published in the November 1935 edition of *Social Frontiers*

³⁴ NA FO 371/66487, 'Report of conversation with K. Zilliacus', M. Padev, 12 November 1947.

³⁵ L. Zilliacus (1940), pp. 22–6.

³⁶ Senate Sub-Committee on Internal Security, 2 January 1953, 'Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations', p. 7

³⁷ House Committee on Un-American Activities, April 1949, 'Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace', Washington DC. Speech of Representative, Paul W. Shafer of Michigan, 21 March 1952, 'Is There a "Subversive" Movement in the Public Schools?'. Paul Werntz Shafer (1893–1954); municipal judge in Michigan, 1929–36; U.S. Representative from Michigan 3rd District (1937–54).

and which had been dredged up by his enemies as evidence of his dubious political affiliations.³⁸ Anti-Communist writers also attacked the Progressive Education Association (PEA), of which Brameld was a member, as a 'Soviet fifth column' with a 'cell of at least thirty communist professors'.³⁹ Theodore Brameld and John DeBoer, the PEA President, who was also personally named as a suspected Communist, refused to be intimidated and continued to express their opinions openly.

In the conservative atmosphere of the 1940s and 1950s in the USA, progressives and new educationists faced accusations that they were seeking to subvert the American way of life.⁴⁰ Attacks upon those suspected of being part of the Communist movement gained strength across the USA during this period.⁴¹ This active support for socialism and radical politics was an important factor that held the NEF back from gaining the full support that it needed, particularly in its attempts to make itself an international organisation. The two main proponents of the NEF's international social agenda had found their political integrity impugned. This seriously compromised the NEF's ability to promote itself successfully.

The situation in Britain differed from that of the USA. While there was suspicion of Communism, this did not necessarily translate into attacks upon organisations promoting radical social agendas.⁴² This reflected a national trend towards the desire for a more radical political agenda after the Second World War.⁴³ In the *New Era*, a series of articles expressed support for these sentiments. One author

³⁸ T. Brameld, 'Karl Marx and the American Teacher', *Social Frontier* 2(2) (November, 1935), pp. 53–6.

³⁹ L. F. Budenz 'Do Colleges Have to Hire Red Professors?', *American Legion Magazine* (November 1951).

⁴⁰ L. F. Budenz, *The Techniques of Communism: Invading Education* (Manchester, NH: Ayer Publishing, 1954), pp. 208–48.

⁴¹ E. W. Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 88. S. Foster, *Red Alert: Educators Confront the Red Scare in American Public Schools, 1947–1954* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

⁴² NA ED 121/796, 'Allegations of Pro-Communist Bias in Selection of Speakers to Schools, 1951'. Council for Education in World Citizenship.

⁴³ C. A. R. Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (London: Cape, 1964), p. 23.

commented that the Communists were 'pointing the way' and that, 'in the USSR there is a philosophy behind the education system which results in a coherent educational structure'.⁴⁴ Beatrice King, a long-standing NEF member, in one of her many articles upon the effectiveness of the Communist system wrote, upon visiting a camp for children, that it was 'impressive evidence of the Soviet attitude to children . . . This attitude of putting the children first makes the task of Soviet educationists much simpler than it is in other countries'.⁴⁵ William Boyd, writing in the *New Era*, argued that Russia had succeeded in inspiring its youth and initiating them into the cultural and intellectual life of their country.⁴⁶ The reaction to the NEF's ideas in Britain was much milder than that faced by educationists in the USA. Only the Ministry of Education raised any questions about the NEF's political affiliations, in particular those of Beatrice King, when the committee applied for a grant.⁴⁷ In this case the committee was able to persuade the ministry that her views and support for Communism did not represent official NEF policy.

The reason for the difference in attitude between the USA and Britain lay in the fact that, in Britain, more radical, social ideals were not considered with the same fear that they were in the USA. The NEF also allied itself with organisations that seemed to promote a much more political and social agenda and did not find these ideals threatening, such as the Council for Education in Citizenship, the National Union of Teachers (NUT) and UNESCO. In fact, most of the NEF's ideals did not originate within the organisation, but through the external links of its membership.⁴⁸ UNESCO had a major impact upon the NEF and its ideas through the involvement with both

⁴⁴ B. King, 'Education in the USSR', *New Era* 24 (June 1943) 24, p. 91.

⁴⁵ B. King, 'A Children's Camp in the USSR', *New Era* 22 (December 1941) 22, p. 249.

⁴⁶ W. Boyd, 'Now and Tomorrow IV: The Community as Educator', *New Era* 22 (January 1941), pp. 1-4.

⁴⁷ NA Ed 121/429, 'ENEF, application for grant', 1949-50.

⁴⁸ Communist Party of Great Britain, *Britain's Schools* (London Communist Party of Great Britain, 1942) Institute of Education University of London, Historical Collection, p. 2.

organisations of Fred Clarke and Joseph Lauwerys. Both men were also editors of the UNESCO *Yearbook of Education*. Inspiration was also drawn from various political publications and manifestos, including those of the Labour Party.⁴⁹ In Britain, the 1945 election success of the Labour Party, under Clement Attlee, with its promise of creating a more equal society and the establishment of a welfare state, was also helpful to acceptance of the NEF's ideas.⁵⁰

The political situation in Britain and the NEF's affiliations with other organisations allowed the NEF to pursue a more radical and international agenda than it might otherwise have been able to. In spite of this, the NEF still had difficulties persuading European educationists that the organisation could be helpful to the reconstruction of education in their countries. In Europe, it was not the NEF's social agenda that caused concern amongst educationists, but rather the belief that the organisation still represented an educational ideology that was no longer relevant.⁵¹ Many European educationists were concerned that the NEF was still pursuing an agenda based upon its original new educational ideals and had not fully accepted that the child-centred education movement was now a liability for the organisation. They did not believe that this ideology was useful in the context of post-1945 international reconstruction.⁵² By the 1950s, stronger international criticism of the new education as a philosophy of education emerged. The first evidence of this came at the 1953 conference in Denmark. Here, the European representatives showed their opposition

⁴⁹ Communist Party of Great Britain, *Manifesto* (London: Communist Party of Great Britain, 1848) Institute of Education, University of London, Historical Collection, p. 17; M. Epstein, 'Progress of Reaction in Education', *Labour Monthly* (September 1942), p. 286.

⁵⁰ R. Barker. *Education and Politics 1900–1951: A Study of the Labour Party* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), p. 136.

⁵¹ WEF III/207, NEF Committee Report, August 1950. The NEF committee produced a statement arguing that: '... education [is] being something broader and richer than mere induction of the young into their social heritage. It must help ... each individual ... grow into a cooperative and responsible member ... of the world society which includes all human beings.'

⁵² P. H. Sheats, 'The Responsibilities of the Teaching Profession for Education in World Affairs', *Progressive Education* 29(2) (November 1951), p. 33.

to any attempt at reviving earlier visions of the new education. The original *laissez-faire* approach of the new education did not rest easily with the increasingly active and socially aware approach that European educationists were promoting.

This criticism was vigorously expressed at the 1953 conference. Torben Gregersen, the Danish representative, a member of the NEF committee and spokesperson for one of the discussion groups, attacked the use of the term 'free education' by new educationists. Did this mean freedom to 'choose one's own activities?' he wondered. If this was the case, he argued, then how did this equate to the fact that most people were not free to choose their adult activities, for example, their work? Gregersen came to the conclusion that such progressive ideas about freedom and individual development were, in fact, unworkable. Gregersen blamed the individuality of the progressives in the 1920s and 1930s for the problems that the NEF was now facing. He considered that they had been too obsessed with developing theories of education and had not involved themselves sufficiently in debates that concerned society. Other European educationists present at the conference endorsed Gregersen's views, including the Belgian, German and Swiss delegates, who all commented that European educationists no longer looked towards Britain or the USA for inspiration.⁵³

Other criticisms of the new education were based upon the belief that it represented a vague and unscientific approach. Another member, the representative of the Northern Ireland NEF branch, commented disparagingly that the new education had been founded upon 'an artistic development and free development'.⁵⁴ This he believed was a theory of education with no scientific validity. The delegates also argued that those who still forwarded a child-centred progressive viewpoint had not

⁵³ WEF III/208, 'Report of Copenhagen Conference', 20 July 1953, p.2.

⁵⁴ WEF III/209, 'Report of Copenhagen Conference', July 1953, p. 2.

adapted their views for the post-war world that now included different threats to world peace than those envisaged by some new educationists.⁵⁵

The European representatives were scathing about Carleton Washburne, the NEF President at that time, arguing that his views of education had not altered in response to political and social developments. James Hemming reported that the delegates believed that Washburne was 'still saying what he said in the twenties' and he was no longer a useful representative of the NEF's approach to education. It was further argued that the NEF was '. . . still tied up with the thinking of the twenties, still using the same terms and discussing the same problems. We should be looking to a more genuinely dynamic concept of education.'⁵⁶ The group decided that the NEF had lost its purpose.⁵⁷

William Boyd, a long-standing member of the NEF, supported this point and blamed the NEF's failure of nerve upon the fact that it had given in to vested interests and lost its identity. He argued that, in fact, the failure of the new education had been due to its rejection of education and its involvement with a myriad of competing theories. The Scottish representative argued that it was the introduction of the psychological approach in the 1920s that had weakened the new education as an ideology. He claimed that '[The English] have been very secure and therefore very individualistic and they have therefore worked out a certain pseudo psychological way of looking at educational problems.'⁵⁸

Declining European attendance at the NEF's conference showed that the NEF was unable to persuade them that the new education was still an international

⁵⁵ M. J. Carey, 'The School and Civil Defense: The Fifties Revisited', *Teachers College Record* 84(1) (1982), pp. 115–27.

⁵⁶ WEF III/208, 'Report', J. Hemming', 29 July 1957.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ WEF I/2, 'Report', W. Boyd', 28 June 1957.

movement and not a purely English concern. The conference at Askov, Denmark, held in 1953 showed that the NEF had not learnt any lesson from the complaints of its European representatives at Copenhagen earlier in that year. The theme of the conference was the 'Teacher and his work'; an attempt to explore the different ways of teaching using new educational and progressive ideas that might be effectively put into practice in schools across Europe. The problem arose, however, that a large percentage of the European branches did not consider that they needed the NEF IHQ telling them what constituted good or correct teaching techniques, pointing to the fact that there was a diversity of practice. This desire constantly to discover and promote the right way of teaching children was, they suggested, a specifically British concern. The French, in particular, believed that it was an attempt by the British to impose their beliefs upon others. The NEF reported that the conference faced 'much scepticism [from] national sections'.⁵⁹

The child-centred approach based upon total freedom was condemned as unworkable and naïve. Delegates at the 1960 conference in Delhi argued that some educationists had taken the new educational ideals of the NEF too far. The practices and ideas of educationists, such as William Kilpatrick and Carleton Washburne, both pivotal in the new educational movement of the 1930s, were continually dismissed.⁶⁰ The conclusion of those present had been that while once the NEF had focused upon the

. . . educational techniques such as those suggested by Montessori, Parkhurst, Ovide Decroly, A. S Neill, the Winnetka School and the educational philosophers . . . maybe in the hands of some the pendulum swung too far damaging the acquisition of skills and tools necessary for

⁵⁹ WEF III/210, 'Askov Conference Report 1953'.

⁶⁰ D. D. Chipman and C. B. McDonald, 'Cold War in the Classroom: Kilpatrick's Student Years at Mercer', *Teachers College Record* 83(3) (1982), pp. 459–65.

real knowledge. So too perhaps did the change over from enforced discipline to self-discipline; but gradually we have come to realise that creativity wells up most fully within a structured and a planned environment . . .⁶¹

The NEF committee sought to reassure its members that it was not seeking a return to this former vision of the new education. The NEF's official literature was rewritten to state that the original approach 'seems to have led . . . either to an excessively self-centred attitude, or to an attitude of bewilderment and despair when means for self-expression are not found in adult life'.⁶² The new education as a child-centred educational philosophy had been implicitly rejected with the move towards a more political outlook during the 1940s. Now, however, it had been expressly rejected as a path for the NEF.

This rejection of the new education, however, did not draw the European membership back to the NEF. The international representation at the 1962 conference in Holland showed that, again, the English-speaking countries, and, in particular, England itself dominated the conference and its decisions. England had 77 representatives, Scotland 13 and Australia 10 compared with 16 delegates from the whole of the rest of the world.⁶³ This was a disappointment for the NEF and went to confirm its declining importance and profile in many of the countries that it had relied upon for so long. The European countries that had supported so many of its activities in the past were clearly not present. France and Germany, countries that had contributed heavily in the past, were no longer sending representatives.

⁶¹ WEF III/219, 'Report on the Delhi Conference 1960', pp. 17–18.

⁶² WEF III/226, 'NEF Publicity Leaflet', undated.

⁶³ WEF III/226, 'Report on the Dutch Conference 1962': England had 77 representatives, Scotland 13, Australia 10, Denmark 4, Norway 3, Belgium 2, USA 2, South Africa 2, Switzerland 1, Pakistan 1 and Sweden 1.

The failure to attract international interest, particularly from Europe, the former intellectual base of the NEF, was a major blow, making the NEF seem to be a parochial and narrowly English organisation. Miss Hathaway, conference reporter for the NEF, noted the failure of the educationists to interact on a truly international footing at the second conference at Askov in 1962. She commented that the conference became two separate groups, those who spoke English and those who spoke French.⁶⁴ This proved a considerable problem for the NEF and its attempts to promote international concerns. Her conclusion was that the world political situation was so polarised that it was impossible to have a truly international conference at that time. This was the main problem that the NEF faced. Any attempts to create a truly international movement were difficult with such limited resources of its own and in the face of larger organisations with budgets funded by governments.⁶⁵ This demonstrated a key factor in the inability of the NEF to gain sufficient trust and legitimacy in order to develop as a successful autonomous organisation. The NEF did not have sufficient formal support from other organisations or bodies nor a clear agenda.⁶⁶ The result, for the NEF, with its limited finances, was an organisation with a very sparsely spread membership and low attendance at international conferences.⁶⁷

The NEF now sought to distance itself from the new education. The failure of confidence in the new education can be seen in the 1966 decision to drop the word 'new' from the NEF's title to be replaced with 'world'. This, it was felt, more clearly reflected the new goals of the NEF, and moved away from such a close identification with the sometimes embarrassing aspects of the earlier new education movement.⁶⁸ This move, debated at the 1966 conference and passed without opposition (with the

⁶⁴ WEF III/223, 'Askov Report', 1965.

⁶⁵ NA OD 3/23, 'The Third Commonwealth Education Conference Ottawa 1964: Minutes'.

⁶⁶ Boin and Christensen (2008), pp. 271–97.

⁶⁷ 'Conference on Education', *Wiltshire and Gloucestershire Standard*, 13 August 1949.

⁶⁸ WEF V/276, 'Report about Change of Name at Chichester Conference', 1966.

exception of Catherine Fletcher, Principal of the Bingley Training College), can be seen as a final step towards the rejection of the NEF's new educational past. The committee believed, however, that the new name more neatly encapsulated the concerns of the NEF at that time. These, the committee argued, were about global issues and world politics rather than a narrow concern with education or the new education.⁶⁹

The NEF, by the 1950s and 1960s, no longer considered the new education to be an expression of its ideological beliefs. As far as the NEF was concerned the new education had outlived its purpose. This was replaced by a myriad of increasingly transitory ideas that had their roots in the counter-culture of that decade. This was one important reason why the NEF as an organisation did not find the respect that it sought, apart from its existing links to other institutions and organisations. The NEF turned its back on its new educational ideals at a time when progressivism was enjoying a revival both in Britain and the USA. As a result of this, the NEF allowed itself to become diverted into a multitude of ill-focused concerns when it might have sought to become part of the new progressivism that was finding favour during the 1960s.⁷⁰ The NEF had also failed to find a satisfactory agenda for itself as an international political or social organisation. Its political links had been confined almost entirely to the British establishment and this did not contribute to making the movement respected in Europe.⁷¹ It failed to establish a coherent system of education and instead became sidetracked in a plethora of other ideologies. More seriously, it

⁶⁹ WEF III/226, 'Comments at Open Forums, Chichester Conference', 1966.

⁷⁰ Squire (1972), p. 10; Semel and Sadovnik (1999), p. 14.

⁷¹ A Correspondent, 'Labour in Trouble', *TES*, 25 March 1960, p. 598.

did not convince educationists that it could deliver the bold visions that were put forward in the 1940s.⁷²

The NEF, therefore, was unable to inspire European educationists or to convince them that it was not purely based upon English 'individualism' as William Boyd had claimed. At this time, it also found that other organisations, particularly UNESCO, were now withdrawing their involvement with its projects and activities.⁷³ The UNESCO major project on the 'Meeting of East and West' was given to the Council for Education in World Citizenship to organise.⁷⁴ The NEF's limited finances permitted it only to offer a day conference at the University of London Institute of Education. The NEF was also unable to revive the new education successfully in the USA, in spite of creating a successor to the PEA (disbanded in 1955), the AEF.

The English new educationists, however, as usual, had a very different outlook upon the problems faced by the NEF and the new education. There was a strong belief that, in fact, the NEF had promoted the new education too successfully and that there was little need to continue doing so. They believed that, in Britain at least, so much of progressive and new educational techniques had been adapted in schools that there was little opportunity left for the NEF to advance its educational cause further. At the 1960 Delhi conference, English delegates claimed that the NEF had not rejected the new education but was naturally evolving to suit contemporary trends and movements. They argued that the natural movement was towards the NEF focusing more upon psychological issues rather than purely education. The NEF committee produced a statement that:

⁷² A. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985 (originally 1953)), p. 10.

⁷³ 'Co operations in Building', *TES*, 10 August 1962, p. 158.

⁷⁴ 'Meeting of East And West. UNESCO Major Project Reviewed', *TES*, 20 July 1962.

The progress of the NEF is the progress of education. From child-centred education to child and culture centred education, from freedom for the child to freedom through self-imposed control . . . from a rebellion against the regimentation of the old school and a mere improvisation of free schools to the development of a systematic theory of education . . . from an intuitive understanding to a scientific and psychological study of the child. These are steps towards achieving the objective of the NEF – a world of peace and of physical and spiritual abundance in all the nations by the creative education of children, youth and parents.⁷⁵

At the 1962 Askov conference, Miss Hathaway who was a veteran of previous conferences as far back as the 1920s, commented that those attending did not have ‘the same sense of mission as had Elsinore’ (Denmark) in 1929, and seemed to believe that the NEF had achieved all that it had intended to. She also stated that many of those present seemed content with the work of the NEF and said that perhaps ‘in the year 2000 [they] will record that many of the aims had been accomplished and their dreams had become a reality’.⁷⁶ Joseph Lauwerys was a supporter of this view and, in his speech to the conference, told them that in the 1920s the discussion had been about the issues of how the new education should be practised and an attempt to rebel against the ‘old static scholastic formal schools’.⁷⁷ He now believed, however, that most aspects of progressive techniques had been accepted into the practice of the majority of schools. Zilliacus had justified his political approach with the claim that ‘much of what we have advocated has now become accepted educational policy; in the second place, education has in many countries come much more under government control than formerly; in the third place we now have UNESCO’.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ WEF III/219, ‘Report on Statement by the NEF Committee, 1960’, p. 19.

⁷⁶ WEF III/223, ‘Askov Report, 1962’.

⁷⁷ WEF III/230, ‘Memorandum on the Post-War Policy of the NEF, May 1947’, L. Zilliacus.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

The English new educationists, however, were able to take a more generous view of the NEF's situation as a result of the less hostile political situation that they faced. Their response did reveal that there was not a true understanding of the problems and issues that faced educationists in other parts of the world, particularly in the USA, where progressivism faced extinction, and in Europe, where it faced apathy. This was not purely the fault of the NEF. As Zilliacus had stated, after 1945, many areas of education and social policy were now under the control of governments and officially funded organisations with which the NEF could not compete.⁷⁹

There were a number of reasons why Brameld and Zilliacus were unable to make the NEF a tool for a radical social agenda during the 1940s and 1950s. One important reason was the prevailing political situation that became increasingly hostile to such ideals. Another reason for the failure of the political zeal of the 1940s lay in the fact that neither Brameld nor Zilliacus were able to continue the momentum that they had created in the mid-1940s. Both men remained on the NEF committees during the 1950s but were increasingly out of touch with the IHQ, much to the frustration of Clare Soper, the secretary.⁸⁰ By the early 1950s, Brameld was only occasionally in contact with the NEF. Zilliacus wrote regularly to Soper but was unable to offer any practical help for the organisation. In both cases, distance, combined with heavy academic involvement – with New York University in the case of Brameld and Columbia University in the case of Zilliacus – meant that neither man was able to provide any real focus for the political sentiments that they argued for. The early death of Zilliacus in 1959 confirmed the end of his influence upon the NEF and of the use of the NEF as a tool for political ideology.

⁷⁹ NA OD 3/22, 'The Second Commonwealth Education Conference, 1962 Delhi: Minutes'.

⁸⁰ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 21 November 1946.

Another reason for the failure of the radical social agenda can be gleaned from an examination of the membership of the NEF and the sorts of people who attended the international conferences which reveals that, in fact, attendees were mainly female and almost entirely schoolteachers. The attendance lists of the conferences from Cirencester 1947 to Askov 1953 did not show an organisation attracting a membership of those seeking radical changes in the education system and within society, but a selection of mostly English teachers seeking to interact with other teachers.⁸¹

Finally, the NEF did not pursue with enough single-mindedness the themes that were introduced at its conferences. The 1948 conference in London did not continue with the theme of social justice raised at the 1947 conference but side-stepped into an examination of 'Human Factors in the School Situation' upon which both the *TES* and the French delegate commented that the discussion needed more direction and did not come to any clear conclusions.⁸² Most importantly, Brameld and Zilliacus found other avenues to express their sentiments, mainly through having their writings published and through their academic careers.

The NEF did survive during this period, however. Much of the reason for this was due to the dedicated and mostly unacknowledged female voluntary support it gained from those such as Catherine Fletcher, Clare Soper and Peggy Volkov. This was also the case with the membership. Women were well represented at NEF conferences, often forming a majority of those present, and were a significant force within the organisation.⁸³ The NEF was not only an informal forum for educationists to express themselves within but was also an important forum for female

⁸¹ WEF III/210, 'Attendance List', Askov 1952.

⁸² 'Conference Technique: NEF Experiment', *TES* 10 April 1948 p. 208

⁸³ WEF III/210, 'Attendance List', Askov 1952.

educationists, whether in teacher training colleges or working within schools, to put forward their views.

A new ideology

During the 1950s and 1960s the debate over whether the NEF should be promoting a psychological or spiritual outlook re-emerged and began to split the movement. By 1945, this debate had been resolved in favour of promoting a more scientific and less spiritual approach. The adoption of a social agenda after 1945 had seemed to confirm the final defeat of both these approaches. This was certainly the case in the first few years after 1945, but with the eclipse of the NEF's social agenda and the continued attacks on the new education, some members sought to return to the seeming certainty of psychology as a scientific approach for the movement. There were calls from some members that the NEF should use the ideas provided by the 'writings of Freud, Adler and Jung and their followers' in its activities.⁸⁴ Members such as Wyatt Rawson strongly supported a psychological outlook for the NEF, stating that the teacher should become a counsellor for the children and that the word 'teaching' should be abolished and the word 'treatment' substituted. Rawson strongly believed that the NEF had lost its true path when it had failed to become an organisation based upon educational and psychological approaches.⁸⁵

The NEF also sought to be viewed as a serious research institution, and to prove, as it had done so during the 1920s, that its ideals were based upon sound scientific reasoning.⁸⁶ Authors in the pages of both the *New Era* and the *Teachers*

⁸⁴ WEF III/226, 'Agenda', circa 1965.

⁸⁵ WEF III/226, 'Working Party, 10 December 1965'.

⁸⁶ NEF, *Play and Mental Health* (London: NEF, 1945).

College Record were increasingly focusing upon the psychological approach.⁸⁷ There seemed to be an ideal opportunity to combine this renewed interest in psychology with an attempt to improve the status of the NEF and to become involved with research in this area. A report was commissioned from psychologist Dr Pierre Turquet, consultant psychiatrist at the Tavistock Institute, London, and his assistant Miss Theodore Alcock to understand 'Attitude Change in Teachers', published as a report on 5 January 1950.⁸⁸ The aim of this was to build up the NEF's reputation as a research-based institution. The purpose of the project was to '... clarify conscious and unconscious attitudes by pointing out the forces at work within the groups ...'.⁸⁹ Unfortunately for the NEF, the report did not yield the results that the committee had hoped. This foray into psychological research, in the NEF's quest for an ideology, was doomed to be short-lived. Instead of giving the NEF the support it needed to convince sceptics that there was a genuinely scientific rationale for the new education, the report presented the opposite view. Alcock and Turquet concluded from these observations that 'A clinical appraisal of the teachers seen in connection with this investigation shows that at least 25% were emotionally ill and in need of medical help which some of them ought to obtain.'⁹⁰ The report also concluded that many teachers were indeed a threat to world peace and that, in fact, teachers were responsible for causing world problems by educating their pupils with antiquated and prejudiced notions. This was not the conclusion that the NEF had been hoping for.

⁸⁷ P. M. Symmons, 'What Education has to Learn from Psychology', *Teachers College Record* 56(5) (1955), pp. 277–85. G. Watson, 'In Honor of John Dewey; John Dewey as a Pioneer of Social Psychology', *Teachers College Record* 51(3) (1949), pp. 139–43.

⁸⁸ P. Turquet attended the London Hospital Medical School and qualified as a medical practitioner in 1939. Turquet worked in the Social Medicine Research Unit and the Medical Research Council.

⁸⁹ WEF IV/237, 'An Experiment in Attitude Changes in Teachers, Report, 1950'.

⁹⁰ WEF IV/237, 'Report on Ad hoc Committee on Turquet/Alcock Based on Meeting on 16 June 1954', p. 58.

When the report was published, members attacked it as damaging to the teaching profession and insulting to teachers.⁹¹ J. W. (Billy) Tibble, lecturer in education at Leicester University commented that the report ‘. . .if published it might give the impression that teachers are psychopaths . . . a contempt for teachers is hardly concealed within the report . . .’.⁹² The methods used by Alcock and Turquet were also criticised as vague and unscientific. Adam Curle of the University of Bradford, a member of the NEF committee, criticised ‘. . . the relative smallness of the samples . . . rather too much is made of a somewhat limited form of investigation’.⁹³ More seriously, the report made the NEF seem aloof from the teaching profession and cast severe doubts on the methods used in its research projects.⁹⁴ The report was an embarrassing setback for the NEF. The NEF did not have the funds or resources to promote itself as a serious educational or psychological research organisation. In the past its membership had included many eminent psychologists and educationists who had shared their ideas with the organisation. It was clear, however, that this was no longer the case. On its own, the NEF was unable to be a centre of educational research or at the cutting-edge of new approaches in education while it lacked the membership and interest of these figures.

The most important influence upon the NEF’s attempt to find a suitable ideology during the latter part of the 1950s and into the 1960s was from its President K. G. Sayidain. Sayidain, Educational Advisor to the Government of India, believed in a more mystical and spiritual vision of education and his outlook was evident in all

⁹¹ Ibid., p.5.

⁹² Ibid., p.5.

⁹³ A. Curle, *Making Peace* (London: Tavistock, 1971), p. 275.

⁹⁴ WEF IV/237, ‘Report on Ad hoc Committee on Turquet/Alcock Based on Meeting on 16 June 1954’, p. 59.

his work with the NEF.⁹⁵ His ideals drew more from Beatrice Ensor and pre-1945 new educationists than those of Brameld and Zilliacus.⁹⁶ As the 1960s progressed, statements echoing these ideals were regularly published in the organisation's publications.⁹⁷ By 1960, the NEF described itself as a '... fellowship [that] embraced people who perpetually sought to understand the place of man in the universal scheme of things'.⁹⁸ Saiyidain argued that the NEF should be about releasing creativity within people, uplifting mankind and helping them to find their inner spirituality.⁹⁹ Sayidain gradually subverted the NEF's traditional conflict between psychology and spirituality, seeking to merge both approaches.¹⁰⁰ He brought a new perspective to the NEF, one that was not affected by either the concerns of Europe or the USA, but reflected a uniquely Indian approach.¹⁰¹ The original spiritual focus of the NEF had come from Ensor's theosophical beliefs that had been strongly based upon Indian spirituality. Sayidain's beliefs brought the NEF more closely back to this early concept of its role.

Other members supported the revival of spirituality as an approach for the NEF. Dr Hemming argued that the NEF should be promoting a clearly spiritual and moral approach. He argued that:

The situation we face today is that the concept of absolute and eternal morality rooted in divine revelation has for some time been breaking

⁹⁵ WEF III/222, 'Report, Meeting of the International Council at Drieberge, Holland 20 July 1962', p. 4.

⁹⁶ W. H. Kilpatrick, 'The Pursuit of Moral and Spiritual Values', *Teachers College Record* (1952) 53(5), pp. 264–69.

⁹⁷ WEF III/230, 'Address, Jubilee Conference of the WEF and Centenary of the Birth of Maria Montessori, 1971'.

⁹⁸ WEF III/219, 'Presidential Remarks, Report on the Delhi Conference 1960', pp. 17 and 18.

⁹⁹ WEF III/222, 'Message from President K. D. Saiyidain to International Conference at Drieberges, Holland 1962'.

¹⁰⁰ WEF III/219, 'Presidential Remarks, Report on the Delhi Conference 1960', pp. 17 and 18.

¹⁰¹ K. G. Saiyidain, 'New Education – A Personal Statement', *New Era* 36 (December. 1955), pp. 199–200.

down. This is not because people are becoming more degenerate but because the foundations of certainty have been crumbling.¹⁰²

At the 1966 conference K. G. Saiyidain's ideals received backing on the basis that it was important to make '... reavailable the spiritual dimension in a post-traditionally religious, in our case Christian, age'.¹⁰³ Saiyidain believed that the progress of the NEF towards a more spiritual and moral approach was a logical one based upon the needs of society. He argued that the aim of the movement had always been to oppose evil and to release good within human beings through education.¹⁰⁴

Saiyidain's leadership, however, was vague and distant. He rarely attended conferences, due to the constraints of time and money. The lack of strong leadership was a continuing headache for the NEF after 1945 and without this the organisation and its ideas became increasingly diverse. By the late 1950s and 1960s, the movement no longer had any educational purpose but had become involved with the counter-cultural ideals of that decade.¹⁰⁵ This was another trend that did not serve the NEF usefully in its search to find a coherent ideology for itself. The NEF's discussions and aims had degenerated into a bizarre mixture of conflicting interests.

The NEF suffered from a failure of confidence in its own ability to make an active difference, allowing its conferences to become sidetracked into seemingly irrelevant discussions. This reduced the NEF's ability to promote its ideals. At the 1956 Utrecht conference, discussions took place around a diverse variety of topics, including the ideas of L. Ron Hubbard, the founder of scientology, that were forwarded as a solution for the ills of the world. One British speaker stated confidently under the conference theme of 'creative education' that 'Mr Hubbard

¹⁰² WEF III/226, 'Working Party, James Hemming, 1965'.

¹⁰³ WEF III/226, 'Agenda, 28 January 1966'.

¹⁰⁴ WEF III/230, 'Inaugural Address at the Jubilee Session of the WEF at the Brussels Conference 1971', K. G. Saiyidan, p. 3.

¹⁰⁵ R. Gal, 'Where Does the New Education Stand', *New Era* 42 (January 1961), pp. 21-7.

seems to have found the missing link that gives man the ability to change himself and his environment.’¹⁰⁶ This did little to persuade delegates that the NEF had a sensible interest in the problems of their individual educational systems or any focus on educational matters at all.

This was particularly evident at the 1966 international conference where the topics discussed – most of which adopted a pseudo-psychological or mystical approach – showed that there was an inability to keep to any specific themes. Topics included: ‘the discovery of the depth dimension in human personality’; ‘human development in the evolution theory’; ‘urbanisation and population growth’; and ‘nuclear energy in war and peace’.¹⁰⁷ There was an active discussion upon the problem of paranormal phenomena. This was linked to the issue of psychology and the development of human spirituality, including such issues as telepathy, clairvoyance and precognition, all showing, according to the NEF report, the fact that the human mind was capable of much more than was presently being exploited. The committee, in its discussions of these conference topics, considered that ‘each of these obviously contains profound implications for educational theory and practice’, but did not express how. However, these statements did little to solve the problems of the NEF or to give it a clear focus. There were too many divergent themes for the NEF to pursue successfully,¹⁰⁸ and it no longer had a clear practical agenda as an educational organisation. Without one, it had difficulty being taken seriously or being heard amidst a plethora of other single-issue organisations seeking to promote themselves. The NEF’s liberal approach was not useful in this new and more competitive climate.

¹⁰⁶ WEF III/215, ‘Memorandum of Creative Education – A New Scientific Approach to the New Education’, 1956.

¹⁰⁷ WEF III/226, ‘Agenda’, 28 January 1966.

¹⁰⁸ A Correspondent, ‘Rainbow Before A Storm. The Threat of Nuclear Weapons’, *TES*, 13 July 1962, p. 45.

There was also criticism from the members who believed that the NEF had lost its purpose. One member asked, 'what did the NEF do apart from attending conferences?' and that 'they should play their parts in various groups'. One member considered that the NEF was 'too much inward looking and we had not really got our feet on the ground'. Another member, Dr Harold Entwistle, a sociologist, commented that the aims and purposes of the NEF and the conference were 'woolly and could mean anything' and that the NEF would help itself more if it made more use of 'research in education'.¹⁰⁹ Dr Ruth Froyland Nielsen, a member from Denmark, expressed her reservations about the themes that the NEF conferences, in particular the most recent ones, had pursued.

As I have been deeply attached to the fellowship since 1927 and present at the International Conferences since 1932 I have know the aspirations and the important contributions made by the pioneers and their followers . . . At the later International Conferences I have felt that our fellowship has . . . worked at a distance from the actual pressing problems in education. It has become philosophical and at times even conventional.¹¹⁰

In response to this criticism Saiyidain argued, with justification, that:

The WEF has always been a rather small organization run by a comparatively few men and women of vision who had more faith than funds, more resilience of spirit than resources . . . e.g. Ensor, Zilliacus, Washburne, J. Lauwerys, Miss Clare Soper. I do not know of any other organizations which working with such a strict limitation of resources and paid personnel have been able to act as catalytic agents of beneficial choices.¹¹¹

In this statement, Saiyidain touched upon one of the main problems that had faced the NEF, after 1945, in its quest to become actively involved with the reconstruction of

¹⁰⁹ WEF III/226, 'Comments', Miss Stewart and C. Fletcher, 1966.

¹¹⁰ WEF III/230, Froyland Nielsen to. Hessing, 19 March 1971.

¹¹¹ WEF III/230, 'Address, K. G. Saiyidan, International Conference, 1966'.

education and society, the continued lack of finances. Saiyidain, however, failed to mention the other main problem that had pursued the NEF and had undermined its attempts to promote itself successfully. This was that, under the presidency of Saiyidain, the NEF continued a post-war tradition of distant leadership that had started with Carleton Washburne and which had allowed the movement to fragment. This was not helpful in promoting the NEF or bringing any form of unity to its conferences or organisation.¹¹²

The NEF faced serious and continual financial difficulties. The 1960 Delhi Conference almost bankrupted the NEF.¹¹³ By the 1960s, UNESCO also seemed to be becoming cynical about the contribution that the NEF was making and questioned the validity of the themes to be discussed at the conference in India.¹¹⁴ Annand reported that he was facing difficulty persuading educationists to travel to the conference and address the members. Many speakers cited other commitments and the high cost of travel. The NEF could not afford to pay them any form of compensation and they were expected to fund their own travel and accommodation. Unsurprisingly, many potential speakers found this an insufficient incentive.¹¹⁵ This situation did not improve and the international conferences made very little money for the NEF. The financial report on the conference stated that: 'At the moment *with very great care* [original emphasis] we may just about break even financially. Commercially speaking I [Annand] have always estimated we need 200 full participants to derive any real benefit from the conference.'¹¹⁶ Unfortunately, only about 150 people were present at

¹¹² K. G. Saiyidain, *Problems of Educational Reconstruction in India*, (London NEF, 1952).

¹¹³ WEF III/219, 'Memorandum, Delhi Conference', 1960.

¹¹⁴ WEF III/219, Annand to Arthur (UNESCO Commissioner for UK), 19 November 1958.

¹¹⁵ WEF III/219, Annand to Gal, 17 November 1958.

¹¹⁶ WEF III/226, 'Chichester Conference 1966, Shaping the Future – New Educational Thinking', p. 171.

the final count. An additional problem was that UNESCO had now changed its approach and was less supportive of small NGOs such as the NEF.¹¹⁷

The NEF faced a series of problems after 1945 that reduced its ability to promote itself successfully. It sought to reinvent itself, but ultimately its main problem was that it had ceased to focus upon education. When the NEF membership continued to be involved with educational concerns it was more successful in developing its network. This was mainly through the work of the national branches, however, with their better understanding of local educational and political conditions, rather than the NEF itself. The work of the ENEF in the field of teacher training in England was an example of this and is explored in chapter six. When the NEF was sidetracked into non-educational issues, outside of its traditional area of interest, it was less successful.

By the 1960s, the NEF had clearly abandoned any pretence at being an organisation dedicated to the promotion of the new education as an ideology. It did this in order to appear relevant to contemporary issues. Instead, however, its changing involvement with a range of other issues, including politics, human rights and the counter-culture of the 1960s, caused it to lack focus and it never involved itself for long enough with any one theme to make an impact. There were a variety of reasons for this continuing failure, some of the NEF's own making, some the result of factors beyond its control. The members of the NEF committee had too much confidence that they had successfully achieved their educational goals and that they therefore no longer needed to concentrate on this area of their work. Instead, they pursued too many diverse themes and as a result alienated the majority of the NEF's membership who still believed themselves to be part of an organisation representing educational

¹¹⁷ A Correspondent, 'Threat of Technology', *TES*, 6 May 1960. p. 918.

concerns. The themes that the NEF pursued aside from education, such as citizenship, democracy and human rights, were also well represented by a variety of other stronger organisations with which a small-scale body, such as the NEF, had little hope of competing.¹¹⁸

However, the most important factor in the decline of the international new educational movement was the wider political climate. During the 1950s, the new education movement pursued a strongly socially reformist and politically active agenda. It was this approach which caused the failure of the internationalist agenda of the new education and the NEF, as the international political climate became increasingly hostile and the attitudes of those upon whom the new education had previously relied for support changed fundamentally. There were also many other opportunities for those who might previously have given their support to the NEF.¹¹⁹

The end of an era: the closure of the NEF IHQ

The problem that the NEF had the most difficulty solving, however, was the continued lack of funding. Clare Soper (as discussed in the previous chapter) was permanently challenged in her efforts to keep the organisation functioning. During particularly difficult periods in the finances, she would often not take any payment for herself in her role as secretary. This lack of funding and the constant struggle to finance the offices and administration of the NEF IHQ in London proved a more serious hindrance in the NEF's quest to promote itself and its agenda than international rejection of its ideology.

Annand, secretary at the NEF IHQ after Clare Soper, realised that if the NEF wished to survive then its administration had to be pared down to the minimum. He

¹¹⁸ 'Making Citizens of the World: the Meeting for the Council for Education in World Citizenship', *TES*, 9 December 1949, p. 863.

¹¹⁹ NA ED 121/128, 'Council for Education in World Citizenship, Deputation to the Board of Education', 1942.

wrote, as early as 1953, in an open letter to the membership, that the finances of the NEF were ‘perpetually in jeopardy, the development of work is hampered’ in spite of the ‘modest needs of international Headquarters’. He added that: ‘The [national branches] . . . seem to have forgotten, in all the stress of their local problems, that the Fellowship is an international organisation.’¹²⁰ He also wrote to Beatrice Ensor in 1956 outlining his concerns over the survival of the IHQ. Ensor was against any discussion of closing the offices in London and refused to believe the situation was as bad as Annand claimed, giving an upbeat response: ‘. . . it is rather wonderful that NEF has managed to exist so long in spite of a recurring problem over money, due of course to the devoted work of the few.’¹²¹ Annand attempted to pull in all the contacts he was able in order to keep the Headquarters functioning. His request to Beatrice Ensor for money resulted in a letter back from her that she would approach an organisation in South Africa that had helped the NEF in the past, ‘the Abe Bailey Trust . . . helped us over the 1934 conference in South Africa but I don’t suppose the Trustees know anything about that . . .’.¹²² Annand wrote again further outlining the financial problems that the IHQ faced.¹²³

It was becoming clear, as the 1950s progressed, that the existence of the IHQ was ceasing to be financially viable in the face of the decreasing membership and a lack of any regular income or financial support. Annand came to the decision that if the NEF were to survive he would have to close the offices in London. Beatrice Ensor wrote a letter strongly condemning this proposal,

I am . . . against closing the London office and Peggy [Volkov – Annand’s assistant] and yourself working from home . . . Reduce headquarters’

¹²⁰ WEF V/274, ‘The Work at Headquarters’, 1953.

¹²¹ WEF I/1, Ensor to Annand, 17 August 1956.

¹²² WEF I/2, Ensor to Annand, 14 February 1957.

¹²³ WEF I/1, Annand to Ensor, 6 February 1957.

expense as far as possible only doing the work of keeping in touch with sections during the nine months until the UNESCO grant is paid in March . . . If the international conference is to be held in India, India should provide the finances . . .¹²⁴

These comments point to the problem, which dogged the progress of the NEF. Its membership was small and dispersed and, consequently, not financially supportive of the organisation.¹²⁵ This lack of finances strongly curbed the efficacy of many of the NEF's projects and aims. The funding received from UNESCO was still not enough to prevent the NEF's finances from declining to an alarmingly low level. The NEF was able to continue to survive thanks to UNESCO projects that were funded generously but this funding, however, was not enough to support the NEF's own activities and conferences. It was the 1960 conference in India that proved to be the final unacceptable financial burden for the IHQ. The costs for the conference in India had consumed the last of the NEF's slender funds.¹²⁶ It was no longer able to sustain an independent international network of activities and conferences relying totally upon the organisation by and funding from the IHQ in London.

Annand decided that in spite of Beatrice Ensor's earlier opposition he had no choice but to close the London IHQ.¹²⁷ Beatrice Ensor had been the only major opponent of this action and her death in 1957 had removed this obstacle. It was ignominious, however, for an international organisation to be based at Annand's house in Sussex. It seemed clear to all concerned that an important era of the NEF had finally come to an end.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ WEF I/1, Ensor to Annand, 27 July 1957.

¹²⁵ WEF I/2, Boyd to Annand, 28 June 1957.

¹²⁶ WEF V/273, 'Report to UNESCO', 1960.

¹²⁷ WEF V/279, 'Report to UNESCO', 1961.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

The NEF may have lost the IHQ, but, in fact, they had been a redundant expenditure for many years. The NEF's strength had always been in its flexibility as an organisation, existing on the minimum of funding but using its membership network to promote and share its ideas. Annand's actions confirmed that the future path for the NEF was to provide a forum for discussion of educational, social and related topics rather than a formal organisation run from a central point. The NEF was not and could not become a single-issue organisation, such as many others that were coming into existence after 1945. Neither could it rely upon any single benefactor to provide it with funding. It was no longer possible to depend on the generosity of handouts by official organisations or government departments.¹²⁹

The NEF was unable to achieve its aims after 1945 for a variety of interlinked reasons. Abiss (1998) and Jenkins (1989) have both suggested that the problems faced by the NEF were due to the fact that many of the ideas that it promoted had been adopted by mainstream schools and legitimised.¹³⁰ While there is some truth in this claim in England perhaps, where there still existed more sympathy towards the sorts of ideas promoted by the NEF, this was most certainly not the case internationally, for example, in the USA. The NEF had difficulty promoting itself for a variety of reasons. The first problem that faced the NEF was that it had, in fact, rejected the new education and failed to find an ideology that expressed its institutional outlook. Attempts by Boyd, Brameld, Rawson and Zilliacus to promote their visions did not succeed in uniting the NEF behind a single vision for the organisation and its purpose. It was also increasingly difficult, in the post-war years, to find a single ideology that would satisfy the needs of educationists in different countries across the world. This,

¹²⁹ NA DO 35/1202, Dunbartin (Director Australian news and Information Bureau) to Baynes (Dominion's Office, Whitehall), 12 June 1946, concerning the Commonwealth funding of the NEF's activities in Australia.

¹³⁰ Abiss (1998), Jenkins (1989), p. 14.

coupled with the increasing centralisation of education and the fact that many aspects of educational reform and social welfare were now being taken over by national governments, made it impossible for the NEF to find a consensus about what its role should be after 1945. The second problem was that the abandonment of education by the NEF and its committee in favour of social welfare caused the movement to lose sight of its purpose. Ultimately, this caused the NEF to become mired in vague discussions reflecting the counter-culture of the 1960s rather than seeking to address serious educational or political issues.¹³¹

Failure to find an identity

In terms of organisational theory, the NEF's confusion over its ideology was indicative of the failure of the organisation to find itself a legitimate identity. Without such legitimacy, the NEF faced difficulty in gaining the trust and support that it needed and that would have helped it expand during this period. An important reason for this failure within organisations, according to Suchman (1995), can be ascribed to whether an organisation possesses strong or weak leadership. In the case of the NEF, it did not possess a leadership that was dedicated or united enough to encourage the development of an institutional aim or ideology.¹³² The NEF also faced much international rejection because of its adoption of a radically social agenda, which did not take into account the goals of its European membership. According to Boin, where an organisation's purpose and ideology differs too much from those from whom it would seek support, this would hinder the 'institutionalization' of the organisation.¹³³ In this case, the NEF faced international rejection because its agenda did not match sufficiently that of those from whom it sought support, from Europe and the USA.

¹³¹ 'Fellowship', *TES*, 24 August 1951. p. 668

¹³² Suchman (1995).

¹³³ Boin and Christensen (2008).

Another problem for the NEF was that, before 1940, a clear consensus from European and American educators had held the movement together. After 1945, political and ideological developments within the USA, particularly during the 1950s, and increasing international political tensions caused severe rifts between European and American educationists. Finally, the NEF was predominantly a British organisation, dominated by English educationists and based in England. The NEF increasingly represented British educational and social concerns that were not well received by the international membership. The NEF did not recognise that individual countries were seeking their own paths to reconstruction that took into account national, rather than international, concerns.¹³⁴ The NEF's difficulties also support the application of Murray Thomas's (1998) 'inertia theory' at this point.¹³⁵ The problems faced by the NEF in forwarding a new ideology and purpose during this period were not entirely due to political hostility from the USA or European apathy. Conditions within Britain were more favourable and could have allowed more involvement with educational and social matters than was achieved. This lack of progress can be explained by the fact that the NEF committee and membership were supportive of the ideas of Brameld and Zilliacus, but initial enthusiasm did not see long-term change due to the continuing and severe lack of finances. As a result of this, the organisation tended to look towards pre-existing aims, practices and networks that could be more reliably sustained.

There were, however, positive outcomes from the problems that the NEF faced during this period. The true strength of the NEF had always been in the way that it allowed a range of different and sometimes competing educational views to be discussed. Annand allowed the NEF to return to its roots and to become a looser

¹³⁴ D. Stewart, 'Towards World Unity of Teachers', *Phi Delta Kappan* 31 (1949), pp. 89–91.

¹³⁵ Murray Thomas (1998), p. 93.

confederation of national branches. One result of this was that discussions concerning educational and political issues were now increasingly being devolved to national branches. This had the effect of strengthening the movement at a grassroots level in spite of the tribulations facing the heart of the NEF. In addition to this, conferences became much more as Ensor had envisaged them, opportunities for international members to network and have discussions in informal surroundings, rather than ways of promoting a particular ideology.¹³⁶ The final positive outcome was that during this period the NEF forged links as an NGO with UNESCO between 1948 and 1964. This relationship was perhaps the most profitable and creative time for the NEF and is examined in chapter six. Through this relationship the NEF sidestepped many of the issues that might have destroyed it as an organisation, ideological rejection in Europe and the USA and its own funding crises. Instead, through its links with UNESCO, the NEF developed an international network that helped it to survive.

Ultimately the success of the NEF lay in the fact that the organisation was flexible enough to accept changes in its administration and ideology. The true power of the NEF now lay in its national branches, which were more able to reflect the needs of their own countries. In particular, the ENEF, the English national branch, which was the most successful of these, sought to form its own network of affiliations in England in order to become involved with social and educational reconstruction there after 1945. The ENEF's network forms the focus of the next two chapters. Chapter four explores the regional activities and work of the membership in England and Wales (which was included for administrative purposes with the ENEF) and chapter five explores the ENEF's institutional links with teacher training institutions and schools. The NEF's international network is examined in chapter six.

¹³⁶ NA DO 35/1202, 'Report to Foreign Office; Proposal for Conference in Australia 1946'.

CHAPTER FOUR

The ENEF's regional network and ideology: 1944–1966

Introduction

The English New Education Fellowship (ENEF) was created in 1927 and became the first national branch of the NEF.¹ The purpose of these national branches was to allow members of the NEF to foster closer links with their localities and to be more responsive to the needs of the regional membership. Until this time, the NEF's membership and activities had been organised entirely by the IHQ in London.² The ENEF possessed a membership base which, while not vast, contained a considerable number of important British educationists. This chapter focuses upon the extent and nature of the ENEF's membership and affiliations between 1944 and 1966, the period during which the importance and network of the organisation expanded. In 1944, the Progressive Education Association (PEA) in the USA was dissolved. As a result of this the importance of the English new educationists within the movement increased and this date is taken therefore as a starting point for this chapter. The ENEF reveals a contrasting example to that of the NEF in that it was ultimately more successful in developing as an autonomous organisation and its ability to gain more legitimacy. Various factors were important in this. The ENEF possessed a more committed and sustained leadership which took greater interest in the work of the organisation. It was also better able to expand its network into educational and other institutions in England. The fact that the ENEF faced a less hostile climate to its work and was not seeking to operate internationally was also helpful.

¹ Boyd (1930), p. 198; Jenkins (1989), p. 94.

² NA ED 121/429, 'Aims and Constitution of the ENEF', 1947.

The English new educationists were determined to create those radical social changes that they had failed to achieve after 1918.³ The ideas of the new educationists during the 1940s resonated with the general desire for the reconstruction of society, both ideologically and practically.⁴ This involved attempting to bring the movement's ideals to a wider audience, the working classes, urban dwellers, parents and teachers. The *ENEF Bulletin* stated that the organisation's aims were 'equality of opportunity for education regardless of race, birth, sex, income or creed'.⁵ In 1942, it was demanded that the school-leaving age be raised to 15, that there be common standards of staffing, qualifications and pay, that all schools should be provided with free medical services and school meals, and that there should be continuation of opportunity for those students who wished to progress to further education, leading to a full opportunity for adult education, free access to universities and colleges and a prohibition of employment below the age of 15.⁶ The existing educational structure was dismissed as a tool to reinforce a 'crumbling social order'.⁷ The *ENEF Bulletin* cited the following statement, by Catherine Fletcher, Principal of the Bingley Training College, as justification for its approach:

Social awareness . . . has at least developed so far that a growing number are prepared to recognize that questions concerning children's education cannot be questions concerning their schooling alone, but must also concern parents, homes, nature of living conditions, food, neighbourhoods, the nature of industry and agriculture and of leisure activities.⁸

³ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 20', *New Era* 25 (September–October 1944), p. 173.

⁴ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 7', *New Era* 24 (February 1943), p. 25.

University of Warwick Modern Records Centre (UWMRC), MSS.179/EDU/3/11/1899F/1-15NUT, 'Panel Report on Education after the War, Education After the War: Observations Received from Members of the Executive', 1941.

⁵ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin 21', *New Era* 25 (November 1944), p. 227.

⁶ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 7', *New Era* 24 (February 1943), p. 25.

⁷ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 6', *New Era* 24 (January 1943), pp. 6–7.

⁸ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF News: Bulletin No. 13', *New Era* 25 (December 1944), p. 218.

Another important aspect of this training was the need to improve standards of living; this included town planning, social engineering of neighbourhoods and the improvement of all facilities.⁹ In Britain there was also increased interest among the English new educationists in the creation of the comprehensive school, increased school welfare services and widening participation in education. The difference of approach between the ENEF and the NEF was evident in their responses to educational and social issues. The ENEF pursued a radical social agenda, regardless of the historic sensibilities of the NEF.¹⁰

This chapter is divided into five sections. First, the personnel, committees, secretaries and finances of the ENEF are explored. The ENEF held regular conferences on a variety of themes. These conferences are examined in the second section. They are used to understand how the organisation promoted itself and as indicators of the support that the ENEF gained. The changing fortunes of the network of regional ENEF branches in England are considered in the third section, and are used to reveal the extent and nature of the support that the organisation gained at a local level. The ENEF's membership believed that, through the NEF's journal, the *New Era*, they could involve themselves with contemporary educational debates. During the period under review, the ENEF and English educationists dominated the journal's articles. In the fourth section, this journal and other relevant publications by the ENEF's membership are examined as a method for understanding how far the journal allowed English new educationists to contribute to educational debates during these years. The administration and problems that confronted the ENEF after 1960 are also examined separately as important factors in revealing the issues that faced the organisation in the latter part of the period under review.

⁹ C. Fletcher, 'Social Approaches to the Curriculum', *New Era* 25 (June 1944), p. 104.

¹⁰ H. G. Stead, 'The Spens Report', *New Era* 20 (March 1939), p. 84.

The ENEF's personnel and committees

One of the most important strengths of the ENEF was that it possessed a well-connected committee, as shown by the committee membership and by its first three presidents – all of whom were also Directors of the University of London Institute of Education during their time as Presidents of the ENEF. This shows the close, continued links that existed between the ENEF and the Institute.¹¹ Fred Clarke was the first President. His main importance was to argue for a decentralised education system based upon ideas of equality and democracy.¹² During his presidency, the ENEF adopted many of these ideas.¹³ G. B. Jeffery took over as President in 1952 and held the office until 1958. Lionel Elvin was President from 1958 until 1973.¹⁴ During his presidency, Elvin encouraged support for comprehensive schooling among the ENEF membership.¹⁵ Elvin was also Director of Education at UNESCO between 1950 and 1956, at a time when the ENEF itself was forging closer links with that body.¹⁶

In the 1950s and 1960s the ENEF had a committee drawn mainly from a mixture of English universities and teacher-training colleges including Miss Catherine Fletcher, Principal of Bingley Training College, David Jordan, Lecturer at Goldsmiths' College, University of London; Joseph A. Lauwerys, Reader in Education at the University of London Institute of Education, and Karl Mannheim,

¹¹ R. Aldrich and P. Gordon, *Dictionary of British Educationists* (London: Woburn Press, 1989), pp. 52–3. Clarke was Director between 1936 and 1945. G. B. Jeffery was Director between 1945 and 1957. Elvin was Director between 1958 and 1967.

¹² F. Clarke, *Freedom in The Educative Society* (London: University of London Press, 1948), p. 20.

¹³ F. Clarke, 'Planned Freedom', *New Era* 21 (November 1940), p. 221–2.

¹⁴ L. Elvin, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 16', *New Era* 40 (March 1958), pp. 72–6.

¹⁵ L. Elvin, *The Changing Pattern of English Secondary Education* (London: Association of Technical Institutes, 1968), p. 6.

¹⁶ L. Elvin, *Encounters with Education* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1987), p. 104.

Lecturer in Sociology, London School of Economics.¹⁷ The University of London Institute of Education employed a significant proportion of these people,¹⁸ and institute staff were present on both the NEF and the ENEF committees.¹⁹ Committee members also represented a wide variety of other teacher training institutions, including Bristol University, the City of Coventry Training College, Exeter University and Gipsy Hill Training College.²⁰ Many of these educationists held important positions within these institutions, either as readers in education, lecturers or senior lecturers. Some of the committee members also had active links with other organisations, ranging from groups such as the Nursery School Association to national organisations such as the NUT.²¹ These links provided the ENEF with a wide academic network. The ENEF benefited from the experience and support that this mutual membership was able to bring at an ideological and planning level.

Another strength of the ENEF was that it encouraged a range of individuals with differing backgrounds and skills to be represented on its committees. During the 1960s, female members were particularly well represented. There were 22 members on the guiding committee in 1967, of whom ten were female.²² This compares favourably with the committee of the 1940s, in which only two out of 11 members were female.²³ The ENEF committees also contained a number of honorary appointments representing important figures in education. These included, Lady Allen

¹⁷ 'ENEF Committee 1943', *New Era* 24 (November 1943), p. 178; and The Moot File 1, 'ENEF Committee'.

¹⁸ ENEF 13, 'Members of ENEF and University of London Institute of Education'. C. Willis Dixon, *The Institute: A Personal Account of the History of the University Of London Institute of Education 1932 to 1972* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1986).

¹⁹ Joseph Lauwerys was on both the NEF and the ENEF committees as were Sir Percy Nunn, Sir Fred Clarke and Dr Susan Isaacs, at that time a lecturer in the Department of Education Psychology at the University of London Institute of Education.

²⁰ ENEF 13, 'Members of ENEF Committee': Exeter University (Miss Howard), Bristol University (Professor Ben Morris), the City of Coventry Training College (Mr James Porter) and Gipsy Hill Training College (Miss Stapleton).

²¹ J. B. Annand, 'News from English Section', *New Era* 42 (February 1961), pp. 36–9.

²² ENEF 7, 'ENEF Committee 1967'.

²³ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF committee members', *New Era* 24 (November 1943), p. 178.

of Hurtwood who was the vice president during the 1960s, Lady Plowden, chair of the 1967 Plowden Report on primary education, the Right Honourable R. A. Butler MP, and Sir George Schuster.²⁴ The guiding and planning committees, which advised the main committee, were the actual powerhouses of the ENEF and were still predominantly made up of longstanding ENEF members. These included Joseph Lauwerys and Professor Ben Morris of Bristol University (who became President after Lionel Elvin in 1973), as well as other stalwart ENEF members such as James Annand, James Henderson, David Jordan and Peggy Volkov.²⁵ After 1960, the ENEF committee gained greater influence, when the NEF was forced to abandon its IHQ at 1 Park Crescent, London, due to lack of funding. The ENEF took the decision to maintain a room in London at 4 Peto Place as a clubroom and a meeting point for both national and international NEF members.²⁶ The NEF IHQ was now based in the provinces, first in Sussex and then in Kent. The NEF's lack of offices in London caused the ENEF to take on much of the former's previous role as a focus for the new education in England.

The ENEF also possessed dedicated secretaries, who were long-serving, with the exception of a period of time in the mid-1960s, and whose work made important contributions to the success of the organisation. The secretaries of the ENEF were its most important officers and were responsible for the day-to-day running of the organisation. The first Secretary of the ENEF was H. G. Stead, who served in this role until his death in 1943. Stead was credited with giving the ENEF the strong vision that sustained it throughout the 1940s and into the 1950s. Hilda Clarke became Secretary in 1943, serving until 1947 when this position was handed over to Raymond

²⁴ ENEF 6, Annand to Lady Hurtwood, 10 December, 1963. Lady Allen was wife of Lord Allen of Hurtwood, politician and founder of the private Hurtwood School, and also a NEF member. ENEF 13, File B, 'Memorandum' on Sir George Schuster.

²⁵ ENEF 13, 'Members of ENEF Committee'.

²⁶ J. B. Annand, 'English Section', *New Era* 42 (February 1961), pp. 36–9.

King, Headmaster of Wandsworth School, London. Raymond King, shaped much of the post-war vision of the ENEF with his focus upon comprehensive education and equality of opportunity. From 1955 until 1963, James Annand, based from his home in Sussex, took the position. He was also Secretary of the NEF IHQ from 1951 until 1965, leading to charges from foreign new educationists that the two parts of the organisation were now indistinguishable.²⁷ Annand's desire was to attract more teachers into the organisation.²⁸ During his time as Secretary of the ENEF, Annand became concerned about the declining level of the membership and the fact that the membership had significantly reduced.²⁹ After 1963, the ENEF experienced a rapid succession of secretaries, which affected the organisation's ability to attract new members or to become actively involved in educational issues. James Henderson briefly became Secretary, assisted by Yvonne Moyse, who became Secretary of the IHQ of the NEF from 1963 to 1973. Henderson resigned his post claiming that he was unable to deal with the complexities of the problems facing the ENEF. In 1964, John Wallbridge became Secretary of the ENEF.³⁰ He resigned in 1965 and Moyse took over the position while also retaining her post as Secretary of the NEF IHQ.³¹

The main difficulty was that, with the loss of funding from UNESCO and declining membership, the secretaries found maintaining the work of the ENEF and the NEF as separate and independent organisations increasingly untenable. In 1965 the decision was made by both committees to combine the NEF and ENEF administration, thus joining the NEF and ENEF in all but name.³² The ENEF committee gained importance after 1960 with the closure of the NEF's IHQ in Park

²⁷ ENEF 16, 'Yvonne Moyse File', 1973. ENEF 18, Moyse to King, 2 June 1969.

²⁸ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum', J. Annand, 10 December 1963.

²⁹ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to Council on Future Policy and Organization', 10 December 1963, J. Annand.

³⁰ ENEF 15, File K, Y. Moyse to K. Kenworthy, 30 March 1976.

³¹ ENEF 13 File B, '1967 Council Members'.

³² ENEF 16, 'Yvonne Moyse File', 1973.

Crescent, London, which left the ENEF's offices in London as the only centre for the organisation in that city.³³

Although the ENEF was solvent, always successfully matching its income to its expenditure, and did not face the financial problems of the NEF IHQ, it had little money left to fund major educational schemes.³⁴ The main concern was that it was not fully self-sufficient and too reliant upon individual donations. The ENEF undertook projects delegated to it by various organisations that contributed subsidies for this work, for example, the UNESCO-inspired conference and project on 'Teachers and World Peace' in 1948 and 1949.³⁵ UNESCO forwarded a one-off donation in 1955 of £1500, in recognition of work undertaken by the organisation on its behalf. The Ministry of Education also awarded an annual grant to the ENEF in 1949 in recognition of various research projects undertaken.³⁶ However, the Ministry of Education was sceptical about Fred Clarke and Lionel Elvin's claims concerning the educational contribution and future financial viability of the organisation and only granted this with reluctance. Clarke had rashly promised UNESCO that he could raise the membership of the ENEF to 5000 within two years. This grant came to an end in 1954.³⁷ The most regular source of finances during the 1950s came from an organisation called Education Services of which David Jordan was a trustee.³⁸ These payments were made in return for the ENEF's help with Education Services' administration. The NEF IHQ itself also consulted the ENEF for advice on projects

³³ J. Annand, 'English Section', *New Era* 42 (February 1961), pp. 36–9.

³⁴ ENEF 8, 'Financial records of the ENEF for 1951 to 1954'. In 1951, its expenditure came to £910, with grants of £530; in 1953 its expenditure was £1469.15 with grants of £895, and in 1954 it reduced expenditure to £1406.70, again with grants of £895.

³⁵ WEF V/279, 'Memorandum on the New Education Fellowship, circa 1958, J. Annand.

³⁶ W. Rawson 'The NEF at Work in Some of its National Sections; English', *New Era* 33 (July–August 1952), p. 157.

³⁷ NA ED 121/429, 'Application for Grant 1949–1950', 'Grant 1950–1951'; NA ED 121/430, 'minutes of meetings between Ministry of Education officials and J. Annand, F. Clarke and W. Griffith', 30 September 1948.

³⁸ K. C. Vyas, 'Secretary's Report 1952', *New Era* 34 (February 1953), p. 36. In 1952, this organisation gave the ENEF the sum of £50, and then a further £75, for administrative purposes.

and ideas. The NEF considered that the ENEF was the one national section that it could rely upon the most. This was in part due to the stable finances of the ENEF, and also to the fact that much of the English membership came from the south of England, where most of the NEF's committee was also based. In 1957 the ENEF papers record that income was supplemented by the regular conferences that the ENEF held. Appeals to members also formed a small addition to other forms of income, with donations from this quarter contributing, for example, just over £69 in 1950 compared with a total expenditure of just over £1500 in the same year.³⁹

The committee included some but not many members who were in senior positions in the state school system. Raymond King was active in encouraging the ENEF to support comprehensive education from his position as secretary of the organisation from 1947 to 1955. He was also Chairman of the Kingston-upon-Thames Association for the Advancement of State Education (KAASE) and played an active part in its work.⁴⁰ He was also a member of the committee of the Campaign for Moral Education during the 1960s.⁴¹ The ENEF also had representatives on its committees from a wide variety of other organisations: the NUT, the Association of Assistant Masters and Mistresses, the London Teachers Association, the National Association of Cooperative Education Committees and the Carnegie Trust UK.⁴²

During this period an increasing number of staff at teacher training colleges joined the ENEF committee. These links provided the organisation with its best hope of being actively involved with educational reconstruction after 1945 and encouraged the ENEF to become directly involved with the issue of teacher training. These members included educationists such David Jordan (at the time Principal of the

³⁹ NA ED 121/429, 'Statement of Finances, 1950'.

⁴⁰ ENEF 18, KAASE to King, 9 February 1968, p. 2.

⁴¹ ENEF 18, Blackman to King, 19 February 1969.

⁴² ENEF 16, 'Affiliations of the ENEF', 1950.

Dudley Training College), Catherine Fletcher (Principal of the Bingley Training College) and Joan D. Browne (Principal of the Coventry Training College for Women). These figures brought with them direct knowledge of the demands and needs of teacher training and significantly influenced the direction of ENEF policy during the 1940s and 1950s through their involvement with the conferences and activities of the ENEF and also through their writings in the pages of the *New Era*.

The committees of the ENEF held a clear advantage in the range of professional experience available to them. Membership of the committees consisted, on the whole, of educationists with wide professional contacts and senior positions. These contacts allowed the ENEF to extend its network and reputation among educational institutions and other organisations. One less positive result of this, however, was that the committees appeared unable to understand or to gain the support of the wider membership. One method for regaining this appeal was through the ENEF's programme of annual conferences which allowed members of the ENEF to meet and to discuss contemporary educational issues. The conferences are explored in the next section.

The ENEF's conferences

The ENEF's conferences reveal the changes in the organisation's ideology as it asserted its independence from the NEF. They also demonstrate the increasing diversity of the NEF's membership as well as reflecting the increased general interest in educational reconstruction in England after 1945.

A number of factors allowed the ENEF's conference to gain support. The ENEF promoted conferences discussing contemporary concerns relating to education. As a result of this democracy and citizenship became prominent themes amongst the discussions of the ENEF and its membership at its conferences during the early

1940s.⁴³ These issues were ones that were seen as pertinent to the post-war situation, and the membership at the conference hoped their inclusion would gain the ENEF wider support among educationists.⁴⁴ The first major regional conference of the ENEF, held in 1943, focused on Democratic Reconstruction in Education. Many of the radical ideas of the post-war NEF found their origins in these regional ENEF conferences. It was as a result of pressure from the membership that the ENEF, along with the equally socially reformist PEA in the USA, had introduced the concept of democracy and citizenship to the NEF during the 1930s, at a time when the NEF itself had seemed to be pursuing a non-official policy of appeasement. In 1939, the ENEF had, along with the PEA, expressed its strong belief in democracy in the face of fascism and appeasement not only by politicians but also by educationists themselves across Europe.⁴⁵ The ENEF believed that the failure of the progressives in Germany and Europe lay in the fact that: 'They believed their whole duty lay within the school, and they refused to concern themselves with politics; we must be concerned with politics.'⁴⁶

The 1943 conference came to the consensus that the post-war education system would be improved by the creation of non-hierarchical schools run by a council of parents, students and teachers.⁴⁷ Active debate followed from the discussions of this conference and the others that followed within the pages of the *New Era*. One headteacher who had attended the conference explained to readers of the *ENEF Bulletin* that it was not necessarily headteachers who resisted such ideas, but often the staff, who 'shun the responsibility which democracy involves; others sense that the

⁴³ V. Ogilvie, 'Towards Education in a Planned Democracy', *New Era* 22 (1941), pp. 217–45.

⁴⁴ 'Controlling a Free People', *TES*, 9 September 1949, p. 620.

⁴⁵ PEA declaration, *New Era* 20 (January 1939) p. 27. The PEA declaration stated that 'we feel that it is incumbent upon us as elected representatives of democratic education to present a vigorous call for action on all possible fronts . . . to lead in opposing every sign and symptom of fascism'

⁴⁶ H. Clarke, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 9', *New Era* 24 (May 1943), pp. 76-77.

⁴⁷ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 17', *New Era* 25 (June 1944) pp. 104–106.

logical corollary is democracy in the classroom and are not prepared for this . . .'⁴⁸ As a result of this debate the ENEF sought to formulate clearer ideas about the sort of teachers that it wanted to enter the profession to implement these ideals: 'His training must be less subject-centred . . . teachers must be more socially minded if they are to render adequate professional service.' It was stressed that only a democratically organised staff could hope to infuse the school community with a 'democratic spirit'.⁴⁹ After this conference, one new educationist commented that:

. . . it is good to know that our ENEF is actively interesting itself and its members in the extension of the home into the school and of the school into the home . . . the great task in front of the community is to provide for the integration of the life of the child and of youth.⁵⁰

The conference theme was given the full support of the regional branches of the ENEF. The Leytonstone branch, in particular, spent a period of time discussing the issue of democracy and citizenship. Its members were concerned that education might be used as a method for social conditioning of children. They attempted a definition of democracy, as 'a form of government interpreting the will of the people as revealed by a free interchange of ideas'.⁵¹ In 1944, as a result of these discussions, Catherine Fletcher chaired a two-day conference on citizenship in education and the need to transmit democratic values at the University College of Aberystwyth.⁵² This revealed the ability of the regional membership to affect ENEF policy and activities during the 1940s. In line with the populist style of the conference, members in discussion groups debated the resolutions. Citizenship training, it was agreed, was an imperative in the new world order, and the curriculum needed to reflect this. Citizenship entitled

⁴⁸ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF News Items', *New Era* 25 (December 1944), p. 218.

⁴⁹ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 17', *New Era* 25 (June 1944), p. 104; D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 21', *New Era* 24 (December 1943), p. 195.

⁵⁰ R. Crowley, 'Building up a democracy from the foundations', *New Era* 24 (December 1943), p. 217.

⁵¹ H. Clarke, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 10', *New Era* 24 (June 1943), p. 104.

⁵² D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 17', *New Era* 25 (June 1944) pp. 104–106.

students to be taught how to question inequality and social injustice, as well as being educated in their responsibilities to others in the communities in which they lived.⁵³ Civics lessons were not considered effective, however. Such values could only be adopted through observing others living their lives according to such precepts.⁵⁴ If the students observed that the whole school or college was operated on such lines, with mutual respect, tolerance and pupils being encouraged to take part in social activities with staff and fellow students, then such values would develop naturally.⁵⁵

Another reason for the success of these conferences lay in the fact that they debated issues of immediate importance in education and involved well-known educationists. In August 1943, a conference was also held at Bangor based upon discussion of post-war reforms in the context of the McNair report and its recommendations. The chair of this conference was Catherine Fletcher and included David Jordan. Issues discussed ranged from the payment and pensions of teachers to the problem of female staff having to leave the school system after marriage. Catherine Fletcher used her opening speech to recommend strongly the McNair report as an important step in creating a more democratic education system in England and Wales.⁵⁶ Historically, the international conferences of the NEF itself were rarely restricted to specific discussion topics. Ensor had always intended that the main purpose of NEF conferences were that they should be forums of social contact between educationists. In direct contrast, the ENEF conferences were concerned with the day-to-day practicalities of teaching and administering schools. This was particularly the case under the direction of Catherine Fletcher, who had strong links

⁵³ Ibid., p. 105.

⁵⁴ A. H. T. Glover, *New Teaching for a New Age* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1946), p. 1.

⁵⁵ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 17', *New Era* 25 (June 1944), p. 106.

⁵⁶ D. Jordan, 'Bulletin No. 20', *New Era* 25 (September–October 1944), p. 173.

with the NUT.⁵⁷ As a result of this focus of the conferences upon contemporary educational and social themes, they proved successful and were able to attract educationists and others, who may not otherwise have been interested in the ideals of the ENEF itself. The conferences were well attended throughout the 1940s and early 1950s, attracting in some cases over a hundred people. This attendance showed that there was a strong interest in educational issues at a grassroots level from those who were not necessarily decision makers in education or who did not otherwise work in education and that small-scale organisations, such as the NEF, could tap into this if they sought to.⁵⁸

The regular regional ENEF conferences continued into the 1950s. They remained the main forum of formal and informal discussion for the membership. Themes ranged from 'Aims and Prejudices in Education' and 'Moral Values and Social Progress', in 1952, to 'General Mathematics in Schools' – which included discussions by teachers about the place of the subject in the curriculum – and a conference about school inspections held in 1955, chaired by Ben Morris, which attracted the attendance of a number of school inspectors.⁵⁹ The regional settings of these conferences were equally diverse, held at many different venues – schools, hired halls, but mainly university or teacher training college facilities. Conference locations were also varied, including Bath, Cambridge, Coventry, Exeter and Ipswich. Some of the conferences were arranged with other groups such as the National Froebel Association and UNESCO, showing that the ENEF was still forging links at this high level. The 1957 conference was arranged, for example, in cooperation with the

⁵⁷ D. Crook, 'The Reconstruction of Teacher Education and Training 1941–1954, with Particular Reference to the McNair Committee' (PhD thesis, University of Wales, Swansea, 1997), pp. 152–6. UWMRC, MSS.179/EDU/3/11/2088NUT Interim Committee File: Folder 1, 'Recruitment, Training and Supply of Teachers 1948', 'General Secretary's Report', 19th July 1947.

⁵⁸ 'ENEF Secretary's Report', *New Era* 34 (February 1953), pp 36.

⁵⁹ J. B. Annand, 'English Section Annual Report 1955', *New Era* 37 (February 1956), p. 69.

Society for Education Through Art. These joint activities widened participation. There was often international representation. In 1952, it was reported that NEF representatives had come from Australia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, New Zealand and Norway to attend the summer conference.⁶⁰

The success of the ENEF's conferences can be seen from the fact that there were, on occasions, multiple conferences in one year, some of these in the form of rallies for parents, teachers and other educationists. It was reported that 400 people attended one such rally, which took place in Exeter in June 1953, attracted in particular by the various arts and crafts activities that were offered.⁶¹ This success was replicated the following year in Ipswich.⁶² Some of these conferences ran for lengthy periods of time, occasionally up to six or eight days. The success of these conferences amongst teachers lay in the fact that they were based upon discussions of themes of importance to them, for example, on the issues of training teachers and employment terms, and that they were organised and attended by ENEF members who also had links with teacher training institutions or other organisations.⁶³ These included ENEF members such as Catherine Fletcher, James Hemming, James Henderson, David Jordan and Joseph Lauwerys. Through these connections many of these conferences gained a wider publicity than they may otherwise have achieved and allowed the ENEF to promote itself more successfully.

The conferences revealed the extensive network of educationists and educational skills available to the English new educationists. Administrators and those working in local education authorities in a variety of posts were well represented as

⁶⁰ J. B. Annand, 'English Section Conference', *New Era* 33 (September–October 1952), pp. 208–10.

⁶¹ J. B. Annand, 'English Section Annual Report 1954', *New Era* 36 (March 1955), p. 58.

⁶² J. B. Annand, 'English Section Annual Report 1955', *New Era* 37 (February 1956), p. 69.

⁶³ J. B. Annand, 'English Section News and Notes', *New Era* 39 (March 1958), p. 73.

active members.⁶⁴ Schools, especially state schools, were also well represented at these conferences, through the attendance of both teachers and headteachers. This showed that the approach adopted by the ENEF was more successful in attracting state schoolteachers than that of the NEF which had difficulty doing so. This showed that many of these teachers were now finding the ideas of the ENEF increasingly attractive.⁶⁵ At the 1962 conference, a large range of special interest groups were present, including the British Committee of the Association for Early Childhood Education, the Commonwealth Teacher Group, the Council for Visual Education and the National Book League.⁶⁶ Although few of these groups represented any major organisations or bodies, they did demonstrate an extensive grassroots movement of reformist social and educational pressure groups. These groups were closely allied with each other, sharing membership and committees. Through these links, there existed a potentially significant network of ideas and individuals that could benefit the ENEF. Most of the groups were limited in numbers but together they represented a formidable alliance of skills and interests, particularly when allied to the extensive network of ENEF groups in a wide variety of cities with memberships ranging from four to one hundred-plus. It is possible to see how the ENEF had the potential through these contacts to involve itself with regional educational and social policy.

The ENEF was part of a social revolution in pressure and special interest groups that came into existence in Britain after the 1940s. It also gained importance thanks to the creation of the emergency teacher training colleges during the 1940s and the involvement of its members and committee with these.⁶⁷ It has been suggested that one of the reasons for the decline of the movement in New Zealand was due to

⁶⁴ J. B. Annand, 'English Section News', *New Era* 42 (February 1961) p. 37.

⁶⁵ ENEF 13, J. Burd to R. King, 6 February 1973.

⁶⁶ J. B. Annand, 'English Section News', *New Era* 43 (February 1962), pp. 42–4.

⁶⁷ UWMRC, MSS.170/EDU/3/11/2025C/4, File: Second Conference Education Committee, 'Report of Conference of Representatives of Emergency Training Colleges held on 27th April 1946'.

competition from a variety of other single interest groups.⁶⁸ In England, the relationship between the ENEF and other educational and social groups was more complex. The ENEF failed to take advantage of the broad range of skills and interests available to it, and by the 1960s had not succeeded in living up to the expectation of its early membership and statements, for example due to its failure to become involved with the debate about comprehensive education.⁶⁹ The main problem facing the ENEF lay in the fact that many of its members and those who were involved with its conferences had other forums available to them where they could focus upon specific educational issues. The universities and colleges from which the ENEF drew its membership were, in reality, also its competitors. They did provide a method through which new educational ideas could be dispersed into mainstream educational thought but, equally, it was through these institutions that many ENEF members chose to work when seeking to advance their ideas, rather than through the ENEF itself. The ENEF also faced competition from other single-interest groups, for example, the Campaign for the Advancement of State Education and the Comprehensive Schools' Committee, which were active during the 1960s. The next section explores another important aspect of the ENEF's network, its regional membership, and considers whether, through this, the ENEF had the capacity to promote itself and its ideas to a wider audience than had been achieved through its conferences.

The ENEF's regional membership and network

There were two other ways that the ENEF gained success in developing its network. First, during the 1940s, the ENEF became the focus for a variety of regional

⁶⁸ Abiss (1998), p. 90.

⁶⁹ 'London Comprehensives' *TES*, 15 February 1957 p. 203.

movements and groups with ambitions for social reform.⁷⁰ Links were forged with various trade unions, for example, the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives, which had branches in a wide variety of areas, the NUT, the Trades Union Congress, and educational organisations such as the Workers' Educational Association (WEA). These organisations possessed a regional influence that the ENEF was not successful in achieving.⁷¹ Many of these links were a direct result of the membership that was attracted to the ENEF's regional branches and discussion groups.⁷² This developing network presented the organisation with the potential to involve itself with education at a regional level.⁷³

Secondly, the ENEF was able to establish a relatively healthy network of regional groups. The first ENEF regional groups began to form during the 1940s, inspired and recruited by local members. These groups represented a wide range of educational interests. The aims and discussions of the groups revealed a genuinely practical focus upon educational issues. The local branches possessed a high level of knowledge and awareness of contemporary issues. The May 1943 bulletin recorded that the most active branches existed in Golders Green, London, Nottingham and York.⁷⁴ By June 1943, a new branch had been formed in Derby, the membership of which, according to its report to the ENEF committee, represented all aspects of education in its expertise: secondary, elementary, youth, adult, parent, social welfare, medicine and industry.⁷⁵

The membership of these groups revealed strong local links with education. The branch in Exeter, Devon, noted a wide range of members. The chairman, a Mr Philip,

⁷⁰ H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 6', *New Era* 24 (January 1943), pp. 6–7.

⁷¹ C. Griggs, *The TUC and Education Reform 1926–1970* (London: Woburn Press, 2002), pp. 159–94.

⁷² H. G. Stead, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 7', *New Era* 24 (February 1943), p. 25.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ H. Clarke, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 9', *New Era* 24 (May 1943), pp. 76–77.

⁷⁵ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 17', *New Era* 25 (June 1944), pp. 104–106.

was from the Devon Education Committee, while a large portion of the membership came from the Exeter Education Committee. There were also representatives from the WEA and the Devon Health Services. Most of the members of these groups were educational professionals, often those working on local education committees and organisations and who sought a forum for discussion of those issues raised by their work. These branches were, however, often limited in numbers; the Exeter branch was started with only 20 members, and the fact that the Nottingham branch had exceeded 100 members was cause for note by the committee.⁷⁶ The numbers represented a core of very active educationists. Through these groups, the ENEF had the ability to involve itself in local issues in a way that the national committee could not otherwise achieve.

Administrators in local education departments, lecturers and teacher trainers at universities and colleges, headteachers at various schools, psychologists, youth workers and professionals of every kind were encouraged to become members of the ENEF's regional groups. The committee agreed that it was through these groups that ENEF ideas would be most effectively heard in areas outside London and the south-east of England. The *New Era* – as well as the ENEF committee meetings and various local groups and conferences – was used both to exhort members consciously to influence educational processes where possible and to raise awareness of new educational ideas within the confines of their own professions.⁷⁷

The ENEF was only one of a number of organisations attempting to be a part of educational decisions making at this time. The ENEF enjoyed a number of clear advantages, however, such as its links with educational administrators, universities and a whole army of dedicated individuals who were active in putting forward its

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 18', *New Era* 25 (July 1944), pp. 141–3.

aims. A list of ENEF branches by 1948 included 19 active groups.⁷⁸ These groups gave the ENEF a voice in many places outside the small network of London universities and training colleges from which its more prominent membership came. Due to the decline in the international new educational network after 1940, the ENEF inherited many of those links and membership that had previously owed their loyalty to the NEF IHQ.⁷⁹ It was also significant that of these branches, 17 of the secretaries were female, thus showing the continued appeal of the ENEF to women involved with education.⁸⁰ The policy of actively encouraging these semi-autonomous groups produced a rise in the grassroots membership of both men and women. It was reported in 1948 that a survey of ENEF membership showed that, as a result of this expansion into the regions, teachers now made up 40 per cent of the organisation.⁸¹ The ENEF benefited, therefore, from an increased interest in education and society in England and a disinterest in the internationalism preached by the NEF. By 1950, the number of these regional branches had peaked, with 20 groups across England.⁸² There were setbacks, however. It was reported that, after the expansion of the 1940s, a number of the more recent branches had ceased to exist.⁸³ This was part of a general trend of declining local involvement with such organisations and was in line with the decline

⁷⁸ H. Clarke, 'ENEF Bulletin No. 14', *New Era* 25 (January 1944), pp. 10–11. These included Barnet, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Derby, Enfield, Exeter, Golders Green, Harrogate, Kent, Liskeard, Luton, Manchester, Norwich, Reading, Sheffield, Wembley and York.

⁷⁹ They included the Association of Masters and Mistresses, the Association of Headmistresses, The London Teachers' Association, The National Association of Cooperative Education Committees and an offer from the Carnegie Foundation (UK) to fund the activities of the ENEF, which was enthusiastically accepted.

⁸⁰ NA ED 121/429, 'List of Branches and Secretaries in England', 1948.

⁸¹ ENEF 16, 'Membership Census for 1948', The membership also included 7% independent schoolteachers, 15% university teachers, 5% from teacher training colleges, 4% from technical colleges, 3% in education services, 3% educational administrators and 3% in industry.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ For example, in 1952 while the Cambridge, Derby, Leicester and London branches were still the most active, those in St Albans and Torquay had closed due to lack of interest.

of the enthusiasm for education and social reconstruction that had characterised the 1940s.⁸⁴

In 1955, James Annand became secretary of the ENEF and stressed his enthusiasm for continuing to expand the network and making the ENEF a truly regional movement.⁸⁵ This ambition was shared by David Jordan, who had started a group at Dudley Training College in 1954. Annand believed that the main problem in the high percentage of groups that failed lay in the fact that their memberships were too loose and lacked organisation. David Jordan believed that, in order to overcome this problem, new discussion groups should be encouraged, of which ENEF membership was a prerequisite. He argued that such groups should be set up at educational institutions and invitations sent out to significant local figures to gain their involvement.⁸⁶ He believed that a greater effort should be made to encourage groups to form outside the south-east of England. This proactive approach was initially successful. Jordan reported that in 1954, his group in Dudley had invited 65 people to attend, of whom 55 had agreed to come and meetings had averaged around 40 of these at any one time. Membership of the group included representatives from the NUT, the Local Education Authority, the Ministry of Education and various training colleges.

As a result of this new approach, by the 1950s, eight new branches had been established. However, the attempts to form groups in other English regions were not ultimately successful. Four of the new branches were based in London and two more in the south-east of England. The activity at the Dudley branch precluded any claim that the ENEF was purely a group from the south of England, but this group was the

⁸⁴ M. Barber *The Making of the 1944 Education Act* (London: Cassell, 1994).

⁸⁵ J. B. Annand 'English Section; Annual Report 1954', *New Era* 34 (March 1955), p. 58-59

⁸⁶ D. Jordan, 'English Section Report', *New Era* 35 (November 1954), p. 193.

exception and it was clear that the ENEF's membership was still mainly confined to educationists in south-east England and London. However, these groups had been unable to replicate the extensive membership that the Nottingham group had possessed in the mid 1940s.⁸⁷ The maximum reported average membership, with the exception of the Dudley branch, was 38 members recorded by the South London group. The rest numbered between seven and ten, and at most 15. Membership details of all the groups revealed that they included a wide range of those involved in education, although there was a heavy bias in favour of schoolteachers and training college lecturers.⁸⁸ The active South London branch had a high percentage of invited participants, in line with Annand and Jordan's aims for the groups. These included members of the local Chamber of Commerce, the Chairman of the London County Council, various local industrialists and a high percentage of lecturers at training colleges. The success of this last group supported the assumptions of those who felt that in order to include a more diverse range of people and to bring the work of the ENEF and the NEF to a wider audience, the organisation had to publicise itself more overtly.

By the 1960s, the initial enthusiasm for these branches had faded away once again. This time, the structure of local groups seemed to collapse in its entirety. The main flaw with these groups was that they did not attract more than a handful of those representing the lower levels of education. The ENEF found difficulty balancing the enthusiasm of its grassroots membership with those who represented education at a

⁸⁷ Only two of the groups met other than in private homes. The South London group met in an unnamed grammar school, soon to be a comprehensive, while the Hertfordshire group met in an independent school where the headmistress was also a member of the group.

⁸⁸ 'ENEF Report', *New Era* 37 (February 1956), p. 68. In this report the London group claimed four secondary modern schoolteachers, a comprehensive schoolteacher and two postgraduate research workers among its numbers. This group also possessed the youngest membership. The Yorkshire group had three training college lecturers, four school welfare officers, a primary headmistress and a university lecturer. The group in the Midlands recorded the highest number of lecturers and training college teachers. The Hertfordshire group contained the most non-educational professionals, including the rector of the local church, a doctor, a dentist, a nurse and a publisher.

higher level. Most seriously, however, the ENEF failed to take advantage of the skills that these groups offered. It did not appear to provide a national context in which debates could gain a wider meaning and seemed unable to promote more widely the ideas that members brought to the regional meetings. It also failed in its quest to extend the organisation beyond its stronghold of universities and teacher training colleges or to expand into regions outside the south-east of England. The ENEF moved constantly from one educational and social issue to another but did not seek to formulate any original responses to them. It considered that its role as a place for various educationists to network and to share ideas was sufficient. The difficulty which it found in retaining the memberships of regional groups clearly revealed a continued grassroots disaffection with this ideal.

The *New Era* and publications by English new educationists

English new educationists believed that their educational ideas would dominate the international movement. Fred Clarke commented that:

there is in many countries, an increasing disposition to look to England for guidance in understanding the role of education in terms of sweeping intellectual and social transition . . . so far as Europe is concerned there are good reasons for thinking that in such circumstances England . . . would be taken as the model.⁸⁹

This was a claim that would be strongly rejected by European educationists after 1945 and suggested that English new educationists did labour under the false belief that England could lead Europe towards educational and social reconstruction. It was believed by the ENEF committee that the *New Era* would provide a focus for their attempts to gain membership and promote their ideas both nationally and internationally. After 1947, the ENEF funded the journal entirely, taking it over from

⁸⁹ DC/MOO, File 1, 'Note', Fred Clarke, 21 August 1939.

the NEF IHQ, showing the increasing domination of the journal by English new educationists and signalling the start of the gradual process of the assimilation of the NEF by the ENEF.⁹⁰ The main reason for this interest in the *New Era* from the English new educationists was that the readership was not confined to members of the NEF. It was also circulated among the libraries of a variety of educational institutions, and through this had the potential to promote the ideas of English new educationists to both students of education, trainee teachers and academics alike.

Unfortunately, the *New Era* failed to fulfil this potential and, by the later 1940s, instead of becoming the international journal that the NEF had hoped, it was still very much restricted to an English readership.⁹¹ Neither did the journal become the international showcase of English new educational ideas that the ENEF had hoped. The domination of the *New Era* by English new educationists and their ideals was not well received by the international, particularly the European, membership.⁹² The main problem was that, in the same way that the IHQ of the NEF was considered by the European new educationists to be dominated by the English organisation, it was claimed that the *New Era* was too much of an English magazine. The European representatives claimed that the magazine did not represent any aspect of their work and that any attempt to use it to promote a single English-based vision of educational and social reconstruction could never take into account the widely varying national and regional circumstances. It was also clear that, as the journal became more heavily dominated by English authors, this increasingly caused a decline in its circulation. The fact that the NEF IHQ and ENEF believed that one single journal written in

⁹⁰ NA ED 121/429, 'ENEF Accounts', 30 September 1947.

⁹¹ In 1950, there were no non-English contributors; in 1951, 14 out of 21 were English; 1952 had no non-English authors; in 1953, 35 from 43 articles were English; 1954, 18 out of 25; 1955, 29 out of 35; 1956, 18 out of 29; 1957, 17 out of 21; 1958, 24 out of 33 and in 1959, 29 out of 47 were English authors.

⁹² WEF III/209, 'Copenhagen Conference of Representatives', 30 July 1953, p. 2.

English could unite the movement also showed that they were out of touch with the opinions of the international membership. At the 1953 Copenhagen Conference, NEF representatives forwarded a variety of complaints about the journal.

We have the impression in Belgium that the New Era [sic] is not an international magazine of the NEF. We have great difficulty in distributing it among our members because many of them do not want a magazine written in English.⁹³

The same opinion was expressed by the German representatives: 'They always say that the New Era [sic] is not an international magazine but an English one.'⁹⁴ And the neighbouring Swiss: 'Same thing is true in the Swiss section . . . the difficulty is not really a linguistic one but of having contents such as would appeal to members.'⁹⁵

Peggy Volkov, the editor, countered these criticisms strongly, stating that 'As regards contents and its Englishness – a huge percentage of them come from England – they are not English except for their authors.'⁹⁶ She did admit that: 'There are not much more than 2,000 subscribers – 800 of these are members of the English section 600 are not members.' Of these 600 non-members, most of these were English subscribers.⁹⁷ Volkov's defence seemed weak. There was truth in the claim that the ENEF and the NEF made little effort to understand educational ideas and practices in Europe. Belated attempts were made to address the problem of the journal's English bias: 'The new editors are trying to reinforce the policy of not allowing the English scene to dominate a journal whose circulation abroad they hope to promote . . .'⁹⁸ Raymond King wrote that, 'we want to get away from the idea that the NEF is run

⁹³ WEF III/209, 'Copenhagen Conference, Biscompte Report', 28 July 1953, p. 11.

⁹⁴ WEF III/209, 'Copenhagen Conference, Karlsson Report', 28 July 1953, p. 11.

⁹⁵ WEF III/209, 'Copenhagen Conference, Fischer Report', 28 July 1953, p. 11.

⁹⁶ WEF III/209, 'Copenhagen Conference Report', 30 July 1953, p. 2.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ ENEF 13, Adams to Browne, February 1972.

solely from London and that only London people have a say . . .'.⁹⁹ This problem also struck at the heart of the ENEF's hopes of making its ideas heard concerning European educational policy. It was not the case that they could merely disseminate English ideas to a grateful Europe. Europeans sought to develop their own ideas, suited to their own needs. They might welcome support and advice, but on an equal basis, not with the ENEF as the dominant partner. These complaints clearly ran counter to Fred Clarke's earlier belief that the Europeans would eagerly accept English help and ideas in the reconstruction of their education systems.¹⁰⁰

While the *New Era* may have alienated its European readership, the journal played an important part in promoting the ideas of female educationists during the late 1940s. Female authors, most of whom were English, wrote a significant percentage of the articles in the *New Era* during these years. It is clear that the journal was a method through which female English educationists and other professionals were able to disseminate ideas of importance to them to a wider audience.¹⁰¹ Most of the female contributors were recorded as being teachers or headteachers of various schools. Most of them represented state schools, although there were others from a variety of other professions with links to education, including psychologists, social workers, or various other child-care professions. Very few of these women were involved with independent schools and only a small selection worked in higher education.

One other feature of contributions to the journal was that a large percentage of the authors were representative of non-teaching or non-higher education professions. The low numbers of staff at universities, teacher training colleges and other higher

⁹⁹ ENEF 12, King to Duttson, undated.

¹⁰⁰ DC/MOO, File 1, 'Memorandum', Fred Clarke, 21 August 1939.

¹⁰¹ In 1950, 17 authors were English female contributors; in 1951, there were seven; in 1952, there were eight; in 1953, 13; in 1954, ten; in 1955, 14; in 1956, six; in 1957, nine; in 1958, 11; and in 1959, 14.

educational institutions having articles published in the journal in comparison to other categories can be explained in part by the fact that there would be other avenues available for them to promote their ideas. Clearly, the journal was not viewed as a device for the publication of leading academic ideas, but more often as a way for a few academics, faithful to the new educational ideal, to discuss ideas that were not acceptable in other journals or publications. The same people produced regular contributions and were representative of a small, albeit prominent, body of new educational devotees at higher education institutions. These authors were also already members of the NEF or ENEF,¹⁰² and represented the academic core of the English new educational network.¹⁰³ The journal increasingly became, after 1945, the voice for this existing academic network and was less successful in finding new authors and readers.

As the 1950s progressed, the journal faced increasing financial problems, showing that although, according to Clare Soper, the NEF Secretary, it was 'editorially successful', fewer people were actually subscribing to it.¹⁰⁴ By the start of the 1960s, this issue had become serious. The NEF continually needed to increase its subsidies to the loss-making journal at a time when it sorely needed the finances for its own survival. Peggy Volkov resigned and the NEF IHQ handed the journal over to

¹⁰² For example, Miss M. Brearley in the Department of Education, University of Birmingham; Adam Curle, Professor of Education and Psychology at the University College of the South West in Exeter; C. T. Daltry; E. L. Herbert, Department of Education, University of Manchester; Marjorie Hourd, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Education, University of Leeds; A. K. C. Ottoway, Lecturer in Education at Leeds University; J. Elizabeth Richardson, lecturer in Education at Sheffield University; and Mary Swainson, Lecturer in Education at University College, Leicester.

¹⁰³ A. Curle, p. 6; A. K. C. Ottoway, p. 6, and E. Richardson, p. 1, *New Era* 34 (January 1953); C. G. Daltry, p. 67, *New Era* 34 (April 1953); M. Brearley, p. 149, *New Era* 34 (September–October 1953); M. Swainson, p. 169, *New Era* 34 (November 1953); D. Jordan, p. 36, *New Era* 38 (April 1957) and p. 146, *New Era* 31 (July–August 1950); M. Hourd, p. 82, *New Era* 32 (April 1951) and p. 8, *New Era* 33 (December 1952); E. L. Herbert, p. 81, *New Era* 32 (April 1951) and p. 103, *New Era* 36 (June 1955); G. P. Meredith, p. 78, *New Era* 32 (April 1951); J. Henderson, p. 18, *New Era* 37 (January 1956); J. Lauwerys, p. 45, *New Era* 37 (April 1956).

¹⁰⁴ WEF III/226, 'The Reorganisation of the *New Era*', Chichester Conference 1966.

the ENEF in 1966.¹⁰⁵ Annand became editor and published the journal from his home in Tunbridge Wells.¹⁰⁶ The print run was reduced from 2,100 to 1,700 to reflect the declining sales. James Wallbridge, secretary of the ENEF, noted that ‘The *New Era* urgently needs to increase its circulation merely to survive.’¹⁰⁷ By the mid-1950s the ENEF was subsidising the journal to the extent of £199 per year.¹⁰⁸ In the short-term, this saved the journal from imminent bankruptcy.¹⁰⁹ The long-term consequences were to confirm further the control of the ENEF over the *New Era* and the failure of the journal as a disseminator of new educational thought.¹¹⁰ In part, the problems of the journal were not of its making. By the 1960s, there existed a wide range of educational journals and organisations. Although English authors writing in the journal were at times at the forefront of contemporary educational movements, little was done to ensure that these ideas were developed or maintained. Ultimately, the domination of the journal by the English new educationists caused it to become a journal for the ENEF, rather than a journal for the international new educational movement.¹¹¹

The ENEF, through its membership, was linked to a wide variety of educationists, most of whom regularly published books and articles in academic journals. However, a survey of the works of some of those most prominent in the organisation reveals that in very few cases did the ENEF gain any mention. An examination of the writings of the three Presidents of the ENEF, Clarke, Jeffery and Elvin, reveal no mention of the organisation or its activities. It is significant that they

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. On the promise of £400 debts were run up in an attempt to revamp the journal. However, this funding did not materialise and the journal was left even further indebted.

¹⁰⁶ ENEF 6, ‘Future of ENEF’, Wallbridge to Members of ENEF Council, undated, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ ENEF 16, ‘Statement of Accounts’, circa 1966.

¹⁰⁹ WEF III/226, ‘The Reorganisation of the *New Era*’, Chichester Conference 1966.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ ENEF 15, Letter to Dr McKenna, 18 April 1981.

did not consider it an important enough part of their work or source of ideas. Fred Clarke wrote widely. In *Education and Social Change – An English Interpretation* (1940), he argued for the use of education to create social reform. These ideas were expressed for the NEF in his article ‘Planned Freedom’ in the *New Era* in 1940, in which he stated their relevance to the new education.¹¹² He followed this with a variety of works and articles upon similar themes but did not credit his involvement with the ENEF as significant in any way to his career.¹¹³ G. B. Jeffery wrote, among other things, books on examinations in secondary schools and a comparison of Cambridge and London Universities, but he, too, did not mention his work with the ENEF.¹¹⁴ Lionel Elvin expressed his views on education in a variety of publications¹¹⁵ but Elvin did not, however, mention the ENEF in any of these, nor in his autobiographical *Encounters with Education* (1987), although he did discuss his involvement with UNESCO.¹¹⁶ This confirms the theory that for these individuals and other educationists who were involved with the organisation the ENEF was not an important part of their careers but a relatively unimportant enterprise to which they gave their support when they were able.

There were also a number of other members who wrote works on education. Joseph Lauwerys wrote widely but did not mention the ENEF or his work within it.¹¹⁷ Wyatt Rawson and James Boyd were among the very few members to write about the

¹¹² F. Clarke, ‘Planned Freedom’, *New Era* 21 (November 1940), p. 221–2.

¹¹³ F. Clarke, *Freedom in the Educative Society* (London: University of London Press, 1948), p. 20. In this work he argued for a decentralised education system based upon ideas of equality and democracy.

¹¹⁴ G. B. Jeffery, *External Examinations in Secondary Schools: Their Place and Function* (London: Harrap, 1958) and *The Unity of Knowledge: Some Reflections on the Universities of Cambridge and London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950).

¹¹⁵ Elvin (1968), p. 6; L. Elvin, *White Paper or Black Reaction* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1973), p. 15; L. Elvin, *The Place of Common Sense in Educational Thought* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977), p. 68.

¹¹⁶ L. Elvin (1987), p. 104.

¹¹⁷ J. Lauwerys, ‘Method and Comparative Education’, *New Era* 25 (June 1944), pp. 164–7 and ‘Adult education’, *New Era* 23 (November 1942), pp. 164–5. Also see J. Lauwerys, ‘Chairman’s summing up’, *New Era* 43 (January–December 1962), pp. 136–8.

organisation, in this case the NEF, in *The Story of the New Education* (1965).¹¹⁸ J. W. (Billy) Tibble wrote about the study of education in a variety of publications. However, his only mention of the new education occurred in his book about fellow NEF member W. B. Curry.¹¹⁹ His writings were mainly concerned with the history and reform of teacher education.¹²⁰ Peggy Volkov, an active member of the ENEF, focused in her work purely upon the education of young children, but did not credit the ENEF with having been a source for any of these ideas.¹²¹ The other important regular publication that was edited by and contained articles from ENEF members was the annual *Yearbook of Education*, produced by the University of London Institute of Education. This was edited at various times by Clarke, Jeffery and Lauwerys. However, while the *Yearbooks* clearly show the strong parallel between ENEF ideas and those being written about in the articles, there was no mention of the ENEF or the NEF.¹²²

The conclusion drawn from this survey of the literature produced by English new educationists is that the ENEF and its work gained very little coverage in print outside the pages of the *New Era*. In fact, while certain new educational ideas were reflected in more mainstream educational publications, there is no evidence that this resulted in the ENEF gaining any greater recognition for its work.¹²³ Two conclusions can be drawn from this. The first is that the ENEF and its membership clearly had a

¹¹⁸ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 185. W. Rawson (ed.), *Learning to Live Together: Report of the Dutch Regional Conference of the New Education Fellowship* (London: New Education Fellowship, 1936).

¹¹⁹ J. W. Tibble, *W.B. Curry* (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1968).

¹²⁰ J. W. Tibble, *The Future of Teacher Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 100.

¹²¹ P. Volkov, *Children's Communities* (London: New Education Fellowship, 1941); P. Volkov, 'Progressive England', *Progressive Education* 24(1) (1946), pp. 34–5.

¹²² G. B. Jeffery and F. Clarke (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1949* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1949). G. B. Jeffery and J. A. Lauwerys (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1950* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1950); J. A. Lauwerys and N. Hans (eds.), *The Yearbook of Education 1951* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 1951).

¹²³ The only ones that gained any publicity within the pages of the *New Era* were *Advances in Understanding the Child, Towards Understanding Ourselves* and *Personal Development in the Primary School and its Importance for the Secondary Stage*.

lot of faith in the ability of the *New Era* alone to promote their ideas. The *New Era* was intended, after all, to be the voice of the new education. However, this situation meant that when the journal faced a declining readership and a lack of funds, it began to lose the recognition it had possessed prior to 1945 as a source for educational ideas among non-new educationists. This allowed the ENEF's ideas to lose prominence; a situation that went almost unnoticed by much of the organisation. The second conclusion is that, in fact, the ENEF did not originate the ideas that were discussed in the pages of *New Era*, but that its conferences and regional groups were forums for the discussion and development of ideas that were brought to it by those members who had links with other organisations. The next section examines the parallel administrative difficulties faced by the ENEF during this period which added to its problems.

Administration and membership 1960–1966

By the early 1960s, the ENEF was once more struggling to make an impact. It did not face the threat of closure that haunted the NEF, but it had become entrenched with a reliable, but non-renewing, membership.¹²⁴ The secretary, James Annand, complained that membership 'is now about 430 and has varied little during the past three years, when new enrolments have about kept pace with withdrawals. It has been suggested that we deliberately remain a small body, or even perhaps [stress] our aims and intents more sharply.'¹²⁵ The ENEF committee was concerned that in contrast to the vibrancy of the 1940s, the organisation was becoming narrow and unrepresentative of current educational concerns. Annand revealed that the main problem the ENEF faced was weak organisation. He stated that 'cohesion, rather tenuous at times, has been

¹²⁴ ENEF 7, Letter to King, 7 February 1967.

¹²⁵ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum', J. Annand, 10 December 1963.

maintained through the ENEF cttee [committee], which for the past year has had as its sole employee the present secretary' (in other words Annand himself).¹²⁶

Wallbridge, the next Secretary, was particularly concerned that the educational climate was changing and that increased hostility to progressive ideas within teacher training colleges and universities was the source of the ENEF's problems. He decided to undertake a full-scale examination of the ENEF during the 1960s and in consultation with the membership, produced his opinion on the state of the new education in England. He considered that, once again, the new education was on the defensive against those who would see progressive ideas purged from the education system.¹²⁷

This perception that the ENEF and its ideals faced a very real threat grew during the 1960s. Montessori herself wrote to the ENEF in 1964 expressing fear that progressivism was being undermined and that organisations such as the ENEF were unable to stop this erosion of values.¹²⁸ Wallbridge believed that the main threat came from vocational and other forms of educational-based training, which undermined the whole new educational concept of education as training for the whole personality. He considered that the ENEF was losing its missionary zeal and becoming too complacent, satisfied that it was enough that some of its ideals had been adopted by society. This complacency, he believed, was exacerbated by the ENEF's close links to various educational institutions and in particular, its links with the University of London Institute of Education.¹²⁹ He complained that these academic institutions were

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to ENEF Council Members', John Wallbridge, circa 1964.

¹²⁸ ENEF 6, Montessori to ENEF Committee, undated. Later partly republished in *New Era* 45 (May 1964), p. 131.

¹²⁹ ENEF 6, 'Note to Committee', J. Wallbridge, 1965.

allowing themselves to be undermined by an inability to see that educational ideals were being challenged.

By the 1960s, in fact, there was truth in such a claim. The exceptionally close links with the University of London Institute of Education stifled non-academic involvement with the new education. The ENEF did not seem to be using the potential of the rest of its membership. Although the Institute of Education provided the ENEF with an importance that it might otherwise not have achieved, this came at the expense of becoming a resting place for Institute staff in between other engagements. The problem of such an academic domination of the ENEF increased during the 1960s and was not successfully resolved.¹³⁰ Wallbridge was concerned that the earlier success in recruiting administrators and other educational professionals had not been continued. In 1965, he wrote to the committee that the main focus of the ENEF's Chichester conference should be to reverse the loss of membership, particularly among younger teachers.¹³¹

This dissatisfaction about the direction of the ENEF and its apparent loss of radical idealism was reflected by a variety of correspondence that the committee received from members. The *New Era* was accused of being 'unreadable' and 'conformist', no longer challenging any aspects of modern education but too satisfied with the *status quo*.¹³² Another correspondent complained that the ENEF no longer had any pioneering ideals, that it was too timid and too small to make any difference to national educational policy.¹³³ Raymond King expressed concern to Wallbridge that the perception of the ENEF by those who came into contact with it was that it was a

¹³⁰ ENEF 16, 'Chairman's Letter', 1973.

¹³¹ ENEF 6, 'Note to Committee', J. Wallbridge, 1965.

¹³² M. Shaver, 'Letter', *New Era* 45 (May 1964), p. 158.

¹³³ B. Wates, 'Letter', *New Era* 45 (May 1964), p. 156.

worthy but insignificant organisation.¹³⁴ The lack of an active membership base diminished the ability of the ENEF to undertake any major projects. The long-running attempt to establish a teachers' residential centre to promote progressive teaching was discussed over many years, but eventually failed. The main reason was the lack of money for such an ambitious plan. However, Wallbridge believed that it was more than just lack of funds; there was also a severe failure of dynamism or active interest in the organisation both by members and non-members.¹³⁵ He argued that:

. . . we could so easily become an organization for the already converted. Because of the apparent only, success of our early work, we are in danger of losing our missionary urge . . . Because we have been going so long and so much of our work is now accepted, we are also in danger of becoming dominated by the Institutes of Education and the Training Colleges – rather than the teachers and parents of children.¹³⁶

This scheme revealed the tensions among the committee members and their vision for the future of the ENEF. The committee was divided between those who sought to make a bold statement about the relevance of the new education through such a scheme and those who believed it was well beyond the means of the organisation.¹³⁷

Annand persuaded Wallbridge that an organisation of the ENEF's small size would not be able to support a potential yearly budget of £100,000 for such a venture and that this was a preposterous plan.¹³⁸

The infighting among committee members continued and served to undermine the work of the organisation. Yvonne Moyses strongly criticised Wallbridge's ineffective leadership.¹³⁹ Her role as Secretary after 1965, however, was praised as

¹³⁴ ENEF 6, King to Wallbridge, 26 June 1965.

¹³⁵ ENEF 6, Wallbridge to Rawson, 3 January 1966.

¹³⁶ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to ENEF Council Members', John Wallbridge, circa 1964.

¹³⁷ ENEF 8, Porter to Annand, 24 August 1964.

¹³⁸ ENEF 8, Annand to Wallbridge, 14 July 1965.

¹³⁹ ENEF 7, Moyses to Wallbridge, 1 December 1965.

instrumental in resolving the problems of both the ENEF and NEF's finances.¹⁴⁰ Moyse, however, was aware that she faced a difficult task combining her work for both the ENEF and NEF. She commented that: 'I might well get into hot water if the other sections knew how much of my time and thought has been spent on trying to help the ENEF in its hour of need.'¹⁴¹ William Myers, the editor of the *New Era*, resigned, claiming that the constant pressure from the committee to cut costs was an impossible demand in the face of declining sales.¹⁴² It was during this period that the administration of the ENEF suffered the most, with a variety of short-lived secretaries and the loss of much of the paperwork relating to the organisation. As a result, the educational work and vitality of the organisation suffered.¹⁴³

The failure to gain the support of those working in schools was a serious blow for the organisation.¹⁴⁴ A study was commissioned by the ENEF during the 1960s to understand why support for progressive ideas at teacher training colleges did not necessarily equate to support from teachers in schools for the organisation. It emerged that a wide number of teachers within state schools were opposed to progressive methods and quashed the progressive ideas of new teachers emerging from training colleges. The dilemma, so the study recorded, was to attract these sceptical 'average' teachers.¹⁴⁵

Although the membership of the ENEF was little more than 400 by the mid-1960s, it was still the most successful of the national branches of the NEF. Considering the potential size of its audience amongst teachers and other educational

¹⁴⁰ ENEF 16, 'Personnel File on Yvonne Moyse', undated.

¹⁴¹ ENEF 18, Moyse to King, 2 June 1969.

¹⁴² ENEF 7, Myers to Annand, 23 April 1964.

¹⁴³ ENEF 12, 'Memorandum', Raymond King, 25 April 1969.

¹⁴⁴ ENEF 13, File B, 'Members or Lapsed Members Attached to London University', undated.

¹⁴⁵ ENEF 6, King to Betty (surname unknown), 18 November 1971.

professionals, however, this did not represent a widespread coverage.¹⁴⁶ Wallbridge warned the committee that:

We are approaching slowly the danger point where the organization will no longer be able to maintain the essential full-time staff. If this critical point is reached and passed, then inevitably, we become another amateur group . . . our membership . . . has in fact slowly been decreasing . . . it is not enough merely to maintain our membership at the present level.¹⁴⁷

It was also noted that:

The ENEF has always claimed to be an organization which included parents. However, examining our membership lists, there seem to be few people whose need to join derives from merely being parents rather than in their professional positions.¹⁴⁸

Wallbridge calculated that there were 300,000 teachers in schools at this time; however, a survey found that very few had ever heard of the NEF, let alone the ENEF.¹⁴⁹ Wallbridge stated that 'even those who have are uncertain as to what value we can be to them or what purpose would be served by them belonging to the organization.'¹⁵⁰ The committee agreed that:

. . .our fellowship has always and inevitably been strongly representative of educational administration and of those who teach teachers. A further condition of rejuvenation is a large increase in the proportion of those actually practising the craft of education at ground level . . .¹⁵¹

It was eventually decided that the ENEF did not have the funds to advertise in any of the usual journals, including the *TES*. The ENEF recognised the problem of its limited membership but was unable to come up with any ways of solving it. Some members now believed that these various problems had caused the ENEF to lose its opportunity

¹⁴⁶ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to ENEF Council Members', John Wallbridge, circa 1964. p.3.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴⁹ ENEF 6, 'Note', J. Wallbridge, 28 September 1965

¹⁵⁰ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to ENEF Council Members', John Wallbridge, circa 1964. p. 4.

¹⁵¹ ENEF 16, 'Chairman's Letter', 1973.

to make a difference to education at a regional level. Significantly, one person wishing to rejoin the organisation after an absence of some years stated that the ENEF did not now have 'any real impact . . . thirty years ago . . . it was a rather "in" organisation . . . it was very difficult for me to discover at all if it still existed'.¹⁵²

Conclusion

The ENEF possessed a well-connected committee representing a wide range of educational concerns which greatly aided its ability to institutionalise and gain autonomy after 1945. The main flaw in its structure, however, was that it lacked methods of communication and the committee rarely made major decisions. In practice, as shown by the above discussion, the entire day-to-day running of the ENEF and its financial problems was left entirely to the secretaries. This was not a satisfactory state of affairs for an organisation that sought to make an impact after 1945. The secretaries were unable to run the organisation in place of the committee members. The problem with having such eminent educationists on the committees was that they rarely had the time to make a difference to the organisation. They possessed other forums for the promotion of their ideas and rarely credited the ENEF with any part in these. Examples of this include Raymond King who was an active member of the Campaign for Moral Education and the Council for Education in World Citizenship, while Lionel Elvin was a member of the latter and devoted much of his time to his work at UNESCO.¹⁵³ Some of the committee members were clearly figureheads alone and took no part at all in proceedings. Lady Allen of Hurtwood and Lady Plowden seem to have fallen into this category. The fact that the committee members could promote their ideas elsewhere, especially with the rise of various

¹⁵² ENEF 15, Levin to ENEF Committee, 28 April 1977.

¹⁵³ ENEF 18, 'Campaign for Moral Education (London)', 'Report', 19 February 1969, and 'Annual Report for the Council for Education in World Citizenship meeting at Russell Square,' 1978, p.179.

single-issue organisations during the 1960s had a negative impact upon the organisation. During the 1940s and 1950s the NEF had a close working relationship with other educational and social organisations. However, by the 1960s, these organisations no longer sought such links with the NEF. The ENEF became almost entirely a forum for discussion but not for action.

The other conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that there existed in England during the 1940s a strong desire for the reform of society and education, a response that contrasts with the one that Daniel Bell and Arthur Zilversmit record in the USA during the same period.¹⁵⁴ This was reflected in the eagerness with which many of those who had previously rejected the NEF joined its discussions at conferences, groups or open meetings, such as the ones in Exeter and Ipswich. The problem for the ENEF, therefore, was not an inability to find people in society with whom to engage in discussion of a radical educational and social agenda after 1945, but that the ENEF was unable to use these connections to promote itself successfully. One important reason for this was that, when it faced challenges, it entrenched itself further into its traditional source of support – higher education institutions. This ensured survival, but stifled the vigorous debate that had come from a membership more representative of the wider education profession.

The next chapter explores the ideological impact of the ENEF upon society and education in England, focusing upon its network at a national level, through the work of its members in educational institutions, including private and state schools and higher education establishments.

¹⁵⁴ D. Bell (1988), p. 285.

CHAPTER FIVE

The ENEF and educational reconstruction after 1945

The English New Education Fellowship (ENEF) became the most important section of the NEF in the period between 1945 and 1966. This was partly due to the fact that the ENEF possessed a wide and well-connected membership, drawn from a variety of universities and teacher training colleges, but also because the IHQ of the NEF was based in London and was able to work closely with the ENEF. Additionally, due to the financial problems and constraints faced by the IHQ with its limited resources, the ENEF committee became, in effect, the controlling body of the international NEF. In chapter four the regional network and membership of the ENEF was examined. In this chapter, however, the focus is upon the ambitions of the ENEF and its desire to be involved with the development of national education policy and the reconstruction of education in Britain.

Four main themes dominated the progress of the ENEF in its quest for involvement in education after 1945. First, during the 1940s and 1950s the ENEF sought to develop its network within teacher training colleges. This network of teacher trainers and academics emerged as the most significant factor affecting the organisation's outlook and its activities by the 1960s. In earlier years, the ENEF and NEF had, before 1940, possessed strong links to private progressive schools. Secondly, after 1945, the ENEF committee attempted to extend its network into the state school system by rejecting its historic links with private schools as incompatible with its focus upon equality of educational opportunity. The third theme that emerged during this period was a tension caused by the domination of the ENEF and its committee by academic staff from various universities and which worked against its desire to involve more schoolteachers in the organisation. Finally, another key area of

the ENEF's involvement were the activities it undertook under the auspices of UNESCO that occupied a significant amount of the ENEF's time and resources between 1947 and 1964.

The first part of this chapter examines the ENEF's ideas and activities relating to the reconstruction of education during the years of the Second World War between 1939 and 1945. The three sections following on from this examine the work and activities of the ENEF between 1945 and 1964 in its three main spheres of interest during this period. (1964 was an important year for the movement as the long-term relationship with UNESCO was terminated.) The first of these post-war sections explores the involvement of the ENEF in the sphere of teacher training, both within teacher training colleges and universities. The involvement of the ENEF and its membership with these institutions was a major factor in its ability to survive and contribute to educational debates after 1945. The next part explores the involvement of the ENEF with the school system both private and state. The aim of this is to understand how far new educational ideas found their way into the education system and whether this extended beyond the narrow base of progressive private schools that were involved with the NEF during the 1920s and 1930s. The involvement of the ENEF with UNESCO is also examined. UNESCO was a key part of the NEF and ENEF's activities and greatly affected the development of its ideology. Finally, the progress of the movement by 1964 is explored, by which date the NEF was no longer involved with UNESCO. This study ends in 1966 when the NEF renamed itself the World Education Fellowship.

The war years 1939–1945: educational reconstruction

There had been active discussion amongst the committee members of the ENEF during this period about the best way of becoming involved with educational issues

and reconstruction in Britain.¹ The inability of international new educationists either to predict or prevent the rise of fascism in Europe and the Second World War had caused enormous loss of confidence in the new educational ideology of the 1920s and 1930s amongst American and English educationists. Vigorous debates had ensued attacking the failure of the new educationists to involve themselves with the problems facing society rather than seeking to isolate themselves² (these issues were examined in chapter two). Fred Clarke, the President at that time, and H. G. Stead, the Secretary, had both actively led these discussions amongst the ENEF. There was much optimism from Stead that the ENEF could become an active part of the reconstruction of education after the war was over. This reconstruction would, he believed, be one that involved creating a fairer society. It was also believed that organisations such as the ENEF, with its network and historical links would be important in this process. The Spens Report of 1938 gained much positive support from English new educationists and furthered this interest. Stead received it with particular enthusiasm.³ The ENEF committee made a statement in a 1945 pamphlet supporting this approach and proposing that the purpose of educational reconstruction should be to ‘provide for every child the opportunity for the best available education’ and in addition to this ‘the organisation must be democratic’.⁴ The problem for the committee was to be able to gain a role within the process of educational reconstruction against the plethora of single-interest groups that sought to promote their own agendas during this period.

The theme that dominated during the 1940s was the desire for a greater equality of opportunity within the school system, in particular the need to enable children from

¹ Richard Dunning, ‘Pottery – Sensitiveness through a Traditional Craft’, *New Era* 34 (April 1953), p. 64; E. M. Churchill, ‘Standards for Teachers or for Children’, *New Era* 34 (May 1953), p. 90; ENEF 11, ‘ENEF Reconstruction in Education – Report of the ENEF Committee 1945’.

² WEF III/209, ‘NEF Report’, 1944.

³ H. G. Stead, ‘The Spens Report’, *New Era* 21 (March 1939), p. 84.

⁴ ENEF 11, ‘Memorandum’, ‘Reconstruction in Education’, 1945.

working-class backgrounds to have greater access to schools and universities.⁵ This approach followed from the general desire at this time to reform society and education.⁶ Child, Lauwerys and Stead encouraged the committee to make a statement rejecting class privilege and affirming their support for the creation of better opportunities within education for all children.⁷ They argued that the best way to achieve this lay within the creation of a comprehensive school system.⁸ They sought to ensure that the ENEF adopted similar ideas to those that were being discussed more widely concerning educational reconstruction at the time.⁹ This gained support from many of those writing in the *New Era* who claimed that the English new educationists should oppose private and selective schooling of all kinds.¹⁰ The ENEF committee believed that by adopting this approach it could gain more interest from state schoolteachers. They sought to achieve this by creating stronger links with teacher training colleges and through this to be able to promote its ideas more successfully among teachers entering the profession.¹¹

This social purpose was given priority as early as 5 December 1943 when Vivian Ogilvie, the ENEF's organising secretary, chaired a general meeting of the ENEF and NEF entitled 'Social Aims of Post-War European Education' at the Friends International Centre, London. This set the agenda for both the NEF and the ENEF and confirmed not only the desire of the movement to be involved with education

⁵ 'NUT Speech by Dr W. Alexander', *TES*, 26 April 1957.

⁶ 'Education is a Social Activity' *TES*, 1952, p. 1.

⁷ ENEF 11, 'Memorandum', 'Reconstruction in Education', 1945.

⁸ H. A. T. Child, 'The Lessening of Anxiety through the Comprehensive School', *New Era* 38 (May 1957), p. 99.

⁹ C. Benn, 'Comprehensive School Reform and the 1945 Labour Government', *History Workshop Journal* (11) (1980). 'Labour Party Supports Comprehensive Schooling', *TES*, 15 February 1957.

¹⁰ W. A. Rumble, 'The Educational Argument for Comprehensive Schooling', *New Era* 38 (May 1957), p. 96.

¹¹ N. Allmark, 'Literacy through Activity', *New Era* 34 (May 1953), p. 85; and L. Pierotti, 'Juniors and their Education Today', *New Era* 34 (May 1953), p. 98.

internationally but also the belief that educationists had a 'special right' to be heard.¹² This meeting, while attended by international educators and under the auspices of the NEF, contained a significant English NEF membership and as such heavily reflected English concerns. Ogilvie recorded that the meeting came to the conclusion that 'educational discussions had too often concentrated on middle-class children' and also that education had failed to consider the social environment that children had been brought up in rather than just the content of syllabi and lessons.

Most significantly, however, the ENEF's new social perspective included a repudiation of the private school system and public schools. Vivian Ogilvie had as early as 1940 argued in an article in the *New Era* that public schools only produced leaders in society because of their privilege and social class and the fact that the 'less favoured classes lack the confidence' to assert their rights, adding that 'in a democracy leadership cannot be based on privilege'.¹³ This attack upon private schooling was also contemporaneous with discussions by the NUT which also believed that such schools would collapse after the war and expressed its 'suspicion of anything they offer'.¹⁴ The ENEF meeting of 1943 criticised not only public schooling but the fact that 'other schools attempted to copy middle-class standards and eventually the ways of the Public Schools . . .'. In a criticism of the private progressive schools, it was argued at the meeting that 'respect for the child's individuality' espoused by such schools was, in fact, a 'smoke-screen' to 'veil an unacknowledged social purpose'.¹⁵ Joseph Lauwerys pursued this theme and argued that private schools should be taken over by the state, claiming that they were not 'justified by the valuable experimental work of a few while there was increasing

¹² 'Social Aims of Post-war Education', *New Era* 24 (January 1943), p. 9.

¹³ V. Ogilvie, 'Now and Tomorrow III: Leadership', *New Era* 21 (December 1940), pp. 245–8.

¹⁴ UWMRC, MSS.179/EDU/3/11/1899F/2, 'Minutes of Education and Evacuation Committee', 17th January 1941.

¹⁵ 'Social Aims of Post-war Education', *New Era* 24 (January 1943), p. 9.

scope for variety and experiment within the State system'. He also argued that merely allowing them to collapse, as he believed would naturally happen in the new more equal educational system that would be created after the war, would 'prolong the danger of a decaying governing class'.¹⁶ Those members of the ENEF who were involved with private progressive schools found themselves put in a difficult situation as a result of these statements. W. B. Curry of Dartington Hall School, a private progressive school and the only member of the committee to represent such schools, found himself forced into an uncomfortable position and in his speech to the conference expressed his support for the new approach.

The dilemma for the ENEF was the traditional reliance of the NEF upon the private progressive school before 1940. This had caused the English new educational movement to become entrenched within these schools at the expense of obtaining a broader network. The main concern for the ENEF committee after 1945 was to increase its network beyond not only private progressive schools but also the universities from which it drew most of its membership and committee. As a result of this the focus of the ENEF during this time became the state school system and teacher training. The committee believed that it was here that the organisation could make the most impact.¹⁷ Rejection of the organisation's links with private schools did not automatically bring the ENEF the successful contacts with state schools that it desired, due to the fact that state teachers had other forums in which to discuss educational or professional issues. This rejection did cut the ENEF off from its traditional area of support and it was as a result of this, that the organisation, in an attempt to involve itself with state education turned to teacher training colleges.

¹⁶ J. Lauwerys, 'Adult Education', *New Era* 23 (November 1942), pp. 164–7.

¹⁷ ENEF 11, 'Memorandum', 'Reconstruction in Education', 1945.

The post-war years 1945–1964: teacher training

Teacher training became a focus of the ENEF after 1943. This involvement was encouraged by the fact that the ENEF increasingly drew much of its membership from those within teacher training colleges and the belief of the committee that these links could be used to promote new educational ideals to teachers.¹⁸ There were three main ways that the ENEF extended its network into teacher training colleges. First, and most importantly, many members of these colleges were represented on the ENEF committee. This included Fred Clarke, Lionel Elvin, Catherine Fletcher, David Jordan, Joseph Lauwerys and Ben Morris. This network gave the English new educationists a significant sphere of activity within the realm of institutions dealing with higher education or teacher training and a valuable opportunity to make its voice heard. The institutions that these links represented included the Bingley Training College, Dudley Training College, the Gipsy Hill Training College, University of London Institute of Education, Manchester University, Sheffield University and the University College of Leicester. University of London Institute of Education staff were present on both the NEF and the ENEF committees.¹⁹

The ENEF was also helped in increasing its network amongst teacher training institutions by the fact that, during this period, many new institutions were being formed or existing institutions expanded to address the shortage of teachers experienced after the Second World War. New institutions were founded, such as the Borthwick Training College for Women in London in 1945,²⁰ and similar establishments at Harrogate and Wakefield in Yorkshire in 1947 and Coventry in

¹⁸ ENEF 13, 'List of Committee Members', These included staff at Exeter University (Miss Howard), Bristol University (Professor Ben Morris), the City of Coventry Training College (Mr. James Porter) and Gipsy Hill Training College (Miss Stapleton).

¹⁹ Joseph Lauwerys was on both the NEF and the ENEF committees as were Sir Percy Nunn, Sir Fred Clarke and Dr Susan Isaacs, at that time a lecturer in the Department of Education Psychology at the University of London Institute of Education.

²⁰ NA ED 143/35, 'Minutes: Borthwick Training College for Women, London', 1947.

1948. This large-scale new creation of institutions allowed the ENEF to extend its network considerably, using the existing academic and professional links of its membership and committee to do so. As a result of this, teacher training colleges became, after 1945, an important part of the ENEF's network. The ENEF often became an unofficial forum for the discussion of those issues that arose concerning the operation and curricula of these institutions. This network was responsible for giving the organisation the support and impetus that kept it alive for most of this period and which replaced that of the private progressive schools. The ENEF risked, however, becoming a mere adjunct to these institutions, a place where academics explored their own ideas but did not commit themselves to advancing the purpose or membership of the organisations itself.²¹

As a result of this the ENEF committee adopted an approach to teacher training during the 1940s that reflected the needs and concerns of those working within these institutions at that time. Those committee members who were involved with both training colleges and the ENEF – Joan D. Browne, Catherine Fletcher, David Jordan and James Hemming – argued that any involvement with the reconstruction of education needed to focus upon the specific issues of rebuilding schools and training teachers. David Jordan argued that the ENEF should involve itself with teacher training colleges even more closely.²² The main difficulty the ENEF faced was that there existed disagreement amongst teacher trainers over what approach the organisation should promote.²³ Authors from teacher training colleges writing in the *New Era* mirrored this disagreement. While some writers were concerned with

²¹ ENEF 11, 'Memorandum to ENEF Committee', John Wallbridge, 28 September 1965.

²² D. Jordan, 'English Section Report', *New Era* 35 (November 1954), p. 193.

²³ D. Jordan 'A Training College Experiment', *New Era* 32 (April 1951), p. 82. At the Dudley Training College, David Jordan, Principal in 1951 and a member of the ENEF's committee, explained that new students to the college were encouraged to take part in a variety of artistic and creative activities at the start of the course. In addition to this, they were also sent to visit schools for 'subnormal' students with a variety of learning and physical difficulties.

ideology and experimentation, others were more interested in the practicalities of student life.²⁴ James Hemming believed that the main purpose of teacher training was that teachers should be taught the key skills to survive in the classroom.²⁵ Joan D. Browne's specific concerns were the continued expansion of the numbers at the City of Coventry College in spite of insufficient facilities.²⁶ She argued, from within the pages of the *New Era*, that the ENEF should pursue research into aspects of teachers' experiences that colleges were unable to do themselves and take up a role that was complementary to the needs of teacher training institutions.²⁷

The second way that this network developed was through the pages of the *New Era*. The *New Era* became the forum for active discussion by staff at teacher training institutions about what constituted effective teacher training.²⁸ The primary concern for educationists at teacher training institutions writing in the journal during and after the period of the Second World War was the recruitment and retention of able teachers.²⁹ There were various solutions put forward to improve this. Margaret Phillips wrote an article arguing that the main problem for the teaching profession was the lack of standardisation regarding selection of candidates by training colleges. She believed that it was only by insisting on certain minimum standards that more able teachers would find their way into the profession. In particular, she was critical of the two-year courses leading into teaching. This approach gained support from those writing in the *New Era* who represented the senior management of a variety of

²⁴ M. Phillips, 'The Married Students in a Women's Emergency Training College', *New Era* 33 (July–August 1952), p. 221.

²⁵ J. Hemming, 'Standards for our Time', *New Era* 34 (May 1953), p. 81.

²⁶ UWMRC, CCA.CCE/C2, Browne to Chinn, 2 September 1959. Browne to Chinn, 22nd January 1959.

²⁷ J. D. Browne, 'The First Teaching Year', *New Era* 32 (April 1951), p. 101.

²⁸ J. Boulby, 'Roots of Human Personality', *New Era* 38 (September 1957), p. 207; B. Morris, 'Freud, Jung and Alder: Their Relevance to the Teacher's Life and Work', *New Era* 37 (January 1956), pp. 1–6; E. Richardson, 'Human Relations in Education', *New Era* 38 (January 1957), p. 25.

²⁹ M. Phillips, 'Guidance and Selection in the Recruitment of Teachers', *New Era* 21 (September–October 1940), p. 198.

schools.³⁰ The *New Era* also drew articles from many others who were actively involved in teacher training at both universities and teacher training institutions and wished to share their ideas in the journal. These included lecturers at the University of London Institute of Education and at Birmingham and Leicester universities among others.³¹ The *New Era*, therefore, played a significant role in contributing to the evolution of the organisation's ideas about teacher training and represented a forum for grassroots contribution to the debates that were taking place.

The *New Era* played an important part in the development of the ENEF's approach towards teacher training in the 1950s. This moved towards one based upon the use of psychology as a tool for training new teachers. This debate emerged first within the pages of the journal amongst English new educationists and then found expression at NEF and ENEF conferences. As a result of this, the ENEF's approach to teaching was increasingly based upon psychology and the belief in teaching as a therapeutic activity.³² This change in approach was caused by the fact that James Hemming, a prominent member of the committee at this time, developed a fervent belief in the value of psychology as a tool in education. Hemming strongly supported a counselling approach to education. He gained support for this from Mary Swainson, Lecturer in Educational Psychology at the University of Leicester. In 1953, she wrote in the *New Era* that teacher training at that time overlooked the mental health needs of

³⁰ E. L. Herbert and B. Yapp, 'The Training of Teachers', *New Era* 23 (January 1942), p. 7. Assistant mistress of the Manchester High School for Girls and later lecturer in education at Manchester University, Herbert, and the assistant master of the Manchester Grammar School, B. Yapp, both of whom did not undertake professional teaching qualifications themselves, argued that while the possession of an educational qualification was not, in itself, necessary to being a good teacher, it could be a useful foundation for assessing an entrant to the profession's abilities. Ian Michael 'The Teacher Himself', *New Era* 24 (September 1943), p. 149.

³¹ C. T. Daltry, 'Creative Painting', *New Era* 34 (April 1953), p. 67. C. T. Daltry was senior lecturer in maths at the University of London Institute of Education. M. Brooke Gwynne, 'Some Modern Attitudes to the Teaching of Reading', *New Era* 34 (September–October 1953), p. 142 and M. Brearley, 'Numbers in the Primary School', *New Era* 34 (September–October 1953), p. 149. Miss M. Brooke Gwynne was from the Department of Child Development and Miss M. Brearley from the Department of Education.

³² A. Curle 'From Student to Teacher Status', *New Era* 35 (February 1955), pp. 21–3.

teachers.³³ She also believed that resistance to new educational methods could be overcome if teachers were educated at teacher training colleges to be psychologically more positive.³⁴ Mary Swainson's ideas were also influenced by her belief in the existence of psychic abilities and in her alternative spirituality.³⁵ The NEF provided an opportunity for those, such as Mary Swainson, who held alternative educational ideas to express them within a non-judgmental arena.

H. A. T. Child and Marjorie Hourd (senior research fellow of the Institute of Education, University of Leeds and a member of the ENEF's committee) also became supporters of this approach to teaching. Child argued that the school of the future would focus more upon emotional development rather than teaching the curriculum.³⁶ Hourd placed emphasis upon the use of psychoanalysis within education.³⁷ The psychological approach gained support from others involved with teacher training. E. L. Herbert of Manchester University wrote of her experimentation with teachers and teacher training through 'free group discussions' where teachers discussed various educational issues while a therapist observed and commented upon the behaviour and unconscious attitudes of the group.³⁸ Joseph Lauwerys, a member of the committees of both the NEF and the ENEF also supported this approach and argued that it was right for the movement to focus more upon relationships as the source of growth in a child in addition to social and material factors.³⁹ The fact that this psychological approach made such an impact upon the ENEF's ideology at this

³³ M. Swainson 'The Training of Teachers and their Mental Health', *New Era* 34 (December 1953), p. 251.

³⁴ M. Swainson 'Psychological Climates Affecting the New Education', *New Era* 34 (November 1953), p. 169.

³⁵ M. Swainson, *The Spirit of Counsel: The Story of a Pioneer in Student Counselling* (London: Spearman, 1977). Also P. Pope and J. West, 'Obituary', 'Mary Swainson', *The Guardian*, Monday, 2 June 2008.

³⁶ 'Emotional Education – The School of the Future', *New Era* 34 (February 1953), p. 53.

³⁷ M. Hourd, 'Psycho-analytical Studies of the Child', *New Era* 37 (June 1956), p. 165.

³⁸ E. L. Herbert, 'Interpreting Teachers' Group Discussions', *New Era* 32 (April 1951), p. 81.

³⁹ ENEF 6, Lauwerys to Henderson, 19 February 1964.

time resulted from the close links that the organisation had with the teacher training colleges where such an approach had already found favour.⁴⁰ The pages of the *New Era* came to be dominated by lecturers and staff at English teacher training colleges, such as Joan D. Browne and Margaret Phillips, who contributed the majority of the articles and as a result the journal became an important part of the ENEF's debate about teacher training. This was, however, at the expense of contributions by those who were involved with teaching in other capacities.

The third part of this network involved the regular conferences held by the ENEF. These conferences were heavily dominated by the teacher training colleges, were mostly held at these colleges, and confirmed their dominance upon the ENEF. The 1952 conference was held at the City of Coventry Training College through its links with Joan D. Browne, its principal. The 1955 conference was held at the Bishop Otter College, a teacher training college in Chichester. The 1957 conference, held in Newton Park in Bath, was chaired by Catherine Fletcher, Principal of the Bingley Training College, and made teacher training its theme. The 1963 conference was held at the Eastbourne Training College.⁴¹ The attendance at these conferences was relatively low, with 69 being recorded as a significant turnout at the 1955 conference at Chichester. This reliance upon teacher training colleges for this support, both in terms of membership and venues for conferences, was a source of concern for some on the committee who believed that the movement risked becoming too sidelined as an adjunct of these institutions and was losing its independence.⁴²

Ultimately, however, the teacher training institutions did not provide the ENEF with the broader network in the state school system that it sought. It became

⁴⁰ J. D. Browne, *Teachers of Teachers: A History of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1979).

⁴¹ ENEF 6, 'Conference Pamphlet', 1963.

⁴² ENEF 16, Handwritten 'Report' of ENEF Chairman, 1973.

entrenched as a junior partner in its relationship with teacher training colleges, a place where ideas could be expressed by those working within them but not as a source of new ideas. The ENEF faced increasing criticism from members that it had allowed itself to be dominated by teacher trainers who, it was claimed, stifled the organisation and its freedom to choose its own goals.⁴³ The approach that the ENEF took regarding educational reconstruction during this period heavily reflected the concerns of the teacher training colleges. Those at teacher training colleges also had other forums for discussion of important issues, particularly the NUT, which could apply pressure for action upon issues of equality of opportunity and reconstruction of education that the ENEF could not, in particular regarding the pressing issues of ensuring that enough students were being recruited for the colleges, that there was sufficient accommodation and that female students were not being discriminated against.⁴⁴ There was much investment in and the creation of new teacher training colleges during the post-war years. The dilemma for the ENEF was that, while it gained a substantial network within these institutions, ultimately this network later drew away from organisations such as the ENEF that could not compete with the increasing centralisation of teacher training and education. The ENEF also failed to take the opportunity to be more than a passive participant in its relationship with the teacher training colleges or universities. It did not have sufficient resources or participation from those on its committee who worked in these institutions to become a research partner in the way that Joan D. Browne envisaged. As a result of this apathy on behalf

⁴³ ENEF 13, Adams to Browne, 21 February 1972.

⁴⁴ UWMRC, MSS.179/EDU/3/11/1899F/2, Folder 3, 'Educational Reconstruction – A report of Proposals by the Executive of the NUT' Conference Easter 1942. UWMRC, MSS.179/EDU/3/11/2088, Folder 1, Interim Committee File, 'Minutes of Executive Committee 12th March 1948' (problems of accommodation) 'Minutes of Executive Committee 22 November 1947' (problems facing women applying to colleges).

of the committee the early potential of the organisation to involve itself in reforming education and society that had been hoped for in the mid 1940s was not fulfilled.

The post-war years: 1945-64: schools

Before 1940, the primary area for the dissemination of new educational ideals in England had been the private progressive school.⁴⁵ This meant that the organisation had little involvement with the state school system, causing the new education to become narrowly focused upon these schools, which by their nature – as private, fee-paying institutions – only benefited those who were able to afford to send their children to them. After 1945, however, the ENEF sought to loosen its links with private schools and to become more involved with the state school system. In the pursuit of this goal, however, it faced difficulty.

The private progressive schools had possessed clear links with the movement before 1940, but this had faded after 1945. The main dilemma for these schools after 1940 was that the ENEF now maintained an ideological opposition to them on the grounds that they were elitist institutions. In the ENEF's response to the White Paper on Educational Reconstruction, the desire was expressed that all private schools, including private progressive schools 'should be eventually assimilated' into the state system.⁴⁶ In spite of the continuing criticisms of such schools by the ENEF and the English new educationists – for example, in the 1948 *Yearbook of Education* – such private progressive schools continued to flourish. These schools satisfied a demand for an education that contained elements of progressivism and new educational ideals, but were not experimental schools in the way that some private progressive schools

⁴⁵ WEF I/34, 'ENEF Report', undated.

⁴⁶ H. G. Stead, 'The White Paper on Educational Reconstruction', *New Era* 24 (September–October 1943), pp. 158–9.

had been during the 1930s.⁴⁷ This continued opposition created a tension within the movement between, on the one hand, the desire to be seen to be less elitist and dedicated to equality of opportunity, in order to attract a wider membership, and, on the other hand, the continuing albeit small-scale support of some private progressive schools.

W. B. Curry, who was on the committee of the ENEF, was the only current representative of the private progressive school on either the NEF or ENEF committees. Wyatt Rawson was a potential ally in this cause, teaching at Bryanston School from 1943 and then Cranborne Chase, its sister school, both in Dorset, from 1946.⁴⁸ The ENEF also took over the duties of the former Home and School Council that represented private progressive schools in 1955. But this did not mean that the ENEF was keen to rejuvenate its links with these schools. Rawson did not show any inclination to support private progressive education on the ENEF committee and the Home and School Council was effectively disbanded. This did not mean that private progressive schools did not remain important within new educational circles, but it did mean that the representation of these schools and the importance of their ideas within the ENEF committee declined vastly after 1945.

The rejection of the private progressive schools by the ENEF committee did not stop a wide range of such schools advertising within the pages of the *New Era* in each issue and promoting their progressive or new educational credentials either explicitly or implicitly to the readership.⁴⁹ After 1945, the private progressive schools survived by exploiting a niche market for those parents who sought aspects of new educational

⁴⁷ Clarke, Hamley et al. (1948), Section II, 'England and Wales', p. 33, A. C. F. Beales (lecturer in education at King's College, University of London) argued that public schools must be absorbed by the State.

⁴⁸ ENEF 16, 'Obituary for Wyatt Rawson', 1980.

⁴⁹ Advertisements in *New Era* 25 (November 1944), p. 227.

ideology mixed with a more traditional approach. These schools ranged from traditional and long-term exponents of progressive educational philosophy, such as Abbotsholme, Badminton School, Bedales, Dartington Hall and Frensham Heights⁵⁰, to less well-known and more recent schools, such as St Mary's Town and Country School in London, Monkton Wyld School,⁵¹ in Dorset, Warmington School in County Durham, and Wychwood School,⁵² in Oxfordshire. A significant number of these schools were situated in southern England, the majority were in the Home Counties, in towns that lay within commuting distance of London but were still in the countryside and so they promoted their rural nature. These included such schools as High March,⁵³ and Wycombe Court based near High Wycombe, a commuter town in south Buckinghamshire. There were also schools in Kent and Sussex, Chiddingstone School in Chiddingstone and Little Felcourt School in East Grinstead, respectively.⁵⁴ In most cases, the advertisements for these schools promoted their outdoor activities, rural pursuits, easy access to countryside and progressive curricula. These schools reflected a new trend in the private progressive school. They were not the original high bastions of pure progressive and new educational thought that had existed during the 1920s and 1930s, but came into existence, or adapted, to capitalise upon the desire of professional and middle-class parents to have a traditional education with aspects of the new educational approach and adopted a pragmatic and flexible approach to new educational ideas. The key difference between these smaller private progressive schools and the older more established private progressive schools lay in their commitment to new educational and radical progressive ideals and their willingness to be flexible in their approaches. Significantly, most of these newer progressive schools

⁵⁰ NA ED 109/5715, 'Frensham Heights School', Report of Inspection, 1935'.

⁵¹ NA ED 109/8737, 'Monkton Wyld School, Dorset', 'Report by Inspector, 1947'.

⁵² NA ED 109/4883, 'Full Inspection Report of Wychwood School for Girls, 1931'.

⁵³ NA ED 109/191, 'Inspectors' Report, High March School, Buckinghamshire, 1941'.

⁵⁴ Advertisements in *New Era* (1948).

were based in the south of England, showing the bias of the movement to that geographical area.

The ENEF's rejection of private schooling meant that it did not make an effort to draw these schools more closely into its network. It, therefore, cut itself off from a considerable base of natural supporters through its opposition to private education. The gap left, however, was not easily filled with links to state schools in the way that the ENEF had hoped. The problem facing the ENEF in attempting to promote its ideas in state schools was that, according to the Memorandum to the NEF Council on Future Policy and Organisation, many of these considered that the ENEF was irrelevant to their needs and did not address wider social and educational issues.⁵⁵ Raymond King argued that the ENEF had allowed itself to become confined to private progressive schools that had 'no relations with the state system'. He also believed that after the 1944 Education Act the 'explosion' in secondary education and examination needs made the version of progressivism that these private schools promoted and their elitist approaches irrelevant and led to their decline.⁵⁶ He was of the opinion that this was due to the fact that 'progressivism' became a term of abuse and that ultimately the NEF had become 'less distinct'. King was convinced that the 1944 Education Act, leading as it did to vast investment and the creation of state schools and state examination systems, ultimately made not only private progressive schools but also small-scale educational organisations such as the ENEF less necessary.⁵⁷

There were two ways that the ENEF sought to extend its network into the state school system. The first, but least effective, was through the work of the committee members themselves. Raymond King, the Secretary during the 1950s, was part of the

⁵⁵ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to Council on Future Policy and Organisation', undated.

⁵⁶ ENEF 14, File B, King to Bullock, 4 March 1982.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

attempt to encourage the ENEF to become involved with comprehensive education. His membership of the KAASE brought some small links for the movement there. The KAASE stated that its objective was that 'selection at 11plus' and 'separatism (the segregation of the more able pupils . . . is not desirable) [original brackets]' and 'should be ended'.⁵⁸ As a result of this link and the role of Raymond King, the Kingston-upon-Thames Chief Education Officer consulted the ENEF committee about the Local Education Authority's plans to end selection in the borough.⁵⁹ The ENEF was only consulted, however, or involved with state education where it had members who were both active and who held important positions within that area, as Raymond King did in Kingston-upon-Thames, rather than through recognition of its own worth and activities. The ENEF also possessed links with the nearby Gypsy Hill Teacher Training College, also in Kingston-Upon-Thames, the Principal of which Ms. F. D. Batstone, appointed in 1947, took an interest in ENEF activities and attended the meetings of the nearby Richmond branch.⁶⁰ Her diaries record that she attended sessions during 1948 and 1949. The diaries, which run from 1945 to 1959 do not record, however, any further attendance during other years which suggests that she either stopped attending or at least the entries were not recorded by the secretary at the college. This attendance coincided with the expansion and development of the college during this period.⁶¹

The other way was through the tacit support from headmistresses and headmasters of various schools themselves who, while rarely actively involved with

⁵⁸ ENEF 18, KAASE to King, 9 February 1968, p. 2.

⁵⁹ ENEF 18, 'Report on Consultation with the ENEF', J. S. Bishop (Chief Education Officer), circa 1968.

⁶⁰ Kingston University, Gypsy Hill Box 12, 'Office Diary' 15 January 1949– 'Washburne – NEF HQ'; 24 January 1949, 'ENEF Richmond group'; 28 March 'ENEF Richmond'; 'Office Diary' 1 March 1948, 'ENEF Group Discussion Richmond'; 15 March 1948, 'ENEF Special Members Meeting – Hamilton House'.

⁶¹ Kingston University, Gypsy Hill Box 16, file: Misc. Materials, 'Memo', Chief Education Office Surrey County Council to Minister of Education, circa 1947. Also file: Correspondence Surrey County Council, 'Principal's Report May 10th 1948'.

ENEF, used the movement to explore their ideas outside of the professional channels open to them elsewhere.⁶² The dilemma for the ENEF was that this was limited to active debates about the new education within the pages of the *New Era*. The reason for this lack of practical involvement with state education was that the ENEF was not representative of state schoolteachers or managers. The only head of a state school on the ENEF committee was Mr. K. B. Webb, Headmaster of Luton Modern School in Bedfordshire. The ENEF's aim, therefore, of encouraging more membership and involvement from schools clearly did not extend to its committee level. A large number of state schoolteachers and heads did, however, write into the *New Era* expressing support for new educational methods. The ENEF was clearly a forum for the exploration and sharing of ideas that it was not possible to discuss elsewhere. There was a diversity of geographical areas represented amongst those school managers who wrote to the *New Era*. This included, for example, the Headmistress of Westbury Infants School, Letchworth (who was concerned about psychological issues and the infant's school), the headmaster of a county primary school (not specified) (who was interested in using movement in learning), the headmistress of a junior school in Chesterfield and another headmistress in Surrey.⁶³

Wyatt Rawson made various claims for the influence of the new education upon the reconstruction of education in England after 1945. He believed that the ENEF was part of many of the educational developments at this time. He claimed significant

⁶² D. Porter 'Creative Writing in Secondary Modern School', *New Era* 36 (February 1955), p. 27; and L. E. Charlesworth, 'The Teacher Face to Face with his Pupils' Parents', *New Era* 35 (December 1954), p. 211.

⁶³ E. D. Cutler (Headmistress, Westbury Infants School, Letchworth), 'Reality is What You Decide You Feel', *New Era* 39 (June 1958), p. 139; J. V. Fenton (Headteacher, County Primary), 'Posture; The Basis of Movement' (July–August 1959), p. 178; M. I. Hewitt (Headmistress, Chesterfield), 'Infants and Juniors – Together or Apart', *New Era* 40 (March 1959), p. 42; J. Hursburgh (Headmistress Mitcham Sherwood County Primary Surrey), 'What Do You Know?' *New Era* 40 (March 1959), p. 45.

involvement of the ENEF with the creation of the comprehensive school in England.⁶⁴ He also credited the English new educationists with the spread of progressive ideas in primary schools during the 1960s.⁶⁵ There is little evidence to support his first claim, but there is evidence of the ENEF's network extending into primary schools, not directly through committee involvement, but through the fact that the *New Era* became a focus of discussion for primary schoolteachers who used the pages of the journal to discuss their specific educational concerns.⁶⁶ The methods that these teachers espoused were clearly heavily influenced by new educational ideas. A significant number of authors, for example, sought the use of more creative teaching methods along new educational lines.⁶⁷ There was also much discussion about the advantages or disadvantages of streaming classes in junior schools.⁶⁸ Junior schoolteachers provided an unrecognised, albeit indirect, potential area of influence for the ENEF and new educational ideals and were often at the forefront of interpreting new educational ideals and putting them into practice in their schools. The difficulty was that the ENEF committee did not actively seek to engage with these teachers and its policies were geared more to the needs of the teacher training colleges or university institutes of education rather than attempting to focus upon what individual teachers sought from the organisation.

The main area for the development of the ENEF's network in schools in England was in the infant and junior schools. Most of the articles in the *New Era* supporting the use of new educational methods came from staff in junior schools. The *New Era* ran a series called the 'Good infant school' designed to promote new

⁶⁴ W. Boyd and W. Rawson, *The Story of the New Education* (London: Heinemann, 1965), p. 186.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ D. Scurfield, 'Parents and Teachers in the Infants' School', *New Era* 33 (March 1952), p. 4.

⁶⁷ B. Buck, 'Poetry and the Child', *New Era* 40 (January 1959), p. 28.

⁶⁸ L. Ives, 'Teaching an Unstreamed Class', *New Era* 40 (March 1959), p. 51; and Hewitt, 'Infants and Juniors', p. 42.

educational methods in these schools.⁶⁹ There was no corresponding focus on the secondary school in the journal and considerably fewer secondary school teachers wrote articles or letters. According to the ENEF's records, it was able to increase its membership among junior schoolteachers and the articles in the *New Era* reflected this, but very few teachers joined who worked in secondary schools.⁷⁰

The post-war years 1945–1964: UNESCO

After 1946, the NEF was unable to fulfil all of its commitments to UNESCO in return for its subvention and encouraged the ENEF to undertake many of them on its behalf. The main reason for this was that the IHQ of the NEF did not possess enough money or resources to carry out educational research. The ENEF possessed a wider network than the IHQ could call upon, including Fred Clarke, Lionel Elvin and Joseph Lauwerys. It was also able to draw upon its own network of academics, teacher trainers and other educational professionals to help it conduct research. As a result, the ENEF took part in a number of UNESCO-sponsored projects and organised conferences on behalf of UNESCO for which the ENEF was made a consultative body.⁷¹ From the start, however, the ENEF faced difficulty conforming to the expectations of UNESCO.

The first conference organised under the auspices of UNESCO took place in 1947. The First Cirencester Conference was devoted to the issue of 'Education and World Peace'. This was followed by publication of a report devoted to this theme by the ENEF committee and authored by, James Annand, the Secretary; Catherine Fletcher, at that time recently appointed Adviser on Teacher Training in West Africa; James Hemming from the AEF; and Ben Morris, then Chairman of the Management

⁶⁹ M. Geak, 'Nursery Schools, Parents and Teachers', *New Era* 38 (June 1957), p. 120.

⁷⁰ E. R. Boyce, 'The Good Infant School', *New Era* 34 (March 1953), p. 42; E. R. Boyce, 'The Good Infant School II', *New Era* 34 (June 1953), p. 103.

⁷¹ ENEF 6, 'ENEf Statement of Aims', 1964, p. 129; NA, ED121/429, 'Application for Grant'.

Committee at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.⁷² This conference contributed to the development of the ENEF's involvement with teacher training and its links with teacher training institutions. The Second Cirencester Conference was organised in 1949, to follow up the success of the first. The theme of this conference was 'Teachers and World Peace'.⁷³ As with the first, the second conference attracted a wide audience of educationists and those involved with teacher training who discussed at some length the issues facing educationists in the continuing reconstruction of education, in this case Catherine Fletcher and David Jordan. One problem for the ENEF, however, was that these only represented English universities and educational establishments. The other problem that the ENEF faced was that these projects and reports were confined to a small number of English educationists; very few schoolteachers were represented amongst those attending these events. Those present noted this and stated that the conclusions that were reached by the conference were also limited due to financial constraints and the fact the conference could only reflect English and mainly academic concerns.⁷⁴

The ENEF continued to be active undertaking projects and conferences for the NEF and UNESCO during the 1950s. In 1952, the ENEF organised, on behalf of UNESCO, a conference on 'Education and the Mental Health of Children in Europe'. This was followed by the 1953 regional conference for education, the theme of which was 'Aims and Prejudices in Education'.⁷⁵ The organising committees of these conferences revealed the broad range of academic representation that the English new educationists were able to attract.⁷⁶ In 1955, the ENEF organised the Inspectors of Education Conference at Chichester, under the auspices of UNESCO, at which

⁷² *The Teacher and World Peace: A Preliminary Survey* (London: NEF, 6 August 1948), p. 1.

⁷³ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 156.

⁷⁴ NEF (1948).

⁷⁵ 'English New Education Fellowship Secretary's Report 1952', *New Era* 34 (February 1953), p. 36.

⁷⁶ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 159.

Marjorie Hourd and Joseph Lauwerys addressed a variety of international delegates about the psychological problems connected to being inspectors in schools. This was followed in 1961 by a conference about the problems faced by adults communicating with adolescents led by Professor W. B. (Billy) Tibble. In 1962, a conference on 'Teachers and East–West Understanding' took place at the University of London Institute of Education, led by James Hemming. In 1963, he organised another conference for the ENEF, under the auspices of UNESCO, based upon the theme of science and world affairs with Sir Julian Huxley as a keynote speaker.⁷⁷ The ENEF, however, again faced the difficulty that it was only able to draw upon a narrow network of academics and educationists. These projects did not represent an international perspective, which it was clear that UNESCO was expecting from the NEF, but were only reflecting an English approach towards educational issues.⁷⁸ For the ENEF, this involvement ultimately drew it away from its primary task of involving more schoolteachers into the movement.⁷⁹

The ENEF committee, however, believed that it had contributed successfully toward UNESCO by undertaking a 'number of important educational projects'. It was claimed that the ENEF's reports on the teaching of human rights and about mental health formed the focus of the 1953 UNESCO conference on the education of the normal child in Europe.⁸⁰ Boyd and Rawson accepted this view and considered that the involvement of the new educationists with UNESCO fertilised its work.⁸¹ The work that the English new educationists took part in for UNESCO, however, was often not very productive for the ENEF itself.

⁷⁷ WEF V/270, 'Report on 10th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs'.

⁷⁸ WEF V/270, Annand to Maheu, 30 July 1959.

⁷⁹ ENEF 6, King to Betty (surname unknown), 18 November 1971.

⁸⁰ ENEF 6, 'Statement of Aims', undated, p. 129.

⁸¹ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 162.

The loss of funding from UNESCO and the termination of the NEF status as an NGO in 1964 was a major financial blow to the NEF and affected the finances of the ENEF to a lesser extent.⁸² The end of the relationship between the NEF and UNESCO and the crisis of confidence that this caused within the organisation ultimately spread to the ENEF. Henderson and Wallbridge both resigned as secretaries in quick succession between 1964 and 1965, specifically as a result of the problems they faced with the ENEF's finances and conflicts with the ENEF committee about the future of the organisation. This is explored in the next section.

After UNESCO: 1964–1966

The dilemma for the organisation during the 1960s was that, with its limited budget and the voluntary status of its committee and officers, it was unable to make an effective impact, leading to the complaint by the 1950s and 1960s that the ENEF had failed in its quest to gain any significant involvement with state education or teachers.⁸³ Three reasons for this were identified. Joseph Lauwerys considered that the ENEF had lost 'conviction' for its activities.⁸⁴ James Henderson believed it was due to the failure of the branch structure and the inability of the ENEF to promote interest in its activities in England. Henderson also argued that this was due to the dominance of the ENEF by the university teacher training departments and teacher training colleges, particularly the University of London Institute of Education.⁸⁵ His attempts to rid the ENEF of these links during his term as Secretary and promote the organisation more amongst teachers proved ultimately unsuccessful. This was due both to resistance by the committee to his changes, lack of sufficient funding to

⁸² ENEF 6, 'Memorandum to Council on Future Policy and Organization', 1967. The ENEF relied upon the funding it received from UNESCO for its projects such as Teachers and World Peace in 1948.

⁸³ ENEF 15, Levin to ENEF, 28 April 1977: 'I wonder if . . . the ENEF had any real impact on the state school system'.

⁸⁴ ENEF 6, Lauwerys to Henderson, 19 February 1964.

⁸⁵ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum' to the ENEF Committee, J. Henderson, 29 September 1965.

undertake the activities that he wanted, and Yvonne Moyse's vociferous criticism of his organisational skills and, in her opinion, seeming lack of concern for the financial realities facing the organisation.⁸⁶

James Wallbridge, the next Secretary, also believed that the only way to encourage schoolteachers to become members of the ENEF and for it to be seen to be more relevant to contemporary educational debates was to reduce the control of teacher training colleges and university academics over it. His attempts to do this also met much resistance from the committee and he too resigned his post as a result.⁸⁷ Yvonne Moyse, who took over the post after him, was much more pragmatic in her approach. She realised that the organisation did not have the funding to pursue grand projects and she believed that the links it possessed with key individuals in universities and teacher training colleges allowed the movement to survive. As a result, she ensured that she worked in close alliance with the committee and particularly with individuals such as Joseph Lauwerys whose advice she constantly sought. She also made sure that the organisation continued its close relationship with university education departments and teacher training colleges. This did not mean that Yvonne Moyse was not critical of the failure of the ENEF and NEF to gain support from teachers. She wrote that she was 'drawn to the conclusion that we are seeking to recruit a further bevy of professors ... and heads of training colleges. I thought that were out to get Bill Smith of Puddletown Secondary Modern ... [teachers] deal with living children not theories about them'.⁸⁸ Moyse was realistic enough, however, to accept that the organisation depended heavily for its survival upon the support of such training colleges and beviies of professors.

⁸⁶ ENEF 7, Moyse to Wallbridge, 1 December 1965.

⁸⁷ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum' to the ENEF Committee, J. Henderson, 28 September 1965.

⁸⁸ DC/JL, WEF Conferences, Moyse to Annand, 12 May 1961.

The ENEF gained much from its links to staff at universities and teacher training colleges. Figures such as Boyd, Clarke, Elvin, Hemming and Rawson contributed to the ENEF's ideology and activities after 1945.⁸⁹ It was through its links with educationists at universities and teacher training institutions that the new education as an ideology and the ENEF as a movement was sustained and promulgated. The dilemma for the movement was that the network that preserved it ultimately caused it to become a rarefied bastion of teacher trainers. By the later 1960s, the membership of the ENEF declined dramatically, from 800 members to only 400 by 1967.⁹⁰ The attempt to involve state schools and teachers in that sector that had been envisioned at the time of the early attacks on private schools in the 1940s had not been successful. The ENEF had replaced involvement with a few private progressive schools with involvement with a few teacher training colleges and universities at the expense of wider credibility. The ENEF's goal of significantly extending its network into the state school system was not possible because it was unable to successfully develop direct links with state schools and teachers. Unfortunately for the ENEF, the period after 1945 saw the creation of many new educational institutions such as teacher training colleges as well as active government involvement in education. All of this gave both academics and teachers many other professional forums for the implementation of their ideas. Ultimately this relegated the ENEF to a small-scale voluntary educational interest and discussion group. Involvement with universities and teacher training colleges, however, was only a small part of the ENEF's importance as a disseminator of ideas and the development of its network. The ENEF's journal the *New Era* became the primary method for the development and survival of English new educational ideas, although this only represented the

⁸⁹ Boyd and Rawson (1965), p. 191.

⁹⁰ ENEF 7, King to Annand, 7 February 1967.

contributions of the two places where the ENEF was successfully able to develop its network after 1945, teacher training colleges and junior schools.

CHAPTER SIX

The NEF's international network 1945–1966

Introduction

The NEF faced a series of challenges in its attempts to recreate its international structure after the Second World War. Before 1940, branches existed in Asia, Australasia, Europe and North America. By 1945, however, as a result of the war, the NEF's international organisation was in disarray. In Europe, many of the branches needed to be recreated in their entirety, the NEF having lost contact with its pre-war membership. These branches had been destroyed either for political reasons, as in Nazi Germany, or had been dispersed in the chaos that accompanied the outbreak of war. The NEF sought to overcome these problems in a variety of ways and these are examined in this chapter. The focus was upon expanding the NEF's links with a variety of other international organisations, both governmental and institutional. The organisation sought to attract a wider membership, representing a greater range of those involved with education. Also, in acknowledgement of the need for greater regional consultation, the NEF sought to work more closely with its national branches.

This chapter examines the international work of the NEF in terms of its ideology and structure after 1945. In the first section, the structure, membership, aims and work of the NEF IHQ in 1945 are explored in order to understand the situation that faced the IHQ at this time. In the second section, the work and activities of the IHQ after 1945 are examined. The third section considers the national branches of the NEF. This section is divided into two parts: the first with an examination of NEF branches in English-speaking and the second looking at non-English speaking countries. In the case of English-speaking countries, this involves an exploration of

the work of the NEF branches in Australia and Canada. Contrasting the work and progress of the NEF in these two countries reveals some of the reasons for the success or failure of the organisation in those regions. The non-English speaking national branches of the NEF in Asia and Europe are then examined. In the case of Asia, the focus is upon India, the only active NEF section in the region. In Europe, the sections in Belgium, Denmark, France and Germany are examined in detail, as they were the most prominent and vigorous NEF sections and reveal the diverse range of local conditions and problems faced by the NEF in non-English speaking regions. Finally, in the last section, the reasons and contributing factors for the relative success or failure of the NEF internationally are discussed.

The focus of this chapter as a whole is upon how the international structure developed and changed between 1944 and 1966. This study of the NEF's national sections seeks to explain what conditions were needed to produce successful and well-functioning organisations and also to understand, where the NEF sections failed, why this took place. The NEF sought to extend its importance and membership by expanding its national sections and its involvement with UNESCO. The ability of the NEF to draw together the differing needs of its sections and to cope with the changing educational and political climate after 1945 is explored in order to understand how far the NEF was able to involve itself with social and educational reforms. This chapter also considers the extent to which socially reforming agendas, such as the one promoted by the NEF, were rejected at an international level after the Second World War. The English branch, the ENEF, is not examined here but has already been explored in detail in chapters four and five.

The NEF IHQ in 1945

The NEF in 1945 still included in its membership a wide selection of international educators. The executive board in 1945 boasted such figures as Harold Rugg of Columbia University, New York, the educationist Jean Piaget, who was Professor of Experimental Psychology at the University of Geneva, and Dr Henri Wallon who was lecturer at the College de France in Paris. The founders of the NEF were still present: Beatrice Ensor in her position as Honorary President; Adolphe Férrière of the International Bureau of Education; Elizabeth Rotten of the Swiss Red Cross; and Amelie Hamaide of L'Ecole Nouvelle, in Brussels, Belgium. In addition to Carleton Washburne, Frank Redifer, President of the PEA and Carson Ryan, from the Carnegie Foundation represented the USA on the board.¹ Laurin Zilliacus, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia, New York, was Chairman. These figures brought with them both their experience and reputations, as well as, most importantly, links with other organisations and institutions. This was an important factor in allowing the international organisation to survive after 1945 as it brought a sense of reliability and respectability to the NEF that it otherwise would have lacked. These international connections also permitted the organisation to survive in the face of international hostility towards the NEF's more radical social ideals as they gave it a broad network of contacts upon which it could rely.

Many NEF committee members had been involved in the war effort and, as a result, were keen to use the NEF as a tool to aid in the reconstruction of education. Others were also involved with UNESCO. Washburne was Director of Educational Reorganisation in Italy for six years between 1943 and 1949 before becoming President of the NEF in 1949, a position he occupied until 1956. Joseph Lauwerys

¹ WEF 1/43, 'Members of Executive Board', 1937.

was Director of the Commission of Enquiry on Special Educational Problems, Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, from 1944–45 and, between 1945–47, was involved in the creation of UNESCO. Lionel Elvin, the President of the ENEF, was Director of UNESCO's Department of Education in Paris from 1950–56. Meetings were held irregularly, however. This necessitated the NEF relying heavily upon the staff and work of the IHQ at Park Crescent, London. The staff there consisted of only a few key figures, particularly, Clare Soper, who was a stalwart and tireless secretary for the organisation. She was the most important person in the IHQ making most of the day-to-day decisions.

The 1930s had been a period of expansion and growth for the NEF's international membership. The NEF had members in many parts of the world by then, ranging from Argentina to Turkey. As a result of this interest, new branches had been founded from the mid-1920s until the late 1930s showing that the NEF was attracting interest from many different parts of the globe.² The NEF adapted its committee structure in response to this. The committee at IHQ was composed of the executive board and the members who were co-opted to help run the NEF from day-to-day and it held its meetings at the headquarters in London. It was decided that in future the international council would appoint certain international members to the executive board to ensure, as far as possible, that it reflected the increasingly international nature of the organisation. Following from this international expansion, the NEF was able to hold regional conferences hosted in a variety of countries, for example, in Sweden in 1931, South Africa in 1934, Mexico and Japan in 1935, and Australia in 1937. The international network was thriving and expanding. The NEF, however, still sought to expand its membership beyond its strongholds in Britain and Europe. Of the

² D. Tewkesbury, 'New Directions in International Education', *Teachers College Record* 46(5) (1945), pp. 293–301.

10 regional conferences held between 1919 and the outbreak of war in 1939, the majority of these were in English-speaking countries; most of the rest were in stable, democratic European states.³

It was possible to join the NEF in two ways. As a World Fellow, the membership fee was sent directly to IHQ. This form of membership did not involve being active in a regional branch. The member received a letter and a list of conferences. This type of membership was mainly intended for those people who wanted to support the NEF but did not want to be active locally, or for those in places with no local branches. The full membership (£1 per annum)⁴, however, involved receiving a copy of the *New Era* or another local journal. It also allowed the members to use the IHQ's reference library in London. Finally, there were memberships for teacher organisations and teacher training institutions, which provided a subscription to the journal the *New Era*, taken up by, for example, the University of London Institute of Education and the National Union of Teachers.⁵

The NEF faced two main problems with its organisation. The NEF had a widely spread membership, but one that comprised only small numbers in several countries. Clare Soper stated that there were 17,000 members by 1949.⁶ Much of the NEF's work was done by volunteers and this naturally affected the progress of the organisation. The work and activities undertaken by regional sections varied according to the time and commitment that members were able to give. This also meant that those members occupying executive posts or sitting on committees might change often, even in more the stable groups. With the decline of the NEF's activity in the USA during the mid-1940s, however, the Australian branch, founded in 1937,

³ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953, p 8.

⁴ NA 83/E/52, 'Financial Statement', J. B. Annand, 30 September 1947.

⁵ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953, p. 7.

⁶ WEF V/271, 'NEF Notes', 1949.

gradually became the more important English-speaking region for the organisation. By the mid-1940s, the conferences of the NEF sections in Australia were rivalling those of the USA in numbers. The expansion of the Australian section is explored later in this chapter.

The NEF IHQ after 1945

There was much hope amongst its members that the NEF could make a positive international impact. The report on the 1945 Cirencester Conference stated that, in the past, the NEF had been almost entirely a middle-class organisation linked to private progressive schools. It acknowledged that many new educationists had been idealistic and ignorant of political reality and had been taken in by political extremists like the Nazis. It was also noted that, while many new educationists claimed to be socialists, educational opportunities at progressive schools were limited to those who could afford to send their children there. At the Cirencester Conference, it seemed that the first signs were now emerging of an understanding of the wider world and the current political situation. It was imperative, therefore, that the NEF attempted to create a coherent, unifying philosophy.⁷ The problem of the loss of contact with so many national sections by 1945 was also a serious issue that needed addressing. Clare Soper reported that, although the NEF could still be called a truly international organisation with '30 sections in 22 countries', this had declined from 'before the war . . . (when the NEF) had branches in 51 countries and 21 magazines in 17 languages'.⁸ The NEF defined its strengths in this way:

The main strength of the NEF lies in its personal resources. Its emphasis is and has always been, on people . . . it attracts a high proportion of thoughtful men and women, many of whom are in authoritative positions

⁷ WEF II/56, 'Australian Newsletter', January 1945.

⁸ WEF V/271, Soper to UNESCO, circa 1949.

and who are therefore able to influence the cause of education in their own country . . . widely distributed geographically, and in all educational fields.⁹

The presumption of the NEF and those English educationists involved with the organisation was that the world, in rebuilding education, would automatically turn to Britain for inspiration.¹⁰ This attitude towards reconstruction was not confined to the NEF. In an article in the *TES*, an anonymous correspondent commented that ‘Englishmen should realize that there are millions in Europe today who feel that we in this country will decide whether the way of life of western civilization will survive or persist.’ It was also suggested, in this article, that the reason Britain should lead the way was because it had successfully resisted the ‘disease of moral collapse’ to which Germany and Europe had succumbed.¹¹

It was important, therefore, to create an agenda, both within the NEF in Britain and in other countries, which would promote democracy and citizenship.¹² How far other countries would view the situation in this way was, of course, an entirely different matter. In fact, the situation was increasingly the reverse, with educationists in individual countries wanting to create education systems suitable for local conditions and not necessarily drawn from Britain. The NEF found this out at the 1953 Copenhagen Conference, when European and American educationists attacked the work of the President, Carleton Washburne. Washburne had been revered by the NEF for his experimental work in progressive education for many years. In fact, in the pages of the *TES*, the work of Carleton Washburne and his methods used in the Winnetka public school system was still receiving positive publicity, showing that

⁹ WEF V/279, ‘Memorandum’, circa 1959/1960.

¹⁰ The Moot, File 1, ‘Some Notes on English Educational Institutions’, F. Clarke, 21 August 1939.

¹¹ ‘Tasks in Germany’, *TES*, 3 January 1948, p. 9.

¹² ‘ENEF Conference’, *TES*, 10 January 1948, p. 22.

British educationists were not fully aware of changes in the educational and political climate.¹³

The IHQ was keen that the NEF should remain 'alive to developments in all spheres, psychological, sociological or political, which impinge on educational fields'.¹⁴ It also stated that its aims were to 'foresee the educational trends of the future, to plan activities, or take part in researches [sic] . . .'. As part of this the IHQ encouraged its committee members to be as active as possible by visiting the various national sections. James Hemming, who was on the NEF committee, toured South Africa, the Dutch section in Holland, the French-speaking Belgian section and the section in Victoria in Australia.¹⁵ Hemming used his visits to promote the ideas of Kees Boeke, the Dutch educationist. Peggy Volkov, the editor of the *New Era*, was also active, visiting Belgium, France and Italy. In 1951 alone, Annand visited the newly created German section, plus Denmark, Holland, Norway and Sweden.¹⁶ In Sweden, 50 members came to hear him speak about education. This was a punishing schedule, however, for only a few committee members to undertake and ultimately these members alone could not single-handedly revive or keep alive the international network.

The main problem for the NEF, however, was to stabilise its finances and to gain greater financial contributions from the national sections. There was some success in this quest. The increasingly successful Australian sections – New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria - had given generous donations to the IHQ. There was also a donation from the Danish Ministry of Education to the extent of 15,000 Krona. This had been through the work of the Danish section and showed that there

¹³ 'An American Experiment in Education', *TES*, 7 February 1948, p. 78.

¹⁴ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953, p. 3.

¹⁵ 'Aftermath of Occupation', *TES*, 24 January 1948, p. 53.

¹⁶ 'German University Life', *TES*, 31 January 1948, p. 64.

were still members in Europe who were actively supporting the IHQ.¹⁷ Close links existed between the NEF and Denmark.¹⁸ There was further financial good news for the NEF. The NEF became involved with UNESCO in 1948, as a result of the work of Clare Soper and Joseph Lauwerys, and received a regular grant in return for undertaking certain appointed projects and reports.¹⁹ By 1953 the NEF was receiving £200 per year from UNESCO.

The relationship with UNESCO was also profitable for the NEF in more than monetary terms. Close links were continued with UNESCO during these years. The NEF was regularly invited to be part of UNESCO conferences and seminars as well as being involved with UNESCO projects.²⁰ A representative from UNESCO sat on the NEF committees and Annand was regularly called to UNESCO meetings, acting as Chairman to the meeting in Paris where the Human Rights Enquiry was launched in 1951, as well as attending the meeting of NGOs in Paris and the Sixth General Assembly. In 1951, the NEF was part of the UNESCO-funded project entitled 'Attitude Change in Teachers', the aim of which was to 'study attitudes in teachers that disturb their understanding of human relationships'.²¹ The NEF had representatives at the Seminar on World Citizenship in 1952, and the Third Conference of NGO's in Paris in 1952, as well as at the opening of the Seventh General Assembly, and the Conference on the Contribution of Education to the Mental Health of Normal Children, both in the same year. In 1953 the NEF was invited to join the International Conference on the Role of Music in Education of Youth and Adults in Brussels and the joint UNESCO–International Bureau of

¹⁷ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953.

¹⁸ C. Ydesen, *Transfer, Translation, Trading – the International Influence on Examinations and School Psychological Testing in Danish Educational History 1920–1960* (Danish School of Education, University of Aarhus: unpublished paper, 2008).

¹⁹ WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 December 1946.

²⁰ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953.

²¹ WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', 1951, p. 3.

Education Conference on Public Education. The NEF fully supported UNESCO activities and was keen to be actively involved. For a small organisation like the NEF, invitations to these conferences were a useful forum for networking, exchange of ideas and publicity. The main problem was finding enough people who were able to attend the long list of conferences that NEF representatives were invited to. Clare Soper attempted to resolve this problem by writing to various committee members, but to little avail.²²

The links with UNESCO were seen as a natural extension of the NEF's aim of creating international unity through the new education. UNESCO, while interested in education, was not purely an educational organisation and had a wide remit. The NEF believed that, due to its international concerns, it had itself been a forerunner of the United Nations and was concerned that UNESCO did not offer it the respect that it felt its senior status deserved. The NEF reminded UNESCO that: 'The NEF was one of the bodies represented at the preliminary meetings that brought UNESCO into being'.²³

The NEF outlined its involvement with UNESCO in a pamphlet written between 1959 and 1960:

In the period 1952–58 it has been associated with UNESCO in the following ways: - (i) at Unesco's request the NEF drew up a list of books which could be serve as guides to school administrators and teachers in the construction of primary school curricula and timetables . . . could be useful to . . . teacher training . . . with relevance to South East Asia. (ii) NEF was represented at the following specialised meetings convened by Unesco . . . study of methods of education for international understanding . . . conference on the education and mental health of children in Europe . . . conference on the place of music in the education of youth . . .

²² WEF 1/43, 'HQ Report', August 1953, p. 7.

²³ WEF V/279, 'Memorandum on the New Education Fellowship', undated.

teaching of foreign languages . . . mutual appreciation of eastern and western cultural values . . . education and mental health of children in Europe . . .²⁴

UNESCO, however, was more interested in the financial position of the NEF. It made continued requests for more hard data concerning the finances, membership and activities of the NEF. UNESCO sought to work with genuinely internationally active organisations and wished to know whether the NEF's finances matched its grandiose statement of aims. The NEF replied to one such request that:

The financial resources of the NEF are relatively weak. Few of its members have material wealth. The better its national sections are the greater their need for funds for their own work and the less they can spare for the maintenance of International Headquarters. Nevertheless, of the £1000 now required annually . . . Headquarters can count in an average year on about £750 from section dues . . . and approximately £500 from members . . . Grants £500 . . . others £500 . . . Unesco subvention £700. This leaves a gap of about £1000 and it is to help fill it that the NEF asks Unesco to increase its annual subvention . . . to the equivalent of 4500 US dollars.²⁵

There were fears, however, amongst some quarters that the relationship with UNESCO was not totally healthy for the NEF. Yvonne Moyse, the NEF secretary complained that ' . . . we put Unesco first and worked within its limits, which meant that with our very small staff [and] headquarters of the time . . . [our attention] was devoted to Unesco work and our own work had to take second place . . .'²⁶ This was a genuine dilemma for the organisation. While undertaking the bureaucracy that being an NGO for UNESCO required, the NEF was unable to expend energy on creating its own projects or affiliations or indeed in developing its own goals. On the other hand,

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ WEF V/272, Moyse to Kingue, UNESCO, 27 February 1970.

however, the NEF did not possess the finances to develop its own agenda and pursue its own activities.

The affiliation with UNESCO did not, in fact, help extend the NEF's membership. The money from UNESCO was enough to complete UNESCO projects but little was left to fund other NEF concerns. As a result, Annand complained that in spite of the links with UNESCO there had been:

No geographical extension of our organisation since Jan 1959 . . . the most effective means of extending our work is through visits by representatives of International Headquarters. Unfortunately financial stringency makes these very rare occurrences

He continued that:

The main factors limiting the expansion of our work are lack of finances and difficulty ensuring that those who wish to found a branch of the Fellowship in a new area are doing it for furthering the aims and objectives of the NEF rather than for their own personal motives.²⁷

The NEF faced the problem, however, that it was not involved actively enough in the international educational community to satisfy UNESCO. The NEF advertised itself to UNESCO on the basis of its international network, but was unable to back these sentiments up with actions. In 1961, UNESCO invited the NEF to a conference on Education and Economic and Social Development in Chile. Twice in 1960 the NEF was invited to conferences on educational matters. On each occasion James Annand was unable to find any committee members who were able or willing to attend and had to refuse the invitations. The NEF rarely had the money or the support to involve itself with international education on a practical basis. This situation did not reflect well upon its international credentials. The dilemma for the NEF was that, while it focused on UNESCO concerns, its survival was ensured but, ultimately, it

²⁷ WEF V/270, Annand to Maheu, 30 July 1959.

was not able to focus upon other activities. In addition to this, a shortage of both money and a lack of time by committee members meant the NEF was not completing UNESCO projects to the best of its abilities either. This was clearly an unsustainable position and did not satisfy UNESCO.²⁸

In 1965, UNESCO sought to end its relationship with the NEF,²⁹ which it no longer considered a useful partner. A letter was written to the committee explaining that the NEF's status as an NGO was to be terminated. This action provoked a flourish of angry correspondence both between NEF officers and to UNESCO. No reason was given for this change of situation, but it was clearly allied to the continuing requests for information about the activities and membership of the NEF. The NEF was convinced that this was a mistake that UNESCO would rectify. Moyse wrote to the President of the NEF, K. G. Saiyidain that:

I received a charming but completely wet letter from Prof. Ben Morris bemoaning Unesco's action but more or less accepting the situation. . . . it would be criminal to let the NEF lapse when it is needed so badly and showing every sign of revival . . . if there is no NEF 'from where shall we get inspiration'?³⁰

Moyse demanded that the NEF try to fight the situation by making representations to UNESCO. She believed that the main problem faced by the NEF was that certain members who were in a situation to help with this had only attended one or two UNESCO committee meetings in many years. As part of the campaign, letters were directed to the NEF's overseas membership in places as diverse as Japan, the USA, Italy, France and Germany. But the NEF was too dispersed to marshal the support it needed to fight this battle. An approach to the Director of Education at UNESCO

²⁸ WEF II/91, Annand to Moyse, 20 September 1970.

²⁹ WEF V/270, Henderson Lebar, Division of Relationships with International Organisations, UNESCO, 6 December 1963.

³⁰ WEF V/274, Moyse to Saiyidain, 12 October 1965.

about the situation only received the vague response that, ‘Dr Gagliotti was not very hopeful of changing the resolution as “policy shifts from time to time”’. The NEF failed to prevent this withdrawal of funds and all financial support for the NEF was removed, leaving Miss Moyse to bemoan the fact that,

... the sudden cessation of the Unesco subvention has put us in a very difficult position, more particularly as over the years we have given the Unesco’s work priority over our own.³¹

The rejection by UNESCO sidelined the NEF further. It also reflected the fact that regardless of the NEF’s beliefs about its importance, it could not rely upon any other organisations for its own existence. The situation also confirmed that UNESCO no longer believed that the NEF had enough international importance to maintain its status as an NGO and the decline in its status meant that it was no longer an organisation with a relevant international agenda. Without UNESCO, the NEF was merely one of many organisations seeking to make itself heard in the field of education. The NEF had relied heavily upon UNESCO activities to give it the focus and direction that it needed. After UNESCO terminated its relationship with the NEF, the NEF found difficulty developing its own ideology or purpose. In terms of organisational theory, the NEF had failed to establish an independent identity for itself that could survive without its relationship with UNESCO or to another organisation.³² The NEF was, therefore, now only able to survive through such relationships and not as an organisation in its own right. As a result of this situation the NEF IHQ now sought to rely more heavily upon its international network for support and finances. This network and the relationship between the international membership and the IHQ is explored in the next section.

³¹ WEF V/276, Moyse to Dijkstra, 23 June 1967.

³² Boin and Christensen (2008), p. 271–97.

The national sections of the NEF after 1945

English-speaking countries: Australia and Canada

The NEF's international network was rebuilt after 1945. Although many of the sections that had formerly been in existence had ceased to exist, they had been replaced by others. There had, however, been some important changes. The Australian NEF membership was now particularly active and was becoming a reliable source of support for the organisation. This growth reflected a growing interest among teachers there in educational issues.³³ New Zealand was part of this region, but for most of the post-war period did not have enough members to form an active section and did not take part in regional activities. The sections in Australia united under a Federal structure that helped coordinate some of their activities, but not their finances. The success of the Australian Federal NEF is contrasted with the situation that faced the NEF in Canada, another English-speaking Commonwealth country, that had previously been an active part of the NEF's network but where the NEF found that the situation after 1945 was less fruitful for the movement. Australia provides an example of a part of the new educational network that was successfully able to legitimise itself and to achieve a level of independence and success that the IHQ was unable to replicate for the whole organisation.

The main problem for the IHQ and a key reason for the evolution of the Australian NEF into an almost independent organisation was that communication between the IHQ and the Australian new educationists was slow and intermittent, often due to the inability of those on the NEF committee to devote themselves more consistently to international matters.³⁴ The NEF was rarely properly informed about

³³ 'New South Wales – Inquiry into Secondary Education', *TES*, 10 December 1954, p. 1149.

³⁴ DC/JL, WEF Conferences, 'Lauwerys to Best', undated, circa 1946, apologising for failure to respond to his correspondence concerning organisation of the conference.

or aware of the educational and political situation in Australia or the views of its membership there. In line with the NEF policy on section committees being made up purely of unpaid volunteers, positions within the Australian sections rotated regularly and membership changed frequently. As a result of this, communication problems with the IHQ were common. It was the existence of the Federal Council, containing in its committee a selection of hard-working and long serving members, that was able to keep these disparate sections – with their often transient membership – alive. The key, therefore, to the long-term success of the NEF in Australia was the underlying continuity of its Federal Council members.

The situation in the 1940s, however, gave the impression that, in fact, the Australian Federal Council was not willing to cooperate with the IHQ. The reason, as usual for the IHQ, concerned the NEF's lack of funds. It was hoped by the NEF that the Australians would be able to increase their financial contributions to the IHQ. The reason for demanding this from the Australian group was because, of all the national groups, the Australians had been the most financially successful.

The 1946 Australian Conference had been well attended; attracting a wide international audience, from England as well as the USA.³⁵ It had been held in association with the Australian Council for Education Research and representatives from British groups as diverse as the Association of University Teachers, the Nursery Schools Association and the NUT had attended. It had made a profit of £2000 for the Australian Federal Council that was keen to keep the funds it had earned for the necessary expenses of its own groups.³⁶ These Australian NEF's attempts to make immediate and useful organisational links were in direct contrast with the IHQ's flirtation with the radical social ideologies of Brameld and Zilliagus at the same time

³⁵ DC/JL, WEF Conferences, 'Short Biographical Sketches of Delegates to the International Conference of Education to be held in all Australian States September to October 1946'.

³⁶ NA DO 35/1202, 'Australian New Education Fellowship', 1946.

in England. As a result of its work, the Australian NEF gained legitimacy and support leading to the development of a more stable financial situation. The Australians did not welcome, therefore, a request from the IHQ to send the proceeds of their conference to support the NEF in London.

Keith Cunningham, the President of the Australian NEF, who was also a member of the Australian Council for Educational Research, wrote to Joseph Lauwerys opposing a further request for money from the IHQ. Having already given £1000 to the IHQ after the very successful conference of 1937, the Australian Federal Council felt that this time it should keep all of the current proceeds for itself.³⁷ The letter continued that the Australian Federal Council did not see why it should be solely responsible for funding the IHQ, when, in fact, other national groups did not pay what they should to the NEF. An anonymous memo was added to the letter by the IHQ stating that the Australians were being 'tight'.³⁸ This early confrontation showed the IHQ that the Australians did not feel that they were in any sense merely an inferior group of the NEF receiving and obeying instructions from London, but would act upon their own needs where necessary. This action also established the precedent that Australian NEF did not view itself as a subservient organisation to the IHQ in London but as an equal. This allowed the Australian branch to be more autonomous and successful but also reveals the reason why the IHQ faced difficulty developing and maintaining a legitimate identity for the international NEF as an organisation. The NEF IHQ was not developing relationships with its national branches after 1945 based upon a clear and respected authority. The NEF's main aim was to draw the international NEF together and disputes with its international membership, such as the one described above with the Australian NEF, only made it less relevant as a

³⁷ WEF II/49, Cunningham to Lauwerys, 9 December 1947.

³⁸ WEF II/49, 'Memorandum', circa 1947, anonymous.

figurehead. This ultimately hindered the development of a strong and cooperative international NEF network that would have allowed the organisation to compete more successfully with other international organisations competing in similar areas. This situation had an immediate and negative impact upon the NEF in the form of a lack of sufficient funding at an important time in its attempts to gain international legitimacy. Joseph Lauwerys wrote to Cunningham that if the IHQ did not receive any further funds then it would have to close by Christmas 1947. This gloomy prediction did not come true, but the lack of financial stability further reduced the ability of the IHQ to act as a strong and definitive international focus for the movement.³⁹

Membership numbers in the sections varied, but it was clear by the 1950s that all the international sections were facing problems attracting the same level of interest that they had done in the 1940s. This was a theme reflected across much of the NEF's international network. During the 1950s, even the membership of the Australian sections had reduced dramatically. In Queensland, membership had fallen to 48 members by 1954. The Secretary there complained that since 1952 membership was static and non-renewing.⁴⁰ This was in direct contrast to 1948 when the membership of the section had been 200. There was continued decline in numbers for the Australian NEF. The Brisbane section had collapsed altogether by 1960 and attempts were made to revive it.⁴¹ Some of the sections, however, were able to retain their membership, for example, New South Wales.⁴²

³⁹ WEF II/49, Lauwerys to Cunningham, 29 August 1947.

⁴⁰ WEF II/51, Damur to Annand, 14 December 1955.

⁴¹ WEF II/55, Annand to Silcock, 28 January 1960.

⁴² WEF II/57, Best to Annand, 5 July 1957. The South Australia section was the most successful, managing to hold onto 100 members by 1962. The Victorian Section had 132 members in 1955, remaining stable for most of this period; WEF II/64, Grierson to Lauwerys, 12 December 1955. In 1956 the section was still able to arrange a successful AGM and conference. Western Australia organised a day conference in the same year and New South Wales had a summer school in creative activities, showing that the sections were still able to attract interest: 'News and Notes', *New Era* 37 (January 1956), p. 141.

The situation worsened during the 1960s. By 1962, however, it was reported that the Victorian section is 'pretty bad . . . but no signs of absolute death'.⁴³ The judgement of the Victorian Secretary about how bad things actually were, however, seems exaggerated when viewed with the fact that the membership of the group was still around 150. The Honorary Secretary of the Victorian section in 1962, Elizabeth Stephenson, reported that she had 'no constructive comments for the problems of IHQ' adding that 'we are . . . poorly organised and small' and that 'we cannot interest influential bodies or persons'. She added that most of the memberships were graduates of teacher training colleges and that they had no official relationships with national organisations.⁴⁴ The situation seems to have been no different for the other sections in Australia by this time which also found similar problems gaining any national support or widening their membership.

This situation compared unfavourably with the immediate aftermath of the Second World War in which the Australian sections attracted much interest and were able to organise conferences attended by people in their hundreds. In 1944, a conference on teacher training in Brisbane attracted 5000 people.⁴⁵ In 1946, there had been another successful conference.⁴⁶ In 1949, South Australia held their Jubilee Conference in Adelaide to which 2100 people came to the opening session and it was estimated that 9000 visited over the four days that it was open. This function also included visits from the Mayor of Adelaide, the Premier of the State and the Minister of Education. Press and radio journalists were present. Best was complaining that the follow up conference in 1950 came too soon and he was disappointed with the fact

⁴³ WEF II/65, Scott to Annand, 5 June 1962.

⁴⁴ WEF II/65, Stephenson to Annand, 30 May 1962.

⁴⁵ WEF II/56, Best to Annand, 22 March 1944.

⁴⁶ NA ED 121/304, 'New Education Fellowship: Australia Conference', 1946.

that only 1000 attended in Sydney and 2100 in Adelaide.⁴⁷ Whereas the NEF in Australia was able to gain such support during the 1940s, by the 1950s and 1960s there was much less official interest in the organisation. This reflected the fact that, in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, there was a much greater interest in the reconstruction of education and an apparent willingness for governmental bodies to fund a range of organisations, such as the NEF, but this support declined during the 1950s. While the NEF in Australia remained active throughout this period, it was no longer possible by the later 1950s to attract the numbers to conferences that had been achieved at the start of that decade.⁴⁸ Attendance at conferences, however, did not necessarily translate into longer-term membership or support of the NEF.

The IHQ continued to request extra funding from the Australian sections, much to their continued annoyance. The main reason for this was that, for most of this period, the Australian sections were viewed as the most financially successful. In 1952, Victoria donated £159 but, in 1954, in response to a request for more money Cynthia Sandell, the International Secretary, stated that the section was living on its capital alone and had no money to spare.⁴⁹ In 1958, in response to a request for money to fund 'research on conference techniques', the Victorian committee wrote back:

. . . why is the NEF HQ only carrying out the project . . . if IHQ [executive board and guiding committee] is to carry out successful experimental work over and above its function as a 'receiving, co-ordination and distributing centre of the international group of NEF sections' there needs to be a closer liaison and integration between the centre and the sections.⁵⁰

The Australian sections did not appreciate being viewed as a source of ready cash for whatever projects IHQ decided to undertake. Their point was a valid one and the

⁴⁷ WEF II/57, Best to Annand, 16 October 1951.

⁴⁸ WEF II/57, Best to Moyse, 11 June 1965.

⁴⁹ WEF II/57, Sandell to Annand, 8 June 1954.

⁵⁰ WEF II/64, Wynn to Annand, 4 March 1958.

source of their main anger with IHQ. IHQ continually claimed poverty and asked for more money, yet continued to involve itself with a variety of projects.

Another problem was with poor organisation and constantly changing membership and secretaries: the receipt of fees were often late or non-existent. The Victorian section wrote in 1960 apologising for only just now sending the capitation fees and subscriptions dues from 1956 and 1957.⁵¹ There was also evidence that the IHQ did not understand the situation in Australia. Lauwerys wanted to combine the Australian group into an Asian one. This was strongly opposed by the Federal Council who wrote that it was hard enough to unite such a disparate country as Australia let alone try to make links with non-English speaking countries in Asia. They commented that 'Incidentally there is not, so far as we know, any section at present operating in New Zealand, nor in Indonesia, nor in Malaya.'⁵²

The fates of the PEA and the AEF, the American sections of the NEF have been examined in chapter four. Canada, however, was one section that might have conformed to the same model as that in Australia. There were similar conditions; Australia and Canada were both English-speaking countries, still parts of the Commonwealth and with links to Britain. Canada had been relatively active and sections had existed there prior to the 1940s. By the later 1940s, however, most of this activity had ceased, apart from a branch in Toronto. There was much interest expressed in starting groups, but very little was done. In 1952, a NEF member there wrote to Joseph Annand inquiring about the possibility of starting a group in Edmonton. Annand responded that, unfortunately, the NEF had so few members in that region that it would be very difficult to do so.⁵³ He concluded that the main reason for this lack of interest in Canada was because 'Canada looks to the US for

⁵¹ WEF II/65, Perl to Annand, June 1960.

⁵² WEF II/65, Cunningham to Lauwerys, 3 September 1960.

⁵³ WEF II/74, Annand to Phibbs, 31 March 1952.

inspiration not England' and at that time the new educational movement in the USA had effectively collapsed with the closure of the AEF in 1955. The previously active Toronto section had itself already closed due to lack of interest in 1949. In 1951, a member expressed interest in restarting the branch but Annand responded that records only showed three members in Toronto.⁵⁴ The collapse of the Toronto branch had been dramatic, in 1945 it still had 134 members, but it was clear by 1949 that most of these chose not to renew their membership. The Secretary, Miss D. Campbell, gave no specific reason for this, but it appeared that the NEF was unable to compete against other educational interests and organisations.

The total collapse of the NEF in Canada was a blow to the movement there as it brought to an end NEF involvement in North America. In Australia, the NEF had survived in spite of the large distances between the sections and members. One reason for this survival was that the Australian regional governments had been much more willing to support the NEF. Another reason lay in the fact that, unlike Canada, Australia had a strong central leadership to support the movement. With the collapse of the movement in the USA, the Canadian section failed also and there was very little that the NEF IHQ was able to do, from its base in London, to prevent this.

Non-English-speaking countries

Asia

The NEF had difficulty achieving success in Asia. Linguistic and cultural problems defeated attempts to encourage groups in that region. Prior to 1945, India, however, had been the exception although, after 1945, most of the activity centred on a few key individuals, such as Rabindranath Tagore. But as he, along with other Indian educationists, became more involved with their own educational concerns, the

⁵⁴ WEF II/74, Annand to Trembley, 11 April 1951.

movement there suffered. Tagore found less and less time for the NEF and focused more upon his progressive school. C. T. Vyas the President of the Indian group was increasingly involved with his own progressive school, called fittingly the New Era. The key figure in the post-war Indian NEF was K. G. Saiyidain, who became the President of the NEF in 1949.

Saiyidain was a prominent figure in the educational establishment and an educational advisor to the Indian government. He used these links to try and ensure that he gained funding and support for the organisation. In 1949, shortly after becoming President, he secured a £20 donation from the Bombay Government as well as a list of wealthy Indians who were sympathetic to the movement and might be willing to contribute.⁵⁵ This was in response to the IHQ asking for funding and threatening that without it the NEF might have to close (as it had done with the Australians in 1947). Saiyidain was potentially in an ideal position to help the NEF. He was Educational Advisor to Bombay in 1949, rising to advisor to the Central Government of India in Delhi in 1950. Finally he became the Senior Educational Secretary to the government in 1957. He was instrumental in organising and gaining support for the Delhi conference in 1960. He also helped to run the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration sponsored by UNESCO in New Delhi.⁵⁶ He was a Muslim, but took a very broad view of spirituality and accepted the truth of many religions. This reflected itself in his more philosophical approach to the new education.

⁵⁵ WEF II/120, Saiyidain to Soper, 19 May 1949. Also Saiyidain to Soper, 29 April 1949.

⁵⁶ WEF II/120, 'Tribute to K. G. Saiyidain' by Joseph Lauwerys, 1971. The National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) originated as the UNESCO Regional Centre for Educational Planners and Administration in 1961–62. In 1965, it was renamed as Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. On the completion of the 10-year contract with UNESCO, the Government of India took it over and renamed it as National Staff College for Educational Planners and Administrators in 1970. Subsequently, it was renamed as NIEPA in 1979.

Unfortunately, however, having contacts with someone as well placed as Saiyidain was not enough to ensure that the NEF flourished in India. Saiyidain became increasingly involved with his own activities and work and was unable to give the organisation the attention that it needed. Groups were sustained in Assam, Bengal and Bombay. The Assam group was thanked for having gained a donation from the Government of India of 5000 rupees for the IHQ in 1955.⁵⁷ The Bombay section was the most active, particularly at the time that Saiyidain was present in that region, holding an All-Indian Educational Conference in 1951. This changed, however, as the 1950s progressed. The IHQ lost contact with the regional sections of the NEF in India and, towards the end of the 1950s, even Saiyidain was not responding to its communications. This led to a number of embarrassing incidents for the IHQ. In 1957, the IHQ received a 'distressed letter' from the Australia section which had been trying to arrange a conference tour but had received no reply from Saiyidain.⁵⁸ Another incident occurred in 1964 when it the Danes attempted to invite Saiyidain to the Askov conference in Denmark in 1965, but, receiving no response, the Danish group invited the Danish Minister of Education instead.⁵⁹

James Henderson expressed his concerns at the continued lack of communication from both Saiyidain and the Indian sections. He wrote that 'your own silence is now quite understandable as you have been moving around the world' but that 'the Indian sections do not communicate with IHQ'. The excuse from one Indian section was that all correspondence had 'gone astray over 2 years'. He reminded Saiyidain that '2 sections – France and Germany have been dissolved and India will be too'. Attempts were made to recreate the NEF branches in India. In 1956, it was reported that efforts were being made to affiliate 18 separate groups to the NEF again

⁵⁷ WEF II/122, Annand to Gadgil, 17 November 1955.

⁵⁸ WEF II/120, Annand to Saiyidain, 19 March 1957.

⁵⁹ WEF II/120, Henderson to Saiyidain, 11 December 1964.

(with a single constitution) and to have a conference at Jaipur to encourage interest. Unfortunately, these endeavours did not last long enough to create an Indian revival as most of the groups were too small or became rapidly inactive.⁶⁰ Saiyidain died in 1971 and this confirmed the end of the movement as an active force in India.

The problem for the NEF was that it was unable to make headway beyond a select group of English-speaking, Anglophile educationists. The movement in India experienced decline for most of the period after 1945, in spite of having an Indian as president of the NEF. Saiyidain's lack of communication with the organisation also confirmed the difficulty of having a committee structure that involved such distances and paucity of communication. In addition to this, the NEF in India had never made enough progress in encouraging membership. Unlike Australia (that faced the same geographical difficulties as India, in terms of size and distance of the membership), India was not one cultural unit. There were regional differences within India, in particular in language and culture. Australia as a region was entirely English-speaking and held stronger cultural affiliations with Britain. After Indian independence in 1947, the NEF was unable to expand its network in India beyond its historical attachment to mystics and educationists such as Tagore, Vyas or Saiyidain.

Europe

The membership of the European NEF varied from country to country. It did consist mainly, however, of academics and those involved with teacher training institutions. In Belgium, in particular, the difficulties of uniting the French-speaking and Flemish-speaking sections of the NEF proved insurmountable and the membership remained strictly separated.⁶¹ Annand, the NEF secretary corresponded entirely in English, often receiving responses in poor English, from the Flemish section, or in very good

⁶⁰ 'Notes on Indian Section', *New Era* 37 (December 1956), p. 20.

⁶¹ WEF II/69, Wens to Annand, 12 April 1952.

English, from Henri Biscompte, the President of the French-speaking section and a lecturer at the University of Brussels.⁶² Communication necessitated, therefore, that the officers of European groups or sections were fluent in English. This restricted positions on committees and officers of the organisation to such people. This also explained to a certain extent, therefore, why the NEF was more successful in countries where more people understood English as a second language, for example, Holland, or where the NEF was able to attract interest from Anglophile academics and teachers in countries where this was not the case. Active official involvement in educational matters was a precursor to an active NEF membership. Interest in the NEF in Belgium, for example, increased after 1951 when the government there proceeded with reforms designed to make the education system more centralised and debates concerning the nature of this education system ensued.⁶³ The fact that Scandinavia cooperated as an unofficial region also strengthened the movement there.⁶⁴

NEF sections were able to survive best where they had official support and links with governmental organisations, as was the case in Finland, Norway and Sweden. The sections in Norway and Sweden joined together in order to create a Scandinavian region. They were helped by the fact that they gained the support of their governments for progressivism and the new education and, on occasions, from those involved with the education departments of those countries or in education in other important positions. The Secretary of the Norwegian section, Otto Grenness, was the Director of the Norwegian Ministry of Education. In Sweden, the section president, Rektor G. Mattsson, was appointed Secretary to the Swedish Carnegie Corporation Committee on Examinations, a position which he used to promote the NEF. Talks were also

⁶² WEF II/69, Annand to Wens, 18 November 1958.

⁶³ Our Correspondent, 'Belgian Subsidies', *TES*, 31 December 1951 p. 1208.

⁶⁴ 'The present State of Education in Norway', *TES*, 7 February 1948, p. 81.

organised with speakers including A. S. Neill and Laurin Zilliacus.⁶⁵ Neill's talk in Norway in 1943 attracted 600 people and showed the vitality of the sections there. Finland benefited from this vitality and its links with Zilliacus, who was Finnish, and was, therefore, also very active as a group. As with the Swedish branch, the Finns could count a Minister of Education amongst their committee members. The Carnegie Corporation granted the President of the Finnish branch US\$3000 to help undertake educational research in Finland. The most active branches and sections, therefore, were those that also had official recognition and support. After 1945, the Scandinavian section quickly became active again and gained the approval of the NEF committee for its cooperative and socially aware approach to educational issues.⁶⁶ There was support for the Danish section from the Danish Ministry of Education which gave 15,000 Krona in support the section.

Regional or local cooperation of sections was an important factor in their survival. In Belgium, Henri Biscompte, who was an active participant and leader of the organisation, led the NEF there. He ensured, more importantly, that all major publications of the NEF were translated into French, and his section produced its own journal. Biscompte also ensured that the NEF diary of activities was translated into French for his members.⁶⁷ In Denmark, the President Torben Gregersen did the same thing and ensured that the journal was translated into Danish. This was clearly one reason for the continued success of both the Belgian and Danish sections. The IHQ, however, did not seem to understand this, continuing to press Biscompte to buy and distribute publications from the NEF book club, all of them in English.⁶⁸ Another key

⁶⁵ WEF 1/43, 'Norwegian Section Report 1943'. In Norway, the President and Vice Presidents (Mrs Anna Sethne and Mr Johan Hertzberg) were school principals in Oslo: Scandinavia Region – Norway and Sweden.

⁶⁶ 'Country and People II – Norway and Sweden', *TES*, 29 October 1954, p. 1010.

⁶⁷ WEF II/70, Biscompte to Annand, 11 May 1953.

⁶⁸ WEF II/70, Biscompte to Annand, 17 August 1953.

reason for the success of the Belgian section lay in the wide variety of activities that Biscompte involved himself and the organisation in. He was active in organising an exhibition of Decroly, a founder member of the NEF and important Belgian educationists, shortly after his death in 1952.⁶⁹ Unfortunately, Annand was unable to come himself or to send a representative but appreciated the hard work that Biscompte was undertaking.⁷⁰ Ironically, Annand was a native of Brussels himself, but his correspondence was always in English while Biscompte always corresponded entirely in French. Biscompte also arranged a variety of other meetings and conferences. In 1953, he suggested that Brussels should be host to a meeting of section representatives and he was also keen to be involved with the Askov conference in the same year.⁷¹

The publication of a regional journal in the local language, instead of merely promoting the *New Era* in English, was a good indicator of a successful section.⁷² Through such journals new educational ideas could be promoted and the NEF could be shown as being not merely a foreign organisation based in London, but genuinely concerned with local issues. The Belgian section's journal, the *Revue Internationale de Psycho-pedagogie* was helpful in establishing the sound credentials of the movement there, publishing details of the NEF's work and activities, as well as showcasing the ideas of Biscompte and others.⁷³ There was also a range of other publications including the regular *Bulletin* of the Belgian section. Members of the section produced a wide variety of articles about the new education in the regular journal of the section *L'école des Parents*, with topics as diverse as the new education

⁶⁹ M. Depaepe, F. Simon and A. Van Gorp, 'The Canonization of Ovide Decroly as a "Saint" in the New Education', *History of Education Quarterly* 43(2) (2003), pp. 224–9.

⁷⁰ WEF II/70, Annand to Huisman, 5 November 1952.

⁷¹ WEF II 70, Annand to Biscompte, 11 December 1953.

⁷² WEF II 70, Lauwerys to Biscompte, 4 January 1954.

⁷³ *Revue Internationale de Psycho-pedagogie*.

and civilisation, preschool education, and the principles of the new education.⁷⁴ The journals and publications of the section continued in one form or another for much of the period after 1945. The section also held regular meetings most months of each year.⁷⁵ The Danish section also produced its own journal, *Det Paedagogiska Selskab* which was a factor in the success of that section.⁷⁶

Involving teachers, particularly new teachers, was also a factor in establishing a successful section. The Danish section benefited from an interest in education, particularly from student teachers.⁷⁷ It was reported that of the 3400 students on courses 1700 were student or new teachers.⁷⁸ It was also calculated that the section had as members 10 per cent of all the teachers in Denmark. In 1953 a successful International Conference was held at Askov in Denmark attracting nearly 200 members and in 1954 a conference on Mental Hygiene and Education attracted 100 members.⁷⁹ More often, membership of sections was made up of educationists who did not always successfully understand the needs of teachers and those working in schools and colleges in their own countries. The Danish section recruitment success was held up as an example of what the NEF sought to achieve across its entire membership.

The combination of a clear strong leadership, often led by one or more persons over a long period of time, coupled with interest from educationists more widely was a common factor amongst those NEF sections and groups that were the most

⁷⁴ B. Malen, 'L'education nouvelle et la civilisation', *L'école des Parents* 6 (April 1961); A. Claret (Inspectrice Cantonale, Séance du 7 November 1948) 'Congres Mondiale de l'education prescolaire', *L'école des parents* 4; H. Lorrent (Directeur General Honoraire de l'enseignement normal), 'Coordination de l'enseignement secondaire pratique et de la culture generale', *L'école des parents* 3 (13 April 1947); H. Frere (Prefet Honoraire de l'athenee du centre), 'Les principes de l'education nouvelle', *L'école des parents* 1 (27 May 1945).

⁷⁵ WEF II/73, 'Programme of Events 1945-46' and '1957-1958'.

⁷⁶ WEF II/91, 'Danish Section Report', 1952-53.

⁷⁷ 'Danish Section News and Notes', *New Era* 34 (December 1953), p. 209.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ TG 7336 Gregersen to Annand, 24 June 1953. TG 7336 Annand to Rasmussen, 26 June 1953. TG 7336 'Conference Programme International Summer Conference, Askov, Denmark', 1953.

successful. More particularly, strong and respected leadership of a section would encourage more educationists and organisations, both governmental and otherwise, to seek to be affiliated with them.⁸⁰ The French-speaking Belgian section was successful, however, because it sought to adapt itself and its activities. It was found, during the 1950s, that there was less interest in lectures and that attendance was dropping so the section decided to stop organising them.⁸¹ The most successful sections were those that adapted themselves to local conditions and needs.

In analysing the reasons for the success of the Danish section, Gregersen suggested that it was not so much to do with supporting NEF aims. He claimed that an adverse effect of gaining such a large membership had ironically meant that members felt less attached to the international NEF. The main reason for growth lay in the interest in education of teachers and students. By 1956, the section could boast 3950 members and there was great interest in the free lectures arranged.⁸² Gregersen had tried to create what he called more of a 'club' or social aspect to the Danish section with social meetings and gatherings, but had found that the members were only interested in attending meetings where they learnt about teaching methods and education.⁸³ From this point of view the Danish section differed from the Belgian section in the composition of its membership. The Belgian section included mostly better established higher-ranking educationists and educational administrators; the Danish section gained membership mostly from teachers and students. The most important reason for success of both groups was the stable leadership and the ability of the leadership to adapt to local concerns and conditions.

⁸⁰ 'News and Notes', *New Era* 37 (May 1956), p. 140.

⁸¹ 'Belgian Section News and Notes', *New Era* 36 (May 1955), pp. 88-9.

⁸² 'Danish Section News and Notes', *New Era* 37 (June 1956), p. 164.

⁸³ TG 7336 'Report on the activity of *Danmarks socialpedagogiske forening*', 1952-1953.

International membership

The organisation of NEF groups depended, however, too greatly upon the motivation or not of a few key figures. If the people who were running these groups either resigned or chose not to be active, then very quickly the whole group would fail. In Denmark by 1965, this formerly active group was also having problems, Torben Gregersen was in hospital with ill health and IHQ complained that they no longer received any communication regarding the group there.⁸⁴ This confirms Jane Abiss's (1998) study of the problems facing the NEF in New Zealand which she also considers relied too heavily upon a small number of individuals and, when these were unable to devote time to their work with the NEF, the organisation there rapidly declined.⁸⁵ The other problem seems to have been one of communication in general, including the fact that in countries where there was not an active enough section to be producing journals in its own language, members were expected to be satisfied with receiving the *New Era* in English. This fact limited the possible extent of the NEF's membership in those areas.

The NEF did not become extinct, as the committee constantly feared would happen. Its membership, however, declined significantly during the post-war period. Before 1945, the NEF membership had been 21,000. By 1945, this had reduced to 17,000 members.⁸⁶ By 1964, the membership had declined to 14,000.⁸⁷ Ultimately, the whole plethora of international organisations that were created after 1945, many of them NGOs with UNESCO and most with their own journals and activities, undermined the importance and relevance of the NEF. The international political situation after 1945 made it more difficult for the NEF to promote its ideas. In

⁸⁴ WEF II/99, Moyse to Erdelt, 9 February 1965.

⁸⁵ Abiss (1998), p. 90.

⁸⁶ WEF V/271, Soper to UNESCO, undated.

⁸⁷ WEF II/168, Moyse to Dr Miel, 11 August 1964.

particular, it had difficulty convincing governments and educationists that these ideas were useful to the reconstruction of education. The NEF faced problems as the international political climate turned against small-scale organisations with radical agendas.

The NEF prospered mostly in those countries with strong liberal educational or social values and with governments interested in supporting minority groups and organisations, for example, the Scandinavian countries and Holland. In Scandinavia and Holland, the groups actively maintained strong links with British new educationists.⁸⁸ Where there was hostility, as in the USA towards the mid-1940s, or apathy to the movement, as in France, it was unable to flourish. The NEF was mostly successful in countries that had strong historical links to Britain, for example, in Australia after 1937, in Canada, in India and in the USA. But it was becoming clear by the mid-1940s that these historical links alone were insufficient to inspire loyalty. The NEF could not rely upon the goodwill of educationists due merely to either links with prominent educationists in those countries or for purely historical reasons.

The NEF was most successful in developing international sections where there was strong leadership and official support. This was particularly the case for Australia. There, the country's regional identity was one of the reasons for the increasing and continuing strength of the movement during the 1940s and after. In Scandinavia, the unofficial region created by the sections there also served the same purpose. Canada never had a regional president and this was perhaps one reason why, after the decline of the NEF in the USA, the Canadian sections began to fail. Australia and India also presented the challenge to the NEF of developing sections in regions in which there were large distances between different groups and areas, as well as, in

⁸⁸ WEF 1/43, 'Report of Dutch Section', circa 1937.

India, the problem of diverse languages and dialects. In the case of India, however, there were too few links with a small number of key educationists which meant that, after 1945, the NEF faced difficulty surviving there when these educationists were no longer able to give the movement their time or energy.

The NEF diary of 1952 recorded that the history of the NEF had been 'founding' in 1921, 'expansion' during the later 1920s, 'recognition' in the 1930s, 'setback' during the '[Nazi] fascist interregnum and war' during the 1930s and 1940s, 'survival' in the 1940s and then 'resurgence' since 1946.⁸⁹ This was a fair judgement of the path and progress of the NEF during these years. There was not, however, resurgence in all parts of the international network. The sections in North America, both Canada and the USA, collapsed during this period. The previous strongholds of France and Germany proved difficult to revive after 1945. The sections in India also began to fail. The NEF found it difficult to adapt its loose and non-authoritarian structure to compete effectively with the political issues that were raised. In the USA, there was hostility towards a foreign, socially suspect organisation; in India, the NEF represented a movement with a too narrow range of contacts.

Harold Rugg correctly identified that the main problem for the NEF after 1945 in the USA was that 'public education . . . has already taken over most of the life and program of the active child-centered schools'.⁹⁰ This was the case in many European countries after this date. Rugg was correct in his assessment. The NEF was no longer the main way for international educationists to share ideas and to network with each other, there existed many other ways to do this, for example, UNESCO. In addition to this, the vigorous interest of national governments in education took from the NEF much of its purpose beyond being one of many educational interest groups. The NEF

⁸⁹ WEF 11/171, 'NEF Diary', 1952.

⁹⁰ WEF II/175, 'Memorandum', Harold Rugg, 20 September 1955.

sections were most successful where they accepted this fact and sought to work with other organisations, as it sought to do so with UNESCO.

Frank Redifer, however, identified another problem that the NEF faced in expanding its international network during this period. He remarked that: 'it is obvious that the widespread use of the phrase "progressive education" seems to have fallen into general disrepute . . . From the statements made by some educators, one might infer that progressive education exerted an evil influence on . . . education.'⁹¹ The sheer variety and lack of consensus about what a progressive or new educational approach consisted of, while being a spur for experimentation in the 1920s and 1930s, was now a liability for the movement. Redifer continued to ask 'where are conferences attended by thousands, the magazines . . .?' In addition to this the NEF was no longer able to flirt with differing political ideals while claiming to possess none. In the increasingly politically divided post-1945 world, all actions and statements made by non-affiliated international organisations such as the NEF and its members were seen as representations of the political views of the organisation by suspicious governments. It was not possible to express the social and educational opinions that the NEF did without being viewed as making a political statement. In one sense the NEF had served its purpose and could no longer be an organisation that could network the most prominent educators of its day, be a forum of educational experimentation, and also seek to play a part in the development of international educational systems. The NEF was most successful after 1945 when it adapted its loose and flexible structure to allow individual sections the autonomy to attract the interest of local educationists and teachers by adapting its ideology and activity to local needs. Debates concerning the relationship of the IHQ with national sections

⁹¹ F. L. Redifer, 'Progressive Education Today', in *Education in Society: Readings*, ed. B. N. Meltzer (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell).

continued for much of this period. The resulting confusion over the role of the IHQ within the international organisation hindered the development of an effective international network. At a joint meeting of the NEF Executive Board and Council in 1960 international members complained about the perceived lack of support from the IHQ and claimed to want it to be more than merely a 'clearing house of information' but to 'formulate world policies'.⁹² This, however, is exactly what the international delegates claimed not to want in 1953. The international members at the 1960 meeting were reminded that the IHQ could never fulfil its potential to guide the organisation without sufficient funding from national sections which was not forthcoming. In 1962, however, in response to an appeal for financial support from the IHQ, the Danish Section replied that, 'We cannot undertake to run neither the I.H.Q nor the 'New Era', and we do not know which section might be able to do it ... As for the 'New Era', we think that it must be run from an English-speaking country.'⁹³ Ultimately, the NEF was more successful when it was not affiliated to organisations such as UNESCO that merely sought to impose their own agendas. The difference between an organisation such as UNESCO and the NEF was that the NEF, as a voluntary organisation, had more freedom to adapt itself to the concerns of its membership which an officially funded organisation could not do.

⁹² DC/JL, WEF Conferences, 'Report on discussions by Executive Board and Council', circa 1960.

⁹³ TG 7336 Gregersen to Annand, 7 April 1962.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion: The contribution of the NEF to the reconstruction of education after 1945

Introduction

This chapter examines the overarching themes that guided the path of the NEF between 1945 and 1966: revival, consolidation and decline. It also explores the importance of the NEF's secretaries, Clare Soper, James Annand and Yvonne Moyses in shaping the organisation. This chapter seeks to put the NEF into a national and international context as well as to establish the NEF within the context of organisational theory as a theoretical framework that explains the organisation's development and progress during these years. The NEF underwent three stages of development after 1945. These stages are linked to the terms of the most important post-1945 secretaries of the organisation, Clare Soper, James Annand and Yvonne Moyses, who each played an important part in the progress of the NEF and its work during this period. The first stage of the NEF's development saw the revival of the NEF and its developing links with teacher training colleges between 1945 and 1951, during which time Clare Soper was Secretary. The second stage took place between 1951 and 1963, during which time James Annand was Secretary. This was accompanied by the growth of the international NEF and a change in the nature of the relationship between the IHQ and its national sections, particularly with the ENEF, that deeply impacted the nature and ideology of the organisation. During this time the NEF's involvement with UNESCO also had a significant impact upon the organisation. Finally, the last stage of the NEF's development after 1963, during which time Yvonne Moyses was Secretary, saw the decline of the NEF's membership

and the organisation facing a growing plethora of problems that threatened its survival.

Various theories have been advanced to explain the progress of the NEF immediately after 1945. Ash (1969) and Punch (1977) both argue that the NEF began to fail as an educational organisation when it abandoned the new education as an ideology.¹ In particular, they believe that it was the NEF's rejection of a child-centred ideology and of its links to private progressive schools that undermined it and its ability to be effective after 1945.² This theory, however, does not address the central issue that becomes evident when examining the NEF and its ideology. This concerns the nature of the new education as an ideology and the extent to which this could ever be considered truly child-centred. The new education had never represented an entirely child-centred approach to education. The new education, as envisioned by Beatrice Ensor, included a highly spiritual purpose that did not fit well with a totally child-centred progressivism. Joseph Lauwerys argued that earlier interpretations of the new education and child development had been mistaken. He wrote:

In the past we had what I now call the 'little flower' concept of the child. We supposed that the child was a total dynamic entity which we had to nourish and water, then it would grow to its full glory . . . [now we believe that] relationships [are] . . . the source of growth – the individual in dynamic interplay with the environment, material and social.³

For Ensor, as a theosophist, the new education had always involved releasing the divine spark she believed lay at the centre of all human beings, but which had not yet been corrupted in children, rather than developing a scientific or fully child-centred approach to education. Carleton Washburne had, however, sought to develop a properly scientific and measurable approach to educating children. Even at this early

¹ Punch (1977), p. 158.

² Ash (1969), p. 49.

³ ENEF 6, Lauwerys to Henderson, 19 February 1964.

stage, therefore, there were rival visions of the new education within the NEF and it was clear that there was nothing approaching a single set of ideals that could be called the new education. Both the spiritual and psychological visions of the new education were rejected during the 1940s as a result of the perceived failure of the movement to oppose fascism during the 1930s, particularly by educationists such as Theodore Brameld and Laurin Zilliacus. At first, this approach focused upon democracy and citizenship, followed by social justice. It was these divisions at the heart of the NEF that hindered its development into a coherent or strong movement.

The new education, therefore, represented nothing more than the goals of the NEF itself and had no life beyond the organisation. It was an umbrella term for the myriad of interests with which the NEF involved itself as an organisation during this period. In 1966, the NEF rejected the use of the term 'new education' in its name and decided to change this to the World Education Fellowship to reflect the organisation's desire to be considered more international. Joseph Lauwerys argued that this was a necessary move, as the term 'new education' no longer possessed any clear and identifiable meaning. He also considered that the term suggested that the NEF sought to promote a child-centred ideology, which, in his opinion, it did not. It is not possible, therefore, to argue that the decline of a child-centred new educational ideology during this period was a reason for the problems facing the NEF after 1945. The term 'new education' had meant many things to many different educationists since the inception of the NEF in 1921. Attempts to differentiate the new education from the NEF, as Ash and Punch seek to, are, therefore, artificial and do not advance understanding of the evolution of the organisation itself during this period. The issues facing the NEF as an organisation, however, categorise the sorts of problems faced by such similar organisations after 1945. The NEF, as a mostly voluntary and non-

professional body, is a good example of such an organisation that had to struggle to survive at a time of the creation of government-funded groups in the field of education, or non-governmental but political single-issue organisations.

The NEF, as an organisation, faced continuing difficulty pulling together the divergent strands that sought to pull it apart. It sought to be an autonomous and freethinking organisation, but could not exist without the funding, and thus the ideological restrictions imposed upon it by UNESCO and various teacher training colleges and universities, upon whom it relied for support, both financial and ideological. The NEF also faced structural problems. It sought to be a loose federation of national sections guided by the IHQ and possessed a committee that only met infrequently. This did not, however, give the organisation the structure needed to promote its views nor to create a clear sense of identity or focus. Without these clear links, national sections did not respect the views of nor seek to work with the IHQ except at a very basic level.

The evolution of the NEF during this period can be partially explained in terms of organisational theory, which states that for an organisation to be successful it needs to possess a clear vision and strong leadership. The NEF only had a weak structure at IHQ and committee level that was unable to hold it together effectively. Nor did it have strong leadership but only a succession of presidents and committee members who were unable to take part in the day-to-day running of the NEF and who were out of touch with the organisation for lengthy periods of time. This was due both to the fact that the presidents were international – Carleton Washburne in the USA and Saiyidain in India – as well as the fact that both the presidents and the other committee members had many other professional avenues in which to express themselves and to which they devoted time at the expense of supporting the NEF. As

a result of this, most of the NEF's officers and committee members were unable to build for the NEF sufficient legitimacy to bind it together and to promote its development as a successful and independent organisation.

1945–1950: revival

The first phase of the NEF's post-war work was categorised by a revival in the organisation under the presidency of Carleton Washburne from 1947 to 1951. Selleck (1972) argues that by 1945 the NEF as an organisation and its ambitions were effectively destroyed by its policy of appeasement towards fascism and the subsequent fascist destruction of its European network.⁴ This is an overly negative assessment of the NEF. In fact, the collapse of the NEF's network and of confidence in its ideology during the late 1930s had allowed it to be revitalised thanks to the involvement with it of American educationists during the 1940s. The NEF during this time was buoyed by the enthusiasm of reconstructing society after the ravages of the Second World War. During the early 1940s, the NEF continued to maintain strong links with certain educationists at various American universities and educational institutions. Brameld was at the University of Minnesota, Washburne and Zilliagus were both at the Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York.⁵ In addition to this, the international conference with the highest attendance that the NEF organised during this period was in Ann Arbor, Michigan in 1941, where educational and political ideology was actively debated.⁶ The agenda discussed at Ann Arbor was one that the NEF adopted enthusiastically after 1945.⁷ The American educationist William Kotschnig led the debate in arguing that the purpose of the new education should not merely be to allow the child to develop free from interference and ideology, as had

⁴ Selleck (1972), p. 25.

⁵ Zilliagus, 'Our Part in the World War', *New Era* 21 (January 1940), pp. 22–6.

⁶ WEF III/235, 'Ann Arbor, Michigan Conference Report', 6–12 July 1941.

⁷ WEF V/279, 'Memorandum on the New Education', 1958.

been the consensus in the 1920s, but that each generation needed to be schooled in democratic ideals.⁸

The facts that the NEF possessed an American President and that it had organised a successful conference in Ann Arbor caused the committee to believe that the USA could be relied upon as a major source of support, both financially and ideologically.⁹ This seemed to be confirmed by the fact that the American educationist Theodore Brameld was prominent in developing those ideas expressed at Ann Arbor concerning citizenship and democracy even further at the 1947 Cirencester Conference. His statements about rebuilding society and education and focusing upon the needs of those who needed the help of society to enjoy the same access to education as others, for example, the working-class in particular, were well received by the mostly British audience at the conference.¹⁰

The training of teachers to be more socially aware and to encourage greater social equality emerged as an important part of these discussions. The NEF and ENEF committees considered that a key method to achieve this was to become actively involved in the training of teachers. This was encouraged by the urgent demand for new teachers to fill the profession and the setting up of emergency teacher training colleges in Britain, for example, institutions such as the Borthwick Teacher Training College in London and the Bradford and Bingley Training College in Yorkshire as well as the publication of the 1944 McNair Report and its discussion of teacher training.¹¹ There was also demand for a more practical focus upon teacher training and the rejection of a more experimental approach, such as the one taken by the NEF prior to 1940. The *TES* of February 1941 had stated that: ‘No demand was more

⁸ Kotschnig (1943), pp. 252–3.

⁹ WEF III/235, ‘Ann Arbor, Michigan Conference Report’, 6–12 July 1941.

¹⁰ WEF III/203, ‘Memorandum’, T. Brameld., 1947, p. 2.

¹¹ D. Crook, ‘Universities, Teacher Training and the Legacy of the McNair Report 1944–1949’, *History of Education* 24 (2) (1995), pp. 231–41.

instant or unanimous at the student conference at Leeds . . . that the training of teachers should be brought more into touch with the reality of the outside world . . . too much time was given to experimental psychology.’¹²

Brameld was convinced that the main task of the NEF should be to unite world teachers and be an active part of their training. ‘I should like to see the NEF make itself an organization for educating teachers as much as children,’ he wrote.¹³ He also believed that the NEF should seek to expand its links and not keep itself aloof as it had done during the 1920s. Brameld argued that the NEF had been freed by the fact that much of its ideology was now accepted and put into practice and that education was now being taken under government control to the extent that organisations such as the NEF were now irrelevant in this process. The NEF, he believed, needed to find another avenue to express its ideas and that bodies such as UNESCO were better placed to implement the educational and social vision that the NEF wished to see put into practice.¹⁴ This was very much in line with the sentiments that Laurin Zilliacus was also seeking to promote and, in the same year, he insisted that the NEF should become an organisation that educated teachers and become involved with teacher training.¹⁵

Unfortunately for the NEF, however, problems concerning personality conflicts between the NEF committee and American educationists, as well as an incomprehension amongst the NEF membership concerning the rapidly changing educational outlook of the Americans, caused a large rift between the two movements and, by the time of the closure of the AEF in 1955, it was obvious that the USA would

¹² ‘Comment in Brief Training of Teachers’ *TES*, 1 February 1941, p. 45.

¹³ WEF III/203, ‘Memorandum’, T. Brameld, 1947, p. 2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁵ WEF I/II, ‘Memorandum on the Post-War Policy of the NEF’, Laurin Zilliacus, 1947.

not be a source of support for the NEF.¹⁶ The resignation of Washburne as President in 1951 due to his inability to give any further time to the work of the NEF also marked this break with the USA. This, however, was not the enormous blow to the movement that it might have been had it possessed a more centralised structure. The day-to-day business of the NEF was controlled by the secretaries at the IHQ in London who interpreted policy decisions, sought donors and made links with international educationists and educational institutions.¹⁷

Susan Semel in Semel and Sadnovik (1999) and Arthur Zilversmit (1993) argue that in the USA there was a rejection of radical educational and progressive ideology after 1945.¹⁸ Carleton Washburne, a leading light in the NEF during the 1930s and 1940s, found it increasingly difficult to continue with his experimental educational activities at the schools in Winnetka, USA. The evidence for this, provided by an analysis of the NEF's activities in the USA, both through the PEA and later through the AEF, reveals that this was in fact the case. There was an increasing suspicion of organisations that possessed an international agenda and which sought to promote more radical educational ideologies.¹⁹ The PEA closed in 1944 and the AEF, the NEF IHQ's attempt to revive its membership there, also failed in 1955. David Bell has taken this argument further and has claimed that this marked the end of interest in ideology of any sort after 1945. This he believes was caused by a negative reaction to the political turmoil of the years prior to 1945 and the rise of fascism and Marxism.²⁰ The failure of the new educational section in the USA caused major difficulty for the NEF which had relied heavily upon funding from there as well as viewing it as a

¹⁶ WEF I/2, Zilliacus to Soper, 18 May 1946. This provoked the response from Clare Soper that 'are they (the Americans) showing signs of breaking away from the NEF?'

¹⁷ ENEF 16, 'Note on Secretaries', undated.

¹⁸ Zilversmit (1993), p. 109.

¹⁹ Semel and Sadovnik (1999), 'Introduction', S. Semel, p. 14.

²⁰ Bell (1988), p. 285.

source of ideological experimentation. The evidence of the NEF, however, does not support the claim that this was mirrored internationally. The NEF, in Britain, in fact, became more ideological and politicised in reaction to its failure to be so in the 1930s. The ENEF also adopted a political agenda that included the abolition of private schooling as early as 1943, an idea which echoed the 1944 Fleming Report published in Britain.²¹ The enthusiasm with which the NEF greeted the ideas of Brameld and Zilliacus concerning social and educational reconstruction shows that the new educationists had not rejected radical ideological solutions to educational and social problems. It does seem evident, however, that, certainly in the USA, there was such a rejection of radical ideology and, as a result, a rejection of the NEF's international and social agenda. To a certain extent, Bell can be said to be partially correct in his assessment that there was an end to ideology during this period. In the NEF's own case, however, this was only a rejection of its pre-war ideals – namely the new education – and the development of a more pragmatic approach to ideology based upon its goals as an organisation, rather than a rejection of ideology.

By 1951, however, the situation was not totally bleak. At least in Britain and to some extent in the USA, thanks to the tireless work of the Secretary, Clare Soper, who resigned in the same year as Washburne, the organisation had increased its network to encompass a number of teacher trainers and educationists, ranging from the University of Delhi to the University of London Institute of Education.²² The final aim of the NEF was one that had its roots in its foundation in 1921 under Beatrice Ensor, as a forum of discussion for educationists who wished to explore and exchange ideas about the 'renewal of the content and method' of education in their own

²¹ 'Social Aims of Post-war Education', *New Era* 24 (January 1943), p. 9.

²² WEF I/37, 'Committee List of 1944'.

countries.²³ The attempt by Brameld and Zilliacus to force a single purpose and ideology upon the NEF was ultimately a failure but the original purpose of the organisation endured. This was the time when the NEF faced the biggest threat to its existence and the most uncertainty.

DiMaggio and Powell (1991) argue that, in accordance with organisational theory, organisations that do not succeed in establishing respect and support, financial or ideological, in their terms 'legitimation', will seek to do so by creating closer ties with larger more successful organisations that have similar agendas. During the 1940s, as a result of the continuing problems facing the NEF and threatening its survival, it sought legitimation by involving itself with external organisations, in the way that DiMaggio and Powell have described. The NEF did this by strengthening its links with teacher training colleges, universities and UNESCO. The NEF, therefore, sacrificed much of its independence and ability to focus upon its own internal affairs in order to achieve this legitimation of its work as an organisation, in the way that DiMaggio and Powell have outlined occurs under such conditions.²⁴

1951–1963: consolidation

Professor K. Saiyidain became the President of the NEF in 1951 and his presidency marked the attempt by the organisation to increase its international network. James Annand became NEF Secretary in the same year and, in 1953, Secretary of the ENEF. Whereas Clare Soper had worked tirelessly for the organisation, seeking to continue the legacy of Beatrice Ensor, to maintain the NEF as an elite educational forum of the new education, Annand realised that difficult decisions had to be made. His time as Secretary marked the gradual merging of the NEF and ENEF as well as the first

²³ WEF V/279, 'Memorandum on the NEF', 1965.

²⁴ DiMaggio and Powell (1991), pp. 1–38.

attempts to address the problem of the non-renewing membership of the NEF.²⁵ The international movement was the main basis of hope during this period. The NEF now sought to rebuild the international network that had existed prior to 1940 but which had been destroyed during the Second World War. It attempted to do this in a number of ways. First it worked to ensure that its network extended to include international organisations such as UNESCO through which it would be able to promote its own agenda. Secondly it focused upon attracting international educators to its membership from a variety of countries and, thirdly, it tried to make sure that it re-established, sustained and expanded a network of national groups or sections in different countries.

It was clear, however, shortly after 1945, that the USA was no longer the source of funding and ideology that it had been previously. It was also evident that the European network that Beatrice Ensor had relied upon so heavily in the 1920s was also no longer closely concerned with the NEF. European countries now sought to rebuild their education systems to suit their own particular needs and circumstances, contradicting Brameld's and Zilliacus' beliefs that the NEF should attempt to promote a unifying social agenda. The NEF's agenda of the post-1945 period put it at odds, therefore, with the changes taking place in attitudes towards education in both Europe and the USA. Educationists in the USA increasingly shunned contact with foreign organisations, seeking instead to find domestic solutions to educational and social issues and rejecting the NEF's more radical social agenda. European educationists did not object to the NEF's social agenda but to its Anglo-centric ideology and presumption that it was possible to recreate European educational systems using British solutions.

²⁵ ENEF 6, 'Memorandum', J. Annand, 10 December 1963.

The European network survived more successfully than the American network and, in some cases – most notably, Belgium, Denmark and Holland – actually flourished, mainly due to possessing either governmental support, as in the case of Belgium and Holland, or strong leadership, in the form of Torben Gregersen in Denmark. The Danish section declined rapidly, however, when Gregersen became ill and was unable to communicate with the IHQ or to organise activities: this demonstrates the problem of relying on only a few key individuals.²⁶ In this case, the bullying tactics of the IHQ to attempt to force a response from Gregersen also revealed the limited range of the NEF's international connections even in apparently successful sections.²⁷

Elsewhere in Europe the new educational network was weak and inconsistent, defying all attempts to create a stable and enduring series of national sections.²⁸ The main difficulty for the NEF was that an organisation based in London, with a mostly English-speaking committee structure, and with all of its official meetings and publications being in English, found it hard to appear relevant to the educational situation in France or Germany. Only when certain individuals such as Gregersen sought to create documents in the language of the country concerned and interpreted new educational ideas more liberally to cover local educational conditions was the NEF successful. The only other place that the NEF found success was ultimately within English-speaking countries that were part of Britain's commonwealth; in particular, Australia possessed an active and lively membership. Ironically, however, the Australian membership was perhaps the most independent and often most critical of the IHQ in London and frequently only paid lip service to the instructions or communications of the IHQ.

²⁶ WEF V/270, Henderson to Gregersen, 14 December 1962; 30 January 1963; 28 March 1963.

²⁷ WEF III/209, 'Report of Copenhagen Conference', 1953, p. 2.

²⁸ WEF III/208, 'Report of Copenhagen Conference, Dr Gregersen', July 1953.

The main focus of the NEF's international ambitions had fallen upon its membership as an NGO with UNESCO from 1948 to 1964. This provided the NEF with a source of both funding and inspiration during this period. The NEF's claim to have been an active part of UNESCO needs to be viewed with caution, however. During this period, the NEF was often unable to send representatives to UNESCO conferences due to both a lack of funding and non-availability of committee members. This meant that the NEF had much difficulty fulfilling its obligations to UNESCO in return for its subvention. The conferences and projects that were undertaken under UNESCO auspices, however, while not permitting the NEF the liberty of creating its own agenda, did allow the organisation to be an active part of the international educational and social reconstruction during this time. The NEF was also fortunate to possess a membership that encompassed many eminent and well-connected educationists who were involved with British universities and UNESCO, as well as standing on the committee of the NEF.²⁹

The NEF also displayed at this point another key feature of organisational theory as forwarded by Haunschild and Miner (1997), based upon DiMaggio and Powell (1983). During the 1950s and early 1960s, the NEF, faced with financial uncertainty and competition with a variety of interest groups, sought to emulate the ideology of a more successful organisation. In the terminology of Haunschild and Miner, this is called 'mimesis'.³⁰ In the NEF's case this meant that the organisation adapted the ideas and work of UNESCO into its own ideology and activities to the

²⁹ WEF V 270, Henderson to Lebar, Division of Relationships with International Organisations UNESCO, 6 December 1963.

³⁰ Haunschild and Miner (1997).

point where the NEF's primary source of legitimation was almost entirely via UNESCO, and to a lesser extent teacher training colleges and universities.³¹

There are, however, limitations to the application of organisational theory to the NEF. The NEF was a voluntary organisation which relied, on the whole, upon donations from limited sources and faced regular problems due to lack of funding. The NEF also relied heavily upon a small number of individuals who maintained its organisation and activities. The NEF, therefore, faced more extreme vagaries and sudden changes to its financial situation and membership during this period, for example the loss of the UNESCO subvention and the collapse of its membership in the USA with the closure of the AEF, than organisational theory is fully able to take into account. Organisational theory presumes a more gradual and structured evolution of an organisation.

Network theory provides a further explanation for the problems that faced the NEF. The NEF developed an informal international network that concentrated upon only a few individuals who shared its social and educational agenda in the way described by Fuchs (2007). This network consisted almost entirely of English-speaking individuals who worked at universities, teacher training institutions or within educational administration. The failure of the NEF to expand its international membership successfully beyond such individuals, especially in non-English speaking countries, meant that the organisation was unable to gain the more important international role that it sought.

1963–1966: decline

Ultimately, Annand was unable to solve the problem of the declining membership or to broaden the NEF's network beyond the universities and teacher training colleges

³¹ P. J. DiMaggio and W. W. Powell, 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', *American Sociological Review* 48 (1983), pp. 147–60.

into schools. Yvonne Moyse took over the post in 1963 and accepted that the future of the organisation was not to be as a progenitor of educational ideas. With the ending of the relationship between the NEF and UNESCO in 1964 and the continued perilous state of the organisation's finances, she realised that the only sure way of surviving was to take advantage of the links with the teacher training colleges and universities. She also found increasing difficulty in keeping alive the last vestiges of the NEF's international network.³²

Between 1964 and 1966, the NEF committee, however, still sought to regain the international status lost with the ending of the relationship with UNESCO as an NGO by involving itself in a variety of international projects and conferences. In 1965, the world conference took place in Askov, Denmark, in a purposeful attempt to revive the enthusiasm of the conference in Askov in 1952. Both the 1966 and 1969 conferences took place in England, 'Shaping the Future' and 'Authority or Participation' being the themes respectively.³³ These were attempts to consider the future of the new education and to attempt to link into the counter-cultural movement of the 1960s by taking up the concerns that disaffected teenagers had with society. It was at the 1966 conference that the decision was taken by the committee, based upon a vote by those attending, to replace the word 'new' with 'world' and rename the organisation the World Education Fellowship in an attempt to shed what was now considered to be an outdated and misunderstood educational ideology that did not belong to the 1960s. It was felt that the term 'new education' no longer reflected the broader focus of the organisation's activities beyond progressive education.³⁴ The objections of Catherine Fletcher to this change and her wish to see the word 'new' kept were recorded but

³² WEF II/99, Moyse to Erdelt, 9 February 1965.

³³ WEF III/22, 'Shaping the Future – New Educational Thinking', 'Report on 1966 Chichester Conference 1966'.

³⁴ WEF V/276, 'Report on Discussion Concerning Change of Name', Chichester Conference 1966.

dismissed.³⁵ This name change, however, marked the total rejection of the new education as an ideology.

The NEF faced two problems by 1966. First, financially the situation for the NEF IHQ was stable but not improving. However, the NEF's international conferences did still manage to be self-financing. It was estimated that the 1966 Chichester conference needed around 200 participants to break even. The attendance, however, for a supposedly international conference revealed the second problem facing the IHQ. Most of those present came from England (77), with only 40 coming from other, mostly English-speaking countries.³⁶ The NEF, therefore, faced the serious problem of being an Anglo-centric organisation based in London and representing mainly English ideas. This problem was one that it never found a satisfactory solution for. The reasons for this Anglo-centricity were twofold. First the IHQ had become entrenched within mainly English universities where it had a stable and secure network of affiliations. This had strengthened because the international situation had not always been favourable to NEF activities and ideas after 1945. The political situation after 1945 meant that individual countries were no longer seeking to import English ideas to solve their own educational and social problems but were attempting to formulate home-grown solutions that were more relevant to the issues that they faced.

Three further problems faced the NEF in its quest to create a successful international network. The 1966 conference revealed two of these dilemmas. First, the NEF's lack of focus upon education revealed a loss of confidence in the purpose of the organisation. Wyatt Rawson wished to see the NEF concentrate upon the need for personal fulfilment. He argued that children should be encouraged to work in 'small

³⁵ WEF III/226, 'Report of Catherine Fletcher's Comments in the Open Forums', Chichester Conference 1966.

³⁶ WEF III/226, 'Chichester Conference Progress Report', June 1966.

groups' and that they should be educated on a 'voluntary basis' at a time of their choosing. His desire was to bring the NEF back into a more distinctly new educational ethos.³⁷ Rawson was the only participant who wished to focus on this topic, however. The agenda for the conference that was drawn up by the working party took as its themes 'The discovery of the Depth Dimension in Personality', 'Development in Evolution Theory', 'Urbanisation and Population Growth' and 'Nuclear Energy in War and Peace'.³⁸ There were criticisms of the conference and the path of the NEF made by members present. One member, Dr Entwistle, stated that the NEF needed to focus upon educational research if it sought to be taken more seriously, rather than focusing on vague statements of belief. Other members argued that the NEF was too inward-looking and was no longer an effective educational organisation.³⁹ Secondly, it was also at the 1966 Chichester Conference that the *New Era's* poor financial situation was revealed. The ENEF, it was stated, would be funding an extra 3d per issue in order to keep the journal in publication. This confirmed the total domination of the IHQ and the NEF by the ENEF and its reliance upon it for funding by this time. This was a problem that the NEF did not effectively overcome. A letter written in 1972 showed that this problem was still a concern stating that: 'The new editors are trying to reinforce the policy of not allowing the English scene to dominate a journal whose circulation abroad they hope to promote . . .'.⁴⁰ Equally, there was difficulty within England concerning the ENEF and its control of the NEF. Raymond King wrote that 'we want to get away from the idea that the ENEF is run solely from

³⁷ WEF III/226, 'Working Party for Chichester 1966', 10 December 1965.

³⁸ WEF III/226, 'Agenda for Conference', 1966.

³⁹ WEF III/226, 'Report of Y. Entwistle's Comments in the Open Forums', Chichester Conference 1966.

⁴⁰ ENEF 13, Adams to Browne, 21 February 1972.

London and that only London people have a say . . . therefore [should] try not to hold all meetings in London as is custom . . .'.⁴¹

The third problem that faced the NEF came, in fact, from the source of its main source of salvation, the ENEF. The ENEF encouraged the NEF to end its links with the private progressive schools. Punch has identified this as one of the main reasons for the decline of the new educational movement. He claims that this led to a loss of focus for the NEF and a general dilution of new educational ideals. Punch did not, however, identify how the NEF came to move away from its traditional network. This was, in fact, due to the ENEF's post-war antagonism to private progressive schools allied to its desire for greater social and educational equality. Brameld and Zilliacus had introduced the NEF to the concept of greater equality of educational and social opportunity at the 1947 conference at Cirencester. It had been the ENEF that had developed this theme to take in an attack on private schooling in Britain as a natural outcome of this belief. Clare Soper and the IHQ were more conservative and still desired to continue with their traditional source of support. Soper was particularly put out when in choosing names to put forward for the ENEF committee. The ENEF had vetoed her choice of W. B. Curry, Head of Dartington Hall School, to be appointed to the committee as a result of their opposition to private schooling. This caused embarrassment for Soper who had already asked Curry to stand and was then forced to relay to him the news of the ENEF's opposition to him.⁴² This was followed by the ENEF's campaign to condemn private schooling of all kinds, also specifically including private progressive schools.⁴³ W. B. Curry was, in fact, elected to the ENEF committee, but the ENEF committee had made clear its opinion on the matter. This was also a parting shot in the attempts of the ENEF to increase its control over the

⁴¹ ENEF 12, King to Dutton, undated.

⁴² WEF I/2, Soper to Zilliacus, 5 December 1940.

⁴³ D. Jordan, 'ENEF Bulletin', *New Era* 25 (November 1944), p. 194.

IHQ, which it did ultimately successfully do. This tension between the IHQ, Clare Soper and the ENEF committee was instrumental in creating strain between the two branches of the organisation that ultimately led to the weakening of the IHQ and loss of its independence. Ultimately, this compromised the autonomy and international credentials of the NEF in the eyes of its international members.⁴⁴

The ENEF, as discussed previously, became the most dominant part in the organisation. The ENEF became the NEF's focus for the search for a way to be involved with the reconstruction of education after 1945. The ENEF had a number of clear advantages. After 1945, Britain did not experience the same rejection of ideology that Zilversmit (1993) records as taking place in the USA. The ENEF had maintained many links with universities and educationists during the period of the Second World War that had sustained it during that time. Enthusiasm for social and educational reconstruction ensured that the ENEF maintained a relatively stable membership. By the latter part, of the period under review the ENEF had achieved its goal of creating a reliable and relatively extensive network. Due to the work of a few individuals at the start of this period, including Fred Clarke, Catherine Fletcher and Raymond King during the 1960s, the ENEF maintained links with a variety of educational institutions. The ENEF may certainly have moved the organisation as a whole away from its original involvement with private progressive schools, but it became entrenched instead in teacher training colleges and universities. Punch's hypothesis concerning the NEF, that it lost its radical focus and its ideals had become diluted and dispersed, also holds true for the ENEF.

The ENEF began the period as an organisation forwarding a radical agenda and being responsible for the NEF promoting a similar one, but ultimately was unable to

⁴⁴ WEF III/209, 'Report of Copenhagen Conference, 29 July 1953'.

follow this through with any real action. Its links with various institutions of higher education meant that it became a forum of discussion and debate for those who worked there rather than an original source of inspiration. This illustrates the danger of relying upon only a few high-level links with certain individuals in these institutions. Clare Soper had faced the same difficulty in her relationships with Joseph Lauwerys and Laurin Zilliacus, both of whom had been very supportive of her work and had kept in close contact with her but neither of whom were able to make much effective practical contribution as committee members to the running of the organisation. The other major problem that faced the ENEF was that, in spite of its focus upon class-based issues and its attack on the perceived privileges of the middle and upper classes, as an organisation it did not itself represent other than a middle-class approach to educational and social issues. The domination within the organisation by those who worked at various higher educational institutions and the narrow base of its adherents meant that the ENEF did not have any true knowledge of or support amongst those that it wished to help.

A number of conclusions can be made, therefore, about the nature of the NEF and its membership between 1945 and 1966. First, Jenkins (1989) argues that the NEF represented a narrow base of middle-class and educated membership who wished to promote a specific view of society and education.⁴⁵ This is true to a certain extent of those who were present on the NEF and ENEF committees whose members were drawn almost entirely from the ranks of educationists and educational professionals. As far as the wider membership of the NEF is concerned, however, there is not enough evidence to make such a claim about their class origins. Jenkins has taken her evidence for the middle-class nature of the members from the letters and articles

⁴⁵ C. Jenkins (1989), p. 14.

written in the *New Era*. The criticism that can be levelled at this approach, however, is that the class origins of those who have contributed to the journal does not necessarily reflect that of the bulk of the membership. By definition, those who write to, or contribute to, the journal are more likely to be those who have specific concerns or educational issues that they wish to be raised. This potentially might only reflect a small percentage of those who were involved with the NEF. Nor was it necessary to be a member of the organisation to contribute to the journal. Attempts to identify exactly the sort of people who were members of the NEF face the problem that the organisation did not keep good records. In addition to this, any other records of the membership that were actually kept have since been lost and it is, therefore, not possible to identify exactly the sort of people who constituted the rank and file. What is evident, however, from the surviving lists of those who attended the NEF's conferences during the 1950s and those who were present in administrative and other capacities within the organisation, is that the NEF had a high percentage of women who were active within its membership.⁴⁶ This was particularly the case for the ENEF, the committee of which was dominated by women.⁴⁷ The articles within the pages of the *New Era* also reflect this fact: a significant majority were written by women, most of whom worked within education, either at schools or teacher training colleges. The NEF, therefore, was clearly a forum that allowed these women to express their ideas and concerns about education.

Second, the NEF IHQ encountered a series of problems in its quest to maintain the organisation's network after 1945. One important reason for these continuing problems was the NEF's inability to find sufficient funding to broaden the membership. Another reason was the lack of coordination and control from the IHQ

⁴⁶ WEF III/222, 'Attendance lists for Copenhagen Conference 1953', 'Attendance Lists for Askov Conference 1953.'

⁴⁷ NA 121/429, 'ENEF Executive Committee List, 1945'.

committee, which at best exerted a *laissez-faire* approach towards the organisation and its activities. David Turner (1993), in his article in the *New Era* about the growth of progressive education argues that the NEF's wide network, amongst which he counts educational administrators, teachers and teaching staff at higher educational institutions, allowed it to play an important part in the development of educational ideas.⁴⁸ The argument has been forwarded in this thesis that the NEF did not itself ever gain a significant role in these areas and that, where the organisation did have a broader network, this was through its international branches, most importantly the ENEF. Another point to be considered is the fact that although most of the committee members of both the NEF and ENEF were well-connected educationists this did not help the organisation, as they tended to focus more upon their professional lives than the needs of the NEF. The links that the IHQ sought to maintain with the university education departments and teacher training colleges did help continue the existence of the organisation at times when it was most financially or politically vulnerable. This, however, was as rarefied a bastion of the new education as elitist in its own way as the links with the private progressive schools had ever been that had been so criticised by the ENEF committee. The NEF IHQ, therefore, was unable to exploit effectively the enthusiasm for reconstruction and social reform that took place after 1945 in Europe and Britain.

Finally, the NEF was a forum for the dissemination of educational and social ideas that emanated from UNESCO and various universities both in Britain and the USA, but was not an original source of its own ideas with the exception of the period of the 1940s under Brameld and Zilliacus. In addition to this, the deaths of key individuals – such as Zilliacus in 1959 and Clare Soper in 1961 – led to a loss of the

⁴⁸ D. Turner, 'The NEF: The Growth of Progressive Education', *New Era* 74 (December 1993), pp. 71–5.

post-war enthusiasm that had sustained the organisation for a number of years and led to a vacuum at its heart which was never successfully overcome.⁴⁹ In particular, the committee possessed a number of individuals whose careers at various universities and educational institutions meant that they were unable to give the work of the NEF the commitment that it needed. Ash considers that the NEF's involvement with UNESCO was responsible for weakening the organisation's ability to promote the new education effectively.⁵⁰ This overlooks the fact that the NEF had ceased, after 1945, to view itself as a tool for the promotion of the new education. The NEF committee believed that the new education did not serve its purpose of becoming actively involved with educational and social issues and had rejected it by 1947. After this time the dilemma for the NEF was whether it was able to promote its new agenda successfully. Ash and Punch have also made presumptions about the nature of the new education. The new education did not exist as a separate ideology from the NEF itself. The new education was the expression of the NEF's aims and ideas. It was a flexible and continually evolving and sometimes disparate set of concepts. The NEF's value as a focus of historical study is that it reveals the network of small-scale groups and organisations that were forums for debates about education and ideas concerning citizenship, greater educational equality and social justice after 1945. Kevin Brehony (2001), in his recent article about progressive education, has suggested that sociologists have invented progressivism from the diverse range of ideas that was progressive education.⁵¹ In the same way, the new education did not exist outside the activities of the NEF. Attempts to make it into a coherent ideology based upon experimental psychology, as the NEF sought to do during the 1960s, did not, in fact,

⁴⁹ WEF I/I, 'Note about Laurin Zilliagus'.

⁵⁰ Ash (1969), p. 49.

⁵¹ K. Brehony, 'From the Continuous to the Discontinuous: Progressive Education Revisited', *History of Education* 30(5) (2001), pp. 413–32.

give the movement life beyond the organisation itself. In spite of the negative assessments of the NEF and its activities by Ash, Punch and Selleck, the NEF did survive successfully, albeit sometimes precariously between 1945 and 1966 and was not as Selleck states 'another victim of fascism'. The situation was entirely different, however, as far as the new education as an ideology was concerned, which, while it experienced a period of time during the 1920s when it almost achieved the status of becoming a movement in its own right, ultimately failed in its purpose of promoting the ideals of the NEF and as a result, by 1945, had effectively been destroyed. The period after 1945 saw the gradual abandonment and destruction of the new education as an ideology but also the adaptation and evolution of the NEF as an organisation to the very different post-1945 educational and political climate.

Bibliography

Unpublished sources and documents: listed by type

University archives

Institute of Education, University of London

World Education Fellowship

WEF I 1 – 43 HQ Papers 1921 –1973

WEF II 44 – 183 Section papers 1920 – 1960

WEF III 184 – 234 International Conferences 1921 –1972

WEF IV 235 – 269 Projects 1942 – 1968

WEF VI 270 – 294 UNESCO 1948 -1972

WEF VII 295 – 312 HQ Publications and Pamphlets 1920 –1964

WEF VIII HQ Library 313 – 342

English New Education Fellowship (partially catalogued)

Boxes ENEF 1 – 18

Joseph Lauwerys papers (partially catalogued)

DC/JL, 'WEF Conferences', Miscellaneous papers

DC/JL, 'Australia 1946 Conference'

The Moot, DC/MOO, Files 1- 18, 'Records of discussions held at University of London Institute of Education'

Kingston University,

Gipsy Hill Teacher Training College

Box 12, 'Future of the College 1946'

Box 16, 'Correspondence with Surrey County Council 1945 –1949', Office diaries
1946-1956

University of Warwick Modern Records Centre

National Union of Teachers

MSS 179\EDU\3\11\2088, 'Recruitment and Supply of Teachers 1948'

MSS 179\EDU\3\11\2025C\ 4, 'Education Committee Minutes 1946'

MSS 179\EDU\3\11\1899F\ 1 – 5, 'Education Committee Minutes'

Coventry Teacher Training College

UWA\CCE\C1 –15, 'Correspondence'

UWA\CCE\ -1, 'Principal's papers'

National Archives, Kew

New Education Fellowship

NA ED 121/304, 'New Education Fellowship: Australia Conference', 1946

NA DO 35/1202, 'Australian New Education Fellowship', 1946

NA ED 136/606, 'Conference for the Democratic Reconstruction of Education', 1944

NA ED 121/429, 'Aims and Constitution of the ENEF', 1947

NA ED 143/35, 'Minutes: Borthwick Training College for Women, London', 1947

Konni Zilliacus MP

FO 371/66487, 'Files on Konni Zilliacus MP'.

Inspections and reports on private schools

NA ED 109/8737, 'Inspectors' Report, Monkton Wyld School 1951'

NA ED 172/220, 'Inspectors' Report, High March School, Beaconsfield, 1956'

NA ED 109/5715, 'Frensham Heights School: Full Inspection, 1935'

NA ED 109/4883, 'Wychwood School for Girls: Full Inspection, 1941'

Other archives

West Yorkshire Archive Service

WRC/13/323, 'Bingley Training College Files Education Committee: Further Education Committee: Bingley College of Education Governing Sub-Committee', 1947 –1955

The Danish National Archives, Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen

TG 7336, Papers of Torben Gregersen (*Torben Gregersens privatarkiv*)

Newspapers and periodicals

New Era

Phi Delta Kappan

Progressive Education

Teachers College Record

Times Educational Supplement

Published sources and policy reports

- Alcorn, N., (1999) 'To the Fullest Extent of His Powers' C. E. Beeby's Life in Education Wellington, New Zealand: Victorian University Press.
- Aldrich, R., (1982) An Introduction to the History of Education London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Aldrich, R., and Gordon, P., (1989) Dictionary of British Educationists London: Woburn Press
- Aldrich, R., (2002) The Institute of Education 1902-2002: A Centenary History London: Institute of Education, University of London
- Altenbaugh, R. J., (1999) Historical Dictionary of American Education Connecticut: Greenwood
- Archambault, R., (1964) John Dewey on Education Selected Writings Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Ash, M., (1969) Who are the Progressives Now? Dartington Hall Studies in Rural Sociology London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Association for Education in Citizenship (1935) Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools
- Association for Education in Citizenship (1936) Citizenship and History: An Address Given at the Association for Education in Citizenship's Meeting at the 24th Annual Conference of Education Associations January 1936
- Association for Education in Citizenship (1936) Bibliography of Social Studies: A list of books for schools and adults

- Badley, J. H., (1924) Bedales: A Pioneer School London: Methuen
- Banks, C., (1955) Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education: A Study in Educational Sociology London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Barber, M., (1994) The Making of the 1944 Education Act. London: Cassell
- Barker, Sir Ernest (1936) Education for Citizenship
- Barker, R., (1972) Education and Politics 1900 – 1951: A Study of the Labour Party Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Bazeley, E. T., (1948) Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Bell, D., (1962) The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties London: Collier Macmillan
- Berg, L., (1968) Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Berger, P., (et al) (1984) Cultural Analysis: The Work of Peter L. Berger, Mary Douglas, Michael Foucault and Jurgen Habermas Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Bestor, A., (1985) Educational Wastelands Urbana: University of Illinois Press
- Blatavsky, H., (1993) The Secret Doctrine London: Theosophical Publishing House,
- Boin, A., The Emergence of Public Institutions: Towards a Dynamic Theory of Institutional Birth and Development (paper prepared for ECPR Conference, Edinburgh, 31 March–2 April, 2003

- Board of Education (1943) Educational Reconstruction (White Paper). HMSO. London
- Board of Education (1943) Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools (Norwood Report) HMSO. London
- Board of Education (1944) The Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders (McNair Report) HMSO. London.
- Bonham- Carter, V., (1958) Dartington Hall London: Phoenix House
- Boyd, W., (1930) Towards a New Education: A Record and Synthesis of the Discussions on the New Psychology and the Curriculum at the Fifth World conference of the New Education Fellowship, held at Elsinore, August 1929 London: A. Knopf
- Boyd, W., (1930) Report on the Fifth World Conference of the NEF London: University of London Institute of Education
- Boyd, W., and Rawson, R., (1965) The Story of the New Education London: Heinemann
- Boydston, J.A., (ed.) (1969) The Early Works of John Dewey (1882 – 1898) Carbondale: South Illinois Press
- Boydston, J. A., (ed.) (1980) John Dewey: The Middle Works (1899 – 1924) Carbondale: South Illinois Press
- Boydston, J. A., (ed.) (1981) John Dewey: The Later Works (1925 – 1953) Carbondale: South Illinois Press

- Brehony, K., (1992) 'What's Left of Progressive Primary Education?' in Rethinking Radical Education (eds.) Rattansi and Reeder 1992) London: Lawrence and Wishart. Pages 196 - 221
- Browne, J. D., (1979) Teachers of Teachers: A History of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education London: Hodder & Stoughton
- Brown, S., Finn, M., eds., (1988) Readings from Progressive Education: A Movement and its Professional Journal London: University Press of America
- Carbone, P., (1977) The Social and Educational Thought of Harold Rugg North Carolina: Duke University, Press
- Campbell, A. E., (ed.) (1938) Modern Trends in Education: Proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937 London: New Education Fellowship
- Campbell, B., (1980) Ancient Wisdom Revealed: A History of the Theosophical Movement Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Carr, W., and Hartnett, A., (1996) Education and the Struggle for Democracy: The Politics of Educational Ideas Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) Children and Their Primary Schools (Plowden Report) HMSO. London.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Education Group (1981) Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England Since 1944 London: Hutchinson

- Child, H. A. T., (1962) The Independent Progressive School London: Hutchinson
- Clarke, F., (1940) Education and Social Change- An English Interpretation
London: Sheldon Press
- Clarke, F., (1948) Freedom in the Educative Society London: University of
London Press
- Collier, K. G., (1959) The Social Purpose of Education London: Routledge and
Kegan Paul
- Condliffe Lagemann, E., (2002) An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of
Educational Research Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
- Cooter, R., (ed.), 1992 In the Name of the Child. Health and Welfare 1880-1940
London: Routledge
- Congress on Education For Democracy (1939) Education for Democracy: The
Proceedings of the Congress on Education for Democracy held at Teachers College,
Columbia University. August 15.16.17 1939 New York
- Connell, W. F (1980) A History of Education in the Twentieth Century World
London: Macmillan
- Cox, C. B., and Boyson, R., (eds.) (1975) Black Paper 1975 London: J.M. Dent
- Cox, C. B., and Boyson, R., (eds.) (1977) Black Paper 1977 London: J.M. Dent
- Cox, C. B., and Dyson, A. E., (eds.) (1968) Fight for Education – A Black Paper
London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cox, C. B., and Dyson, A. E., (eds.) (1969) Black Paper Two: The Crisis in
Education Critical Quarterly Society

- Cox, C. B., and Dyson, A. E., (eds.) (1970) Black Paper Three London: Critical Quarterly Society
- Cunningham, K.S., (ed.) (1938) Education for Complete Living: The Challenge of today, the Proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in Australia, August 1 to September 20 1937 London: New Education Fellowship
- Curle, A., (1971) Making Peace London: Tavistock
- Curry, W. B., (1947) Education For Sanity London: Heinemann ltd.
- Crump, G., (1936) Bedales Since the War London: Chapman and Hall
- Davies, K., (1981) Polam Hall: The Story of a School London: Prudhoe
- Demane, J., and Entwistle, H., (1996) Beyond Communitarianism: Citizenship, Politics and Education London: Macmillan Press ltd.
- Dent, H. C., (1942) Education for Democracy London: New Education Fellowship
- Dent, H. C., (1944) A Charter for Teachers London: New Education Fellowship
- Dent, H. C., (1968) The Education Act, 1944: Provisions, Regulations, Circulars, Later Acts London: University of London Press
- Dent, H. C., (1949) Secondary Education for All – Origins and Development in England London: Routledge and Kegan Paul ltd.
- Dent, H. C., (1977) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales 1800 – 1975 London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Dewey, J., (1950) Democracy and Education New York: Macmillan
- Dewey, J., (1950) Democracy and Freedom New York: Macmillan

- Dewey, J., (1951) Experience and Education London: Macmillan Co.
- Dewey, J., (1967) The School and Society Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Dewey, J., (1926) Schools of Tomorrow London: J. M Dent and Sons ltd.
- DiMaggio J., and Powell W. W., The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991)
- Elmhirst, L. K., (1961) Rabindranath Tagore: Pioneer in Education London: John Murray
- Elton, G. R., and Evans, R., (2002) The Practice of History London: Blackwell
- Elvin, L., (1965) Education and Contemporary Society London: C.A Watts
- Elvin, L., (1987) Encounters With Education London: University of London Institute of Education
- Elvin, L., (1968) The Changing Pattern of English Secondary Education London: Association of Technical Institutes
- Elvin, L., (1973) White Paper or Black Reaction London: University of London
- Elvin, L., (1977) The Place of Common Sense in Educational Thought London: George Allen and Unwin ltd.
- Evans, R., (1997) In Defence of History London: Granta Books
- Evans, R. W., (2004) The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children? New York: Teachers College Press
- Evans, R. W., (2007) This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and the Censure of Social Studies Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing

- Floud, J., Halsey, A., Martin, F., (1956) Social Class and Educational Opportunity London: Heinemann Ltd.
- Foster, S. J., (2000) Red Alert!: Educators Confront the Red Scare in American Public Schools, 1947 – 1954 London: P. Lang
- Foucault, M., (1972) The Archaeology of Knowledge London: Tavistock Publications
- Gibson, M., (2002) A History of the Gipsy Hill Training College 1917 – 1975 London: Kingston University
- Glover A.H.T (1946) New Teaching for a New Age London: Thomas Nelson and Sons
- Gordon, P., and Aldrich, R., (1997) Biographical Dictionary of North American and European Educationists London: Woburn Press
- Gordon, P., and Aldrich, R., and Dean, D., (1991) Education and Policy in England in the Twentieth Century London: Woburn Press
- Gordon, P., and Lawton, D., (1978) Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Gosden, P.H., (1983) The Education System Since 1944 Oxford: Robertson
- Graham, P. A., (1967) Progressive Education A History of the Progressive Educational Association: From Arcady to Academe Columbia, New York: Teacher's College Press
- Griggs, C., (2002) The TUC and Educational Reform 1926-1970 London: Woburn Press.

- Gross, B., and Gross, R., (1971) Radical School Reform London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Gutmann, A., (1987) Democratic Education Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Hemming, J., (1957) Teach them to Live London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Hemming, J., (1980) "The Betrayal of Youth": Secondary Education Must Change London: Marion Boyars Publishers
- Hemming, J., (1949) The Teaching of Social Studies in Secondary Schools London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Hemmings, R., (1973) Fifty Years of Freedom: A Study of the Development of the Ideas of A.S. Neill London: Allen and Unwin
- Henderson, J. L., (1966) The Teacher: Neither Saviour nor Stooge London: The Guild of Pastoral Psychology
- Hendrick, H., (1974) Images of Youth: Age, class and the male youth problem 1880 – 1926 Oxford: Clarendon
- Hendrick, H., (1994) Child Welfare, England 1872-1989 London: Routledge
- Holmes, G., (1952) The Idiot Teacher: A book about Prestolee School and its Headmaster E.F. O'Neill London: Faber
- Homs, J., Madden, A. F., Morris Jones, W. H., (1980) Australia and Britain: Studies in a Changing Relationship London: Routledge
- Hutchins, R., (1953) The Conflict in Education In a Democratic Society London: Harper

- Jackson, B., and Marsden, D., (1966) Education and the Working Class London: Penguin Books Ltd.,
- Jeffery, G. B., and Lauwerys J. A., (eds.), (1948) The Yearbook of Education 1948 London: University of London Institute of Education
- Jeffery, G. B., and Clarke, F., (eds.), (1949) The Yearbook of Education 1949 London: University of London Institute of Education
- Jeffery G. B., and Lauwerys J. A., (eds.), (1950) The Yearbook of Education 1950 London: University of London Institute of Education
- Jones, K., (1983) Beyond Progressive Education London: Macmillan
- Jones, K., (1989) Right Turn: The Conservative Revolution in Education London: Hutchinson
- Judge, H., (1974) School is Not Yet Dead London: Longman
- Kach, N. K., Patterson, R. S., and DeFaveri, I., (eds.) (1986) Essays on Canadian Education Calgary: Detselig
- Kazamias, A., (1966) Politics, Society and Secondary Education in England Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press
- Kilpatrick, W. H., (1930) Our Educational Task: As Illustrated in the Changing South
- Kliebard, H. M., (2004) The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958 New York: Routledge,
- Korn, C. V., (1991) Alternate American Schools: Ideals in Action New York: State University of New York Press,

- Kotschnig, W. M., (1943) Slaves Need No Leaders: An Answer to the Fascist Challenge to Education London: Oxford University Press.
- Larsson, Y., (1987) The World Education Fellowship: Its Origins and Development with Particular Emphasis on New South Wales Australian Studies Centre, London.
- Lauwerys, J. A., and Hans, N., (eds.), (1951) The Yearbook of Education 1951 London: University of London Institute of Education
- Lauwerys, J. A., (ed.) (1969) Teachers and Teaching London: Evans Bros
- Lawson, J., and Silver, H., (1973) A Social History of Education in England London: Methuen
- League of Nations Union. Education Committee Geography Panel (1935) Geography Teaching in Relation to World Citizenship London
- League of Nations Union. Modern Languages Panel (1935) Modern Languages Teaching in Relation to World Citizenship London
- League of Nations Union (1935) Report on Modern Languages Teaching in Relation to World Citizenship London
- Liebschner, J., (1991) Foundations of Progressive Education London: Lutterworth Press
- Lowe, R., (1988) Education in the Post-War years: A Social History New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc.
- Lowe, R., (ed.) (1992) Education and the Second World War London: The Falmer Press

- Lowe, R., (1997) Schooling and Social Change London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Lowe, R., (ed.) (2000) History of Education: Major Themes Volume 1 London: Routledge Taylor & Francis
- Lummis, T., (1988) Listening to History: The Authenticity of Oral Evidence Pennsylvania: Rowman & Littlefield
- MacDonald, J. B., (1972) A New Look to Progressive Education in Squire, J., (ed.) Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Macpherson, C. B., (1966) The Real World of Democracy Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macpherson, C. B., (1973) Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Macpherson, C. B., (1977) The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Maclure, J. S., (1986) Educational Documents: England and Wales 1816 to the Present Day London: Methuen
- Madden, A. F., and Morris-Jones, W. H., (eds.) (1980) Australia and Britain: Studies in a Changing Relationship Sydney: Sydney University Press
- Mahlerbe, E. G., Carson, J., and Rheinallt Jones, J., (eds.) (1937) Educational Adaptations in a Changing Society: Report of the South African Education Conference held in Capetown and Johannesburg in July 1934, under the auspices of the New Education Fellowship London: New Education Fellowship

- Mangan, J. A., (1977) 'Athleticism: A Case Study of the Evolution of an Educational Ideology' in Simon and Bradley (Eds.) The Victorian Public School: Studies in the development of an educational institution: a symposium Dublin: Gill and Macmillan
- Marsden, D., (1971) Politicians, Equality and Comprehensives Fabian Tract 411: London: The Fabian Society
- McCulloch, G., (1994) Educational Reconstruction: The 1944 Education Act and the Twenty- First Century London: The Woburn Press
- McCulloch, G., (2007) Cyril Norwood and the Ideal of Secondary Education Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- McCulloch, G., and Richardson, W., (2000) Historical Research in Educational Settings Buckingham: Open University Press
- McLean M., (ed.), (1981) J.A. Lauwerys: A Festschrift. Educational Library Bulletin 22 London: University of London Institute of Education
- Ministry of Education (1947) The New Secondary Education. Pamphlet no 9 London: HMSO
- Ministry of Education (1958) Secondary Education for All: A New Drive London: HMSO
- Mitchell, F. W., (1967) Sir Fred Clarke: Master Teacher, 1880-1952 London: Longham
- Montessori, M., (1912) The Montessori Method London: Heineman
- Montessori, M., (1989) Education for a New World London: Heineman

- Murray Thomas, R., (1998) Conducting Educational Research: A Comparative View Connecticut: Greenwood
- Musgrove, F., (1971) Patterns of Power and Authority in English Education London: Methuen
- National Union of Teachers (1969) Plowden: The Union's Comments on Some of the Major Issues of the Plowden Report London: National Union of Teachers
- Neill, A.S., (1937) That Dreadful School London: Jenkins
- Neill, A.S., (1916) A Dominie's Log London: Athenaeum Press
- Neill, A.S., (1920) A Dominie in Doubt London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd.,
- New Education Fellowship (1938) Education for Complete Living: The Challenge of today, the Proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in Australia, August 1 to September 20, 1937 London: New Education Fellowship
- New Education Fellowship (1945) Play and Mental Health London: New Education Fellowship
- New Education Fellowship (1948) Problems of Child Development: (A Contribution to the Understanding of Children's Needs) London: New Education Fellowship
- New Education Fellowship (1965) Cultural and Scientific Values London: New Education Fellowship
- New Zealand Department of Education (1944) The Post-Primary Curriculum (Thomas Report) Wellington, New Zealand

- Palmer, J., (2001) Fifty Modern Thinkers on Education: From Piaget to the Present New York: Routledge
- Parkin, L., (1968) Middle Class Radicalism Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Parkinson, M., (1970) The Labour Party and the Organisation of Secondary Education 1918 – 1965 London: Routledge
- Peaker, G. F., and Gilbert, F., (1971) The Plowden Children Four Years Later London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales
- Pekin, L., (1934) Progressive Schools: Their Principles and Practice London: Hogarth
- Placzeck, B. R., (1958) Record of a Friendship Between Wilhelm Reich and A.S Neill 1936 – 1957 London: Gollancz Ltd.
- Postman, N., and Weingartner, C., (1971) Teaching as a Subversive Activity London: Penguins Books Ltd.
- Punch, M., (1977) Progressive Retreat. A Social Study of Dartington Hall School 1926 to 1957 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rattansi, A., and Reeder, D., (eds.) (1992) Rethinking Radical Education – Essays in Honour of Brian Simon London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Rawson, W., (ed.) (1936) Learning to Live Together: Report of the Dutch Regional Conference of the New Education Fellowship London: New Education Fellowship

- Rawson, W., (1933) A New World in the Making: An International Survey of the New Education London: New Education Fellowship
- Rawson, W., (1937) The Freedom We Seek London: New Education Fellowship
- Rawson, W., (1956) The Werkplats Adventure: An Account of Kees Boeke's Great Pioneer Comprehensive School: Its method and psychology London: Stuart
- Reimer, E., (1974) School is Dead – An Essay on Alternatives in Education London: Penguin
- Rosenthal, M., (1986) The Character Factory, Baden Powell and the Origins of the Boy Scouts Movement London: Macmillan
- Ross, D. G., (1972) Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Rubinstein, D., (1979) Education and Equality London: Penguin
- Rubinstein, D., (1993) Capitalism, Culture and Decline in Britain 1750 – 1990 London: Routledge
- Rugg, H., and Shumaker, A., (1928) The Child Centred School – An Appraisal of the New Education London: George G. Harrap
- Rugg, H., (1939) Democracy and the Curriculum London: University of London Press
- Russell, D., (1980) The Tamarisk Tree / Vol.2, My school and the years of war London: Virago

- Russell, D., (1985) The Tamarisk Tree / Vol. 3, Challenge to the Cold War
London: Virago
- Russell, D., (1975) The Tamarisk Tree / Vol. 1, My quest for liberty and love
London: Elek
- Rusk, R., (Revised by James Scotland 1979) (1982) Doctrines of the Great Educators London: Macmillan
- Saiyidain, K. G., (1952) Compulsory Education in India London: A Universal Publication
- Saiyidain, K. G., (1957) Problems of Educational Reconstruction London: New Education Fellowship
- Saiyidain, K. G., (1966) The Humanist Tradition in Indian Educational Thought
London: Asia Publishing House
- Scott, W. R., (2001) Institutions and Organizations London: Sage
- Sederman, D., (1989) A History of Abbotsholme School 1889 – 1989 Uttoxeter:
Abbotsholme school
- Selleck, R. J. W., (1968) The New Education 1870-1914 London: Pitman
- Selleck, R. J. W., (1972) English Primary Education and the Progressives 1914-1939 London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

- Semel S., and Sadovnik, A. R., (eds.), (1999) Schools of Tomorrow, Schools of Today: What Happened to Progressive Education? New York: Peter Lang
- Sewell, J. P., (1974) UNESCO and World Politics: Engaging in International Relations Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Silberman, C. E., (1970) Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education New York: Random House
- Silver, H., (1980) Education and the Social Condition London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- Simon, B., (1965) Education and the Labour Movement 1870 – 1920 London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Simon, B., (1969) Democracy and Education 1870 – 1900 London: Camelot Press Ltd.,
- Simon, B., (1991) Education and the Social Order 1940 to 1990 London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.
- Skidelsky, R., (1969) English Progressive Schools London: Penguin
- Skilbeck, M., (ed.) (1970) Dewey London: Collier- Macmillan Ltd.
- Springhall, J., (1977) Youth Empire and Society London: Croon Helm
- Squire J., (ed.), (1972) A New Look at Progressive Education Washington D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Stewart, W. A. C., (1972) Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750 to 1970 London: Macmillan

- Stewart, W. A. C., (1968) The Educational Innovators: Volume II Progressive Schools 1881-1967 London: Macmillan
- Swainson, M., (1977) The Spirit of Counsel: The Story of a Pioneer in Student Counselling London: Spearman
- Tawney, R. H., (1922) Secondary Education for All: A Policy for Labour London: George Allen and Unwin
- Tawney, R. H., (1964) The Radical Tradition London: Penguin
- Thane, P., and Sutcliffe, A., (1986) Essays in Social History Vol. 2 Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tibble, J., (1971) The Future of Teacher Education London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- UNESCO (1959) Education for International Understanding Paris: UNESCO
- Wardle, D., (1976) English Popular Education 1780 – 1975 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Washington, P., (1993) Madam Blavatsky's Baboon. Theosophy and the Emergence of the Western Guru London: Secker and Warburg
- Wiener, M., (1980) English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850 – 1980 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Willis Dixon, C., (1986) The Institute: A Personal Account of the History of the University of London Institute of Education 1932 to 1972 London: Institute of Education, University of London

- Wilson, Howard, E., (1938) Education for Citizenship
- Wooldridge, A., (1994) Measuring the Mind, Education and Psychology in England Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Zilliacus, L., (1935) Education for Citizenship London: Association for Education In Citizenship
- Zilversmit, A., (1993) Changing Schools: Progressive Education Theory and Practice, 1930 – 1960 Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Zirkoff, B. (ed.), (1977 originally 1877) Isis Unveiled: H. P Blatavsky London: Science–Theosophical Publishing House

Articles

- Abiss, J., (1998) 'The New Education Fellowship in New Zealand: Its Activity and Influence in the 1930s and 1940s' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* Volume 33. No. 1. Pages 81-93
- Allmark, N., (1953) 'Literacy through Activity' *New Era*. Volume 34. May. Page 85
- Anderson, A., (1948) 'Protecting the Right to Teach Social Issues' *Progressive Education* October. Volume 26. No. 1. Pages 23- 27
- Anderson, A., (1952) 'Meeting the Attack on Education – The Attackers and Their Methods' *Progressive Education* January. Volume 29. No. 3. Pages 66-67.
- Beck, R. H., (1948) 'Progressive Education Faces the Future' *Progressive Education* March. Volume 25. No. 5. Pages 82- 83
- Boin, A., and Christensen, T., (2008) 'The Development of Public Institutions: Reconsidering the Role of Leadership', *Administration & Society* Volume 40. No. 3. Pages 271–297
- Boyce, E. R., (1953) 'The Good Infant School' *New Era*. Volume 34. March. Page 42
- Boyce, E. R., (1953) 'The Good Infant School II' *New Era*. Volume 34. June. Page 103
- Boyd, W., (1941) 'The Community as Educator' *New Era* January. Volume 22. No. 1. Pages 1- 4

- Brearley, M., (1953) 'Numbers in the Primary School' *New Era*. Volume 34. September–October. Page 149
- Brehony, K. J., (2004) 'A new education for a new era: the contribution of the conferences of the New Education Fellowship to the disciplinary field of education 1921-1938' *Paedagogica Historica* Volume 40. No. 5. Pages 733 – 755
- Brehony, K., (2001) 'From the Continuous to the Discontinuous: Progressive Education Revisited' *History of Education* Volume 30. No. 5. Pages 413 – 432
- Brooke Gwynne, M., (1953) 'Some Modern Attitudes to the Teaching of Reading' *New Era*. Volume 34. September–October. Page 142
- Carey, M. J., (1982) 'The School and Civil Defense: The Fifties Revisited' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 84. No. 1. Pages 115–27
- Charlesworth, L. E., (1954) 'The Teacher Face to Face with his Pupils' Parents' *New Era*. Volume 35. December. Page 211
- Chipman D. D., and McDonald, C. B., (1982) 'Cold War in the Classroom: Kilpatrick's Student Years at Mercer' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 83. No. 3. Pages 459–65
- Clarke, F., (1940) 'Planned Freedom' *New Era* November. Volume 21. No. 9. Pages 221- 222
- Cremin, L. A., (1957) 'The Progressive Movement in American Education: A Perspective' *Harvard Educational Review* Volume 27. Pages 251 – 270
- Daltry, C. T., (1953) 'Creative Painting', *New Era*. Volume 34. No. 4. Page 67

- Depaepe, M., Simon, F., and Van Gorp, A., (2003) 'The Canonization of Ovide Decroly as a "Saint" in the New Education' *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 43. No. 2. Pages 224 – 9
- DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W., (1983) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', *American Sociological Review*. No. 48. Pages 147–60.
- Dorn, C., (2006) 'The World's Schoolmaster: Educational Reconstruction, Grayson Kefauver, and the Founding of UNESCO, 1942 - 46', *History of Education*. Volume 35. No. 3. Pages 297 — 320
- English New Education Fellowship (1944) 'The Teacher in School and Society, with Particular Reference to the McNair Report' *New Era*. Volume 25. No. 1. September-October. Pages 173 -176
- Epstein, M., (1942) 'Progress or Reaction in Education' *Labour Monthly*. September. Pages 285 – 286
- Fuchs, E., (2007) 'The Creation of New International Networks in Education: The League of Nations and Educational Organizations in the 1920s' *Paedagogica Historica*. Volume 43. No. 2. Pages 199-209
- Fuchs, E., (2007) 'Networks and the History of Education' *Paedagogica Historica*. Volume 43. No. 2. Pages 185-197
- Gal, R., (1961) 'Where Does the New Education Stand' *New Era*. January. Volume 42. Pages 21- 27

- Haunschild, P., and Miner, A., S., (1997) 'Modes of Interorganizational Imitation: The Effects of Outcome Salience and Uncertainty', *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Volume 42. No. 3. Pages 472 – 499
- Herbert, E. L., and Yapp, B., (1942) 'The Training of Teachers' *New Era*. Volume 23. January. Page 7
- Herbert, E. L., (1951) 'Interpreting Teachers' Group Discussions' *New Era*. Volume 32. April. Page 81
- Hourd, M., (1956) 'Psycho-analytical Studies of the Child' *New Era*. Volume 37. June. Page 165
- Jenkins, C., (2000) 'New Education and its Emancipatory Interests (1920 – 1950)' *History of Education*. Volume 29. No 2. Pages 139-151
- Kilpatrick, W. H., (1952) 'The Pursuit of Moral and Spiritual Values' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 53. No. 5. Pages. 264–69
- Kingston, A., (1952) 'The Role of the Educator in a Democracy' *Progressive Education* January. Volume 29. No. 3. Pages 184 - 185
- Larsson, Y., (1987) 'Pioneering Progressive Education: The World Education Fellowship in Australia and the World 1915 – 1987' *New Era*. Volume 68. No. 2. Pages 53 – 64
- Lauwerys, J., (1942) 'Adult Education' *New Era*. November. Volume 23. No. 9. Pages 164 and 165
- Lauwerys, J., (1944) 'Method and Comparative Education' *New Era*. June. Pages 164-167

- Lauwerys, J., (1962) 'Chairman's Summing Up' *New Era*. January-December. Pages 136-138
- Lee, J. M., (1953) 'Anticipating Progressive Education Attacks' *Progressive Education*. January. Volume 30. Pages 116 –118
- Lowe, R., (1996) 'Postmodernity and Historians of Education: A View from Britain' *Paedagogica Historica*. Volume XXXII 2. Pages 307 – 323.
- McCulloch, G., (2006) 'Cyril Norwood and the English tradition of education' *Oxford Review of Education*. Volume 32. Number 1. Pages 55 – 69
- Molinaro, L., (1951) 'Progressive Education at Mid-Century' *Progressive Education*. Volume 29. November. No. 2. Pages 38 – 41
- Omolewa, M., (2007) 'UNESCO as a Network' *Paedagogica Historica*. Volume 43. No. 2. Pages 211-221
- Peters, R.S., (1979) 'Democratic Values and Educational Aims' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 8. No 3. Pages 463 – 481
- Pierotti, L., (1953) 'Juniors and their Education Today' *New Era*. Volume 34. May. Page 98
- Porter, D., (1955) 'Creative Writing in Secondary Modern School' *New Era*. Volume 36. February. Page 27
- Ranson, S., (1988) 'From 1944 to 1988: Education Citizenship and Democracy (Part I: Transforming the government of education)' *Local Government Studies*. Volume 14. No. 1. January- February. Pages 1-19

- Reese, W., (2001) 'The Origins of Progressive Education' *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 41. No. 1. Spring. Pages 1-24
- Rugg, H., (1948) 'Progressive Education – Which Way?' *Progressive Education*. February. Volume 25. No. 4. Pages 35- 37 and page 45
- Rumble, W. A., (1957) 'The Educational Argument for Comprehensive Schooling' *New Era*. Volume 38. May. Page 96
- Saiyidain, K. G., (1955) 'New Education – A Personal Statement' *New Era*. Volume 36. No 12. Pages 199 - 200
- Smith, J. T., (2002) 'The Beginnings of Citizenship Education in England' *History of Education Society Bulletin*. No. 69. May. Pages 6 – 16
- Suchman, M., C., (1995) 'Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches' *Academy of Management Review*. Volume 20. No 3. Pages 571– 610
- Stead, H. G., (1939) 'The Spens Report' *New Era*. Volume 20. March. Pages 84 and 85
- Stead, H. G., (1943) 'The White Paper on Educational Reconstruction' *New Era*. Volume 24. September–October. Pages 158–9
- Stewart, D., (1949) 'Towards World Unity of Teachers' *Phi Delta Kappan*. Pages 89 – 91
- Sutherland, N., (1986) 'The Triumph of Formalism: Elementary Schooling in Vancouver from the 1920s to the 1960s' *British Columbia Studies*. Spring/Summer. Pages 69 –70

- Swainson, M., (1953) 'Psychological Climates Affecting the New Education' *New Era*. Volume 34. November. Page 169
- Swainson, M., (1953) 'The Training of Teachers and their Mental Health' *New Era*. Volume 34. December. Page 251
- Symmons, P. M., (1955) 'What Education has to Learn from Psychology' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 56. No. 5. Pages 277–85
- Watkins, C., (2007) 'Inventing International Citizenship: Badminton School and the Progressive Tradition between the Wars' *History of Education*. Volume 36. No. 3. Pages 315— 38
- Watson, G., (1949) 'In Honor of John Dewey; John Dewey as a Pioneer of Social Psychology' *Teachers College Record*. Volume 51. No. 3. Pages 139–43
- Taylor, W., (1994) 'Prospects for Progressive Pedagogy in England's Schools in the late Twentieth Century' *The New Era in Education*. Volume 75. Pages 7 – 11
- Turner, D., (1993) 'The New Education Fellowship: The Growth of Progressive Education' *New Era*. Volume 74. No 3. Pages 71 – 75
- Volkov, P., (1946) 'Progressive England' *Progressive Education*. Volume 24. No. 1. Pages 34 - 35
- White, M. H., (2007) 'Traversing Personal and Public Boundaries: Discourses of Engagement in New Education 1930s-1980s' *Paedagogica Historica*. Volume 43. No.1. Pages 151 – 163
- Zilliacus, L., (1940) 'Our Part in the World at War' *New Era*. Volume 21. No. 1. Pages 22 - 26

- Zilliacus, L., (1946) 'A World-Wide Union of Educators' *Progressive Education*. Volume 21. No. 1. Pages 54 - 57
- Zilliacus, L., (1953) 'The Philosophy of the New Education' *New Era*. Volume 34. No. 9. Pages 165 - 168

Dissertations and theses

- Crook, D., (1997) The Reconstruction of Teacher Education and Training 1941-1954, with Particular Reference to the McNair Committee Unpublished PhD thesis University of Wales, Swansea.
- Jenkins, C., (1989) Professional Middle Class and the Social Origins of the Progressivism: A Case Study of the NEF 1920 to 1950 Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London
- Jusmani, A. A., (1961) The Attitude to the Child in Progressive Educational Theory and Practice in England since 1890 Unpublished M.Ed. thesis University of Leicester
- Wallace, B. (1988) An Examination of the Thought Expressed by the NEF Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, Institute of Education, University of London
- Sinha, R. (1971) A Critical History and Evaluation of the NEF from its foundation in 1920 Unpublished MA dissertation, Sheffield University

Appendix I:

Committees of the New Education Fellowship

Committee after 1931

B. Ensor, Chair of the International Council; Director of the Fellowship

A. Ferriere, Joint Director (Switzerland)

E. Rotten, Joint Director (Germany)

Additional Members and Advisers

W. Boyd, University of Glasgow

F. Clarke, McGill University, (Canada)

D. Katzaroff, University of Sofia, (Bulgaria)

A. Lynch, NEF Field Secretary, School headmaster

J. Piaget, Bureau International D'Education, formerly of the Institut Jean Jacques

Rousseau, (Switzerland)

H. Pieron, College De France, (France)

W. Rawson, former teacher

H. Rugg, Columbia University, (USA)

C. Ryan, Director for Indian Education, Washington, (USA)

R. Ulrich, Dresden (Germany)

E. White, Director of Merrill- Palmer School, (USA)

L. Zilliacus, (Finland)

Committee After 1944

C. Washburne, Chairman (Becomes chairman in 1937)

B. Ensor, President (resigned presidency in 1947)

Vice Presidents:

A. Ferriere

D. Katzaroff

E. Rotten.

J. Lauwreys, Acting Chairman.

Executive Board:

C. Beeby, (New Zealand)

R. Best, (Australia)

K. Boeke, Head of Bilthoven Children's Community (Holland)

W. Boyd, (Britain)

T. Brameld, University of Minnesota (USA)

T. Gregerson, (Denmark)

Hamaide, L'Ecole Nouvelle, Brussels (Belgium)

J. Hemming, (Britain)

D. Jordan, (Britain)

J. Piaget, (Switzerland)

K. G. Saiyadain, (India)

M. Specht, (Germany)

H. Wallon, Lecturer at the College De France (France)

E. White (USA)

L. Zilliacus, Teachers College, Columbia, New York, USA (USA)

Committee after 1951

K. G. Saiyadain, President. Educational Adviser to the Indian government and lecturer at the University of Delhi (India)

Executive Board:

L. Borghi, (Italy)

L. Van Gelder, (Holland)

T. Gregerson, (Denmark)

J. Hemming, (Britain)

J. L. Henderson, (Britain)

D. Mclean, (Australia)

Froland Nielsen, (Norway)

Committee after 1964

K. G Saiyidain, President

J. L. Henderson, Honorary International Secretary

J. Lauwerys, Chairman

Executive Board

R. Best, (Australia),

L. Borghi, (Italy)

R. Gal, (France)

L. Van Gelder, (Holland)

T. Gregerson, (Denmark)

A. Hamaide, (Belgium)

J. Hemming, (England)

F. Redifer, (USA)

D. Jordan, (England)

D. McLean, (Australia)

J. Piaget, (Switzerland)

Appendix 2:

Committee of the English New Education Fellowship

Committee after 1945

Presidents

F. Clarke, 1927 - 1952

G. B. Jeffrey, 1952 - 1958

L. Elvin, 1958 - 1973

Secretaries

H. G. Stead, 1927 - 1943.

H. Clarke, 1943 - 1947

R. King, 1947 - 1955

J. Annand, 1955 - 1963 (Secretary of the NEF. 1951-1965.)

J. Henderson, 1963

J. Wallbridge, 1964 – 1965

Y. Moyse, 1965

Committee

C. Fletcher, Principal of the Bingley Training College;

D. Jordan, Lecturer at Goldsmiths' College, London University

J. A. Lauwerys, Reader in Education at the University of London Institute of Education

K. Mannheim, Lecturer in Sociology, London School of Economics.

E. W. Woodhead, Director of Education in Norwich LEA

J. Compton, Director of Education in Ealing LEA

W. B. Curry, Headmaster of Dartington Hall School

V. Ogilvie, Organising Secretary of the ENEF

E. Salter Davies, Editor of the *Journal of Education*

K. B. Webb, Headmaster of Luton Modern School, Bedfordshire

Additional Committee Members

Vice presidents

Lady Allen of Hurtwood

Lady Plowden

The Executive

Right Honourable R. Butler (MP),

Eleanor, Lady Nathan

Sir George Savage and

Sir George Schuster (1881-1982).

J. Lauwerys

B. Morris, Bristol University (who became President after Lionel Elvin in 1973)

J. Annand

J. Henderson

D. Jordan

P. Volkov.

Appendix 3:

International Conferences

1945 – Bryanston – England

1946 – Australia

1947- Cirencester – England

1948 – London – England ‘Human Factors in Education’

1949 – Cirencester – England ‘Teacher and World Peace’

1950 – Germany – ‘Child Development’

1953 – Copenhagen – Denmark ‘Meeting of Section Representatives’

1954 – Chichester – England ‘Group Leaders’ Conference’

1954 – Brussels ‘

1955 – Chichester – England ‘Inspectors of Schools Conference’

1955 – Switzerland

1956 – Utrecht – Holland ‘Constructive Education and Mental Health’

1959/1960 – Delhi – India – ‘Conference for Teacher Training’

1962 – London – England ‘Conference for Teacher Training’

1962 – Drieberge – Holland ‘Meeting of International Council of NEF’

1965 – Askov – Denmark

1966 – Chichester – England ‘Shaping the Future’

1969 – London – England ‘Authority of Participation’

1971 – Brussels – Belgium ‘NEF Jubilee Conference’ (including ‘Maria Montessori Conference’