

**BUTLER'S BATTLE: WARTIME & THE NATURE OF COMPROMISE**  
*An Analysis of British Educational Reform During World War II*

*Submitted for review to the University of Michigan History Honors Thesis Program*

*Rachel Ashley Lerner*

*Advisor: Professor Brian Porter-Szucs*

**March 31, 2015**  
**Winter Semester**

## **Table of Contents:**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 1:</b> <i>The Wartime Evacuation of British Youth</i>	<b>10</b>
<b>Chapter 2:</b> <i>The Beveridge Report and the Labor Party</i>	<b>20</b>
<b>Chapter 3:</b> <i>The Passing of the Education Act of 1944</i>	<b>34</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>65</b>

## **Acknowledgments:**

It's safe to say that this thesis triggered more anxious nights eased only by big scoops of Ben & Jerry's Phish Food ice cream than any other academic endeavor I have undertaken. Thanks to all those important people who helped me complete the journey.

To the University of Michigan history department, thank you for providing the opportunity for me to undertake such a significant undergraduate history project. I am extremely grateful to have had the chance to take classes from a wide array of esteemed academic leaders who challenged me to question opinions and to view complex issues from new perspectives. The skills I learned in the classroom and through undertaking this thesis project have enhanced my ability to think critically, independently, and to reach informed and justifiable deductions.

To Alexa Pearson and the University of Michigan Library department, thank you for giving a needy and often frantic undergraduate student much needed research assistance and for providing invaluable help as I searched for difficult-to-find primary and secondary sources to support my conclusions.

To Professor Kali Israel, I express my appreciation for helping me over the initial hurdle of starting the research process and for sharing your ideas about how to dive in to such a substantial academic pursuit.

To Professor Brian Porter-Szucs, I extend my deepest thanks not only for your work and leadership in the Honors History Colloquium but for your tireless mentorship and support as my advisor. I am so grateful to you, Professor, for your absolute care for your students, and I am honored that I was among them. Your continued encouragement throughout the process gave me the strength and confidence I needed to bring this project over the finish line.

And to my Mom and Dad, thank you for being on the other end of many late night phone calls, this year and the past three years, and for giving me the opportunity to have such an amazing educational experience. Your belief in me gave me the courage to believe in myself. Everything I have achieved in Ann Arbor I credit to you both. I love you.

For today, goodbye. For tomorrow, good luck. And forever, go blue!

## **Introduction:**

In January of 1941, the mass-circulation magazine *Picture Post* devoted its entire New Year edition to an imagination of the future postwar world of Great Britain. The editors contrasted “prewar” illustrations of unemployed, downtrodden parents fetching their children from grim, deteriorating schools with hypothetical “postwar” sketches of affluent men and women picking up their smiling young from cheerful, bright buildings laid out in cities filled with shimmering glass, strong concrete, and wide grassy lawns. The journalists proclaimed that “the tragic tale” of the 1930s would never again exist in Britain.<sup>1</sup>

While the ideas imagined by the Post’s editors may have been idealized, an overarching analysis of legislation enacted by the British government in the 1940s demonstrate that the personal and subjective capacities and rights of citizens influenced federal policy to a greater extent than they had previously. The theme of rational, orderly modernity underscored national conversations of communal purpose and civic renewal. From infant and maternal welfare to voting behavior to the rights of the married, single, old, and young, the interior lives of citizens became an object of increased debate, both in media outlets and in the Parliamentary chambers.<sup>2</sup>

In this thesis, I analyze how these new conversations affected federal pedagogical legislation. Specifically, I contend that World War II triggered a bipartisan openness to educational reform that allowed Board of Education President Richard Austen Butler (Rab) to pass radical education legislation through the political maze of Parliament. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Correlli Barnett, *The Lost Victory: British Dreams, British Realities, 1945-1950* (London: Macmillan, 1995), 126.

<sup>2</sup> Becky Conekin and Frank Mort, eds, *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain, 1945-1964* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1999), 111.

act, the Education Act of 1944, equalized and standardized youth access to schooling in ways that previous prewar reform had failed to accomplish.

In this paper, I theorize that much of Rab's political success was due to increased appeasement by a Conservative party eager to retain their majority in Parliament. In my first two chapters, I analyze specific reformist educational catalysts of the World War II environment, focusing on constituencies affected by wartime youth evacuation and a fiercely united Labor Party invigorated by the popularity of the 1942 Beveridge Report. I rely upon this analysis in my final chapter to examine how Rab was able to use this receptive political environment to negotiate effectively with religious and Conservative leaders and to obtain the political allies needed to push the Education Act of 1944 through the government.

The uniqueness and innovativeness of Rab's bill, I believe, rests primarily in its tackling of the prior, long-standing "dual system" of British education. That system, which separated secular schooling from religious schooling, began with the passage of the W.E. Forster Education Act of 1870. For centuries, education in Britain had been solely a religious responsibility, but with the passage of the Forster Act, accountability was also given to the Parliament. Specifically, Parliament was tasked with the responsibility to fill in the crevices of the religious system by providing education to any student who did not have access to a denominational education.<sup>3</sup> The result was the creation of a "dual system" of education that allowed parents to choose between secular and religious schooling for their children.

---

<sup>3</sup> Anthony Howard, *RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler* (London: Cape, 1987), 111.

However, this two-dimensional system resulted in a starkly unequal educational structure where, largely due to financial disparities between the two educational systems, students attending religious schools and students attending secular schools attained vastly different types of education. As British society modernized, religious institutions faced increased difficulty meeting the needs for new school accommodations and technologies. The Balfour Act of 1902 attempted to address this problem by creating “Local Education Authorities (LEAs)” that took over the responsibilities previously exercised by local school boards. Specifically, the Act directed the new agencies to designate local state funds to help pay teachers’ salaries for the religious schools in their counties. But, fierce protests ensued, as many local education councils refused to pay for the education for Church schools, declaring “Rome on the Rates.”<sup>4</sup>

With the Balfour Act unsuccessful, the dire financial circumstances of the religious educational institutions increased. While the total number of schools administered by the Church of England fell from 12,000 to 9,000 between 1900 and 1940, the majority of surviving schools were small, single-teacher village schools housed in antiquated and outdated facilities. For the 1,250,000 children still being taught by the Church of England, their access to education was far inferior to 3,000,000 students in State schools. The Hadow Reports of 1926 further aggravated the financial crisis for religious leaders as the study mandated the reorganization of schooling into separate schools for primary and post-primary students. This meant new buildings, a task the Church could not afford.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, *The Art of the Possible: The Memoirs of Lord Butler* (London: Hamilton, 1971), 97.

<sup>5</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 98.

At the end of World War I, political legislation was attempted yet again. Prominent Labor politician H.A.L. Fisher set out for a religious settlement as President of the Board of Education, only to see his hopes quickly diminished by harsh Conservative outcry. He was able to pass the Fisher Act of 1918, which called for a vague “establishment of a national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby.”<sup>6</sup> However, the Act led to minimal tangible results, as even after World War I, only ten percent of British youth received any post-primary education. Goals desired during the war dissipated in postwar malaise. A decade later, new President of the Board of Education Sir Charles Trevelyan tried again as he attempted to negotiate an educational structure that would minimize the “dual system” inequalities. But, he also was defeated – and eventually driven into resignation – by an alliance between religious leaders and Conservative support.<sup>7</sup>

Echoing the debates and conversations that were taking place in other countries during the same time period, each national organization in Britain had a different idea of how state agency and traditional religious control should intersect, and how that should affect educational reform. While religious leaders proclaimed that financial problems should not lead to state intervention in their sovereignty over religious education, on the left, Labor organizations such as the Trades Union Congress advocated the radical abolishment of all denominational schools. The National Union of Teachers issued a circular that “the only satisfactory solution would be the achievement of a national unified system of education by means of the transfer of all non-provided schools...to the

---

<sup>6</sup> Robert Ulich, *The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 117.

<sup>7</sup> Ulich, *Education*, 117-121.

control of the local education authority.”<sup>8</sup> The Free Churches Union declared that the dual system minimized the rights of religious and secular minorities, as religious leaders were allowed to appoint their own faculty, causing thousands of posts to only be open to teachers of specific denominations. And, finally, non-conformists argued for an “agreed syllabus” that would teach religious ideas without adhering to one specific denomination.

Since this issue evoked such controversy and partisan passion, many political leaders were hesitant to attempt to engage in negotiations, especially after witnessing the results of Fisher and Trevelyan’s attempts. For example, the Education Act of 1936 did not even address the “dual system,” instead focusing on raising the school age, providing grants to build more secondary schools, and increasing standardized testing. And, since secular schools were concentrated in more affluent areas, many parents had no choice but to send their children to less satisfactory denominational educational systems.<sup>9</sup> It was not until Rab and the Education Act of 1944 that a progressive structure addressing this divide was finally successfully passed and implemented.

Because of this long and difficult history of legislation surrounding the “dual system,” I chose to focus my thesis on the revolutionary compromise of the Education Act of 1944. In my survey of historical studies of twentieth century education reform, most studies focus on the Education Act of 1944 in terms of its other aspects, most particularly, its extension of the mandatory school age to 16. For example, Robert Ulich’s *The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective* analyzes how the Education Act of 1944 delivered a brute punch into the face of the children labor workforce by its mandatory provision, while Clive Griggs’ *The TUC and Education*

---

<sup>8</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 98.

<sup>9</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 98-101.



*Reform, 1926-1970* highlights the Education Act's extension as an attempt to create a more intellectual workforce. Outside of historical works specifically geared towards education reform, academic works written about legislation passed in the 1940s – such as, Richard Titmuss's *Essays on the Welfare State*, Karl De Schweinitz's *England's Road to Social Security*, Angus Calder's *The People's War: Britain 1939-1945*, and Correlli Barnett's *The Lost Victory: British dreams, British realities, 1945-1950* – examine the Education Act of 1944 as one step in the grander scheme of the new “cradle to grave” British political philosophy.

My thesis supplements this existing literature with a specific, detailed look at how the consequences of World War II triggered an environment that ultimately allowed the passage of a controversial plan that attempted to equalize British youth access to education. Relying on primary source components such as parliamentary transcripts, political pamphlets, newspaper and media reports, and prominent leaders' autobiographies, I attempt to craft a narrative of the “dual system” that connects Rab's successful legislation with the environment of the 1940s.

As historians, we see the ending of World War II as the start of a new global era, heralded by revelations of Nazi inhumanity and the unleashing of the atomic bomb. In Great Britain, a powerful pre-World War II empire, rebuilding after the war provided a broad range of opportunities to implement new national ideals and priorities. In this thesis, I explore that one of these new opportunities allowed, blazoned by Sir Richard Austen Butler, was to transform British education.

## Chapter 1: The Wartime Evacuation of British Youth

*“The relief of mind to parents and the improved freedom of action left to the adult inhabitants of cities by a scheme of [child evacuation] would provide a contribution to defence, an inspiration to trust, and a counteractant to panic, the value of which can scarcely be overestimated... Whether this to be an exaggerated belief or not, humanity alone requires that we should give a first consideration to the safety of our children.”*

- John. A. Ryle, May 9, 1938  
*Letters to the Editor, The Times*<sup>10</sup>

Friday, September 1, 1939 was expected to be a watershed in British education advancement. On this date, under the terms of the Education Act of 1936, British children would be required to remain full-time students until the age of 15. However, instead, the media was reeling from a federal announcement the morning before from the Ministry of Health, who warned that “as a precautionary measure...it has been decided to start evacuation of schoolchildren and other priority classes [from designated areas]” the following day.<sup>11</sup> So, on the morning of September 1, 1939, as Nazi Germany invaded Poland halfway across Europe, “there began an exodus unprecedented in history” from London and other heavily populated cities in England and Scotland to areas declared safe from wartime danger within the British empire.<sup>12</sup>

This formal evacuation announcement was not unexpected. As the reputation of Axis war success surged and the British declaration of mobilization seemed imminent, federal agencies laid out careful and specific evacuation plans and issued national circulars regarding the shelter and education of possible evacuees. The Ministry of

---

<sup>10</sup> John A. Ryle, “A.R.P Plans, The Evacuation of Children,” *The Times*, May 9, 1938. Published four months before formal evacuation procedures were undertaken.

<sup>11</sup> H.C. Dent, *Education in Transition, a Sociological Study of the Impact of War on English Education, 1939-1943*, ed. Dr. Karl Mannheim (New York: Cape University Press, 1944). The following chapter relies heavily on the observations of prominent educational journalist, Howard C. Dent, who chronicled his findings in this 1944 report.

<sup>12</sup> Dent, *Education*, 1.

Health, the government agency delegated with the task of evacuation, organized efficient partnerships between national railways, local authorities, the Federal Food Department, and receiving British households. The Board of Education issued numerous circulars, with instructions for both evacuated schoolteachers and the local education systems that would receive them. Circular 1469, issued in May 1939 by the Board of Education, laid out instructions for a curriculum for evacuated students containing improvised dramatic work and the use of local surveys. Circular 1474, issued on August 29, 1939 by the Board of Education, contained a foreword written by the President of the Board of Education Herbrand Sackville, who wrote “the extensive preparations for evacuation being well forward, it is time to consider what is to happen to children after evacuation.”<sup>13</sup> These federal procedures finally commenced on the morning of September 1, 1939, as, was observed by educational British journalist H.C. Dent, “with clockwork precision innumerable parties, large and small, of schoolchildren in the charge of their teachers, of others with children below school age, and of expectant mothers, converged from every point of the compass upon the railway stations, marched in endless but ordered streams up to the platforms, were swiftly loaded on to waiting trains, and as swiftly borne away to unknown destinations” across the United Kingdom.<sup>14</sup>

However, even as a smooth and efficient transportation of evacuees was underway, the consequences of evacuation on British society – and subsequently on the British education system – became increasingly apparent. With its inherent outcome of social mismatching between evacuees and receiving households, reports from the period quoted a substantial body of British citizens who were stunned by the evacuation’s

---

<sup>13</sup> Dent, *Education*, 6-7. Dent included numerous quotations from federal documents in his report.

<sup>14</sup> Dent, *Education*, 1.

exposure of Britain's "two-nations". As F.A. Iremonger, the biographer of Archbishop of the Church of England William Temple, wrote a decade later, the rural middle-class was forced to debate and question, how "these [evacuated] boys and girls – half-fed, half-clothed, less than half-taught, complete strangers to the most elementary social discipline and the ordinary decencies of a civilised home [could be] products of free institutions of which Britons [have been] bidden to think with pride."<sup>15</sup> In another study from the period, the Trades Union Congress reported that the comingling of students from different areas exposed the varying and – widely differing – levels of schooling given across the country. Outside of the primary school sphere, the British Army reported that over a quarter of young male recruits were "virtually illiterate", strongly "handicapp[ing]" the armed services.<sup>16</sup>

Simultaneously, despite the meticulous policies planned by the Board of Education, the educational system across the United Kingdom collapsed. Even with the circulars and preparations of the Board of Education and its allied organizations, specific and satisfactory education systems were not in place in many areas receiving evacuees, leading to a chaotic situation for hundreds of local school systems. Additionally, parents who chose not to send their children away from evacuated areas did not have a place to send their children for school, since the Board of Education had shut down educational buildings in evacuated areas in order to allow those buildings to be available for wartime tasks. Consequently, in January of 1940, approximately half a million British children

---

<sup>15</sup> Anthony Howard, *RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler* (London: Cape, 1987), 117. Archbishop William Temple would go on to become one of the most progressive Church of England leaders on education.

<sup>16</sup> Clive Griggs, *The TUC and Education Reform, 1926-1970* (London: Woburn Press, 2002), 116.

were receiving no education.<sup>17</sup> Hundreds of thousands of parents were forced to consider the alarming situation of a society without an available educational system. With children out of school and parents anxious and exasperated, public dissatisfaction of the British educational system surged.

In early 1939, discussions of significant educational difficulties triggered by the dramatic and mass intermingling of different societal classes as a result of the September evacuation were mostly absent from the British general media. Conversely, light-hearted, even flippant, attitudes toward evacuation were more readily apparent, such as illustrated in a quote from an article in the September 9 *The Times Educational Supplement* where the author noted reassuringly that, “nor is there any reason to anticipate that the [evacuated] children will prove difficult to manage [for] it must be remembered that school journeys and organized country holidays have existed for many years, and that therefore a large number of boys and girls realize that good manners and avoidance of mischief are expected of them.”<sup>18</sup> In the United States, *The Washington Post* reported on September 3, 1939 that “somewhere in England, Sept. 2 – Being evacuated is just like a great Sunday picnic – only it lasts longer.”<sup>19</sup> However, despite these demonstrated attitudes, the effect of evacuation on public discourse proved to be substantial and long-standing.

As a result of several factors, the official evacuees of September 1, 1939 who poured into the surrounding middle-class rural villages came disproportionately from the

---

<sup>17</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, *The Art of the Possible: The Memoirs of Lord Butler* (London: Hamilton, 1971), 92.

<sup>18</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 7. In 1940, Dent was the editor of the *The Times Educational Supplement*.

<sup>19</sup> Derrick Wilde, “London Evacuation ‘Fun’, Boy Refugee, 8, Declares,” *The Washington Post*, September 3, 1939. This article from an American newspaper illustrates oblivion at evacuation repercussions crossed national borders.

poorest strata of British society. First, as war had become increasingly clear in early 1939, wealthier British citizens had already made their own arrangements, separate from federal intervention. Additionally, evacuation areas were mostly areas of high population densities, such as London, where overcrowding was at its worst, and social strata was lower. Finally, federal surveys of several provincial British areas in the 1930s estimated that while twelve to fifteen percent of British families lived below the poverty line, these families included twenty-two to thirty percent of children. Therefore, it was more likely that a child or a pregnant mother evacuated would come from a poorer societal class.<sup>20</sup>

Therefore, despite early unconcerned reports, as evacuation continued, adverse accounts of the evacuees came from every part of the country, for as Dent observed, “evacuation had, in fact, lifted the lid to reveal a seething stew of social degradation hitherto unsuspected – or if suspected, ignored – by increasingly comfortable and comfort-loving middle- and upper working-classes which had for years been enjoying rising standards of domestic luxury and social amenity, and which had more and more tended to overlook their obligation to care for the interests of [the] less fortunate.”<sup>21</sup> As a direct result of the evacuation, these “innately decent countryfolk” were forced to care for illiterate, uneducated children who had spent their lives in the slums of overcrowded cities and were oblivious to cultural practices such as bathing, brushing their teeth, or relieving themselves in sanctioned areas. Reports by the National Federation of the Women’s Institute in late 1939 highlighted stories of multitudes of children and adult women bed wetters among the evacuees, widespread epidemics of infestations of sores and lice in the population, and graphic tales of juvenile debauchery. Distressed by the

---

<sup>20</sup> Angus Calder, *The People’s War: Britain, 1939-45* (London: Cape, 1969), 40.

<sup>21</sup> Dent, *Education*, 11.

behavior of the city children now in their homes and schools, thousands of townspeople held “indignation meetings” in their village streets, shops, and country parlors, detailing the “vileness of the disgusting evacuees who were foully desecrating the immaculate homes of their faultless and irreproachable hosts” and questioning what to do next.<sup>22</sup> Across the nation, in local meetings, national forums, and media debate, many in the British public condemned the British primary school system for failing, as Dent wrote, in their “hard task of civilizing the children of Britain.”<sup>23</sup> In a Letter to the Editor published in *The Times* on January 11, 1941, the writer lamented that “it has one been one of the startling results of the evacuation of children from our greatest centres of population that in many instances their gross ignorance of the simplest facts...has been laid bare far and wide...The times are crucial. A bold policy is called for.”<sup>24</sup>

Additionally, aside from its effect on social conversation, evacuation also triggered a breakdown of local education systems. Just a month after the supposed “extensive preparations” of evacuation had been implemented, it was clear to the Board of Education that their carefully laid plans had failed in organizing satisfactory wartime education arrangements, both in the “evacuee receiving” areas and the evacuated areas. Failure in the “evacuee receiving areas” began in the way billeting was handled at the detaining points. Despite the government directives that schools of children would remain together with their schoolteachers from home, billeting officers thought solely in terms of billets. Subsequently, ignoring the protests of the city educational officials on the spot, billeting officers separated student from student, and student from teacher. For

---

<sup>22</sup> Dent, *Education*, 8-12.

<sup>23</sup> Dent, *Education*, 26.

<sup>24</sup> Arthur Worchester, “Religious Education,” Letters to the Editor, *The Times*, Jan 11, 1941.

example, one half of a girls' senior school was spread over thirteen villages, and two halves of a school were found at opposite ends of the country, simply because it had been too difficult at the point of departure to load them all on to the same train.<sup>25</sup> As Dent observed, "hundreds of urban teachers began their way in the reception areas by tramping an unknown countryside day after day throughout the hours of daylight...searching for the children they had so carefully and so efficiently shepherded from the cities."<sup>26</sup> Because children were mostly separated from their specific schoolteachers, local educational authorities were forced to create cohesive educational plans to support the chaotic blending and different educational levels of students from different regions. Due to the wide variance of schooling in different educational systems, this proved to be a difficult and impossible ask.<sup>27</sup>

Additionally, substantial delay in making preparatory educational arrangements for the influx of evacuated students by the Board of Education and the local education authorities into the "evacuee receiving" areas became apparent, as the delay was so gross in some instances that no educational arrangements were made at all. In October of 1939, the Secretary of Education in West Suffolk concluded that it had been impossible to make any arrangements before the evacuated children had arrived "even of the most tentative nature...because no one [before September 1] had any accurate information as to the area from which the children would come, the numbers in which they would arrive, the type of school which they had been attending, and to what village or town they were to go."<sup>28</sup> The surge of students overwhelmed the public education systems of these local

---

<sup>25</sup> Dent, *Education*, 21.

<sup>26</sup> Dent, *Education*, 19.

<sup>27</sup> Dent, *Education*, 18.

<sup>28</sup> Dent, *Education*, 18-21.



towns, and consequently the systems broke down. The plans that the receiving areas would be able to use improvisation, initiative, and a “double-shift” system to keep their education systems in tack proved inadequate, as the contrasting levels of schooling necessary for the students from different regions proved insurmountable.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, at least a million schoolchildren – one-fifth of the total school population – did not evacuate. The Ministry of Health maintained that while evacuation of schoolchildren should be highly suggested, it was irresponsible and immoral to force it upon parents. As was reported in a “Health and Safety” editorial in *The Times* on December 20, 1940, “the Minister of Health yesterday announced several decisions bearing upon the problem of combining safety with health in a country subject to bombardment [for] practically all those who have examined this problem [of evacuation] have been forced to the conclusion that compulsion...too often...would conflict with deeply rooted sentiments which, though the results may seem unwise, are not in themselves ignoble.”<sup>30</sup> However, at the same time, federal policy required that with the onset of war, educational facilities in the evacuated areas must close. With children out of school, soon-to-be President of the Board of Education Richard Austen Butler noted in his autobiography that “there were considerable doubts whether the structure [of society] itself could be held together.”<sup>31</sup> While the Board of Education rushed to reopen schools in evacuated areas and organize schools in “evacuee receiving” areas, as Dent observed, the public outcry against the closing and disorganization of schools “was a striking illustration of the sociological rule that the significance of an institution of society only

---

<sup>29</sup> Dent, *Education*, 20.

<sup>30</sup> Editorial, “Health and Safety,” *The Times*, Dec 20, 1940. It is interesting to note that over a year after the September evacuation, the debate on procedure was still continuing.

<sup>31</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 92.

becomes really appreciated in a marginal situation.”<sup>32</sup> Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that, especially in areas that were not directly subject to bombardment, the breakdown of the educational system had the most intimate and personal effect on British households of any wartime concern.

On February 7, 1940, as one of his only acts as the President of the Board of Education, Herwald Ramsbotham announced that compulsory attendance at school would again be enforced. Later that year, Prime Minister Winston Churchill began a series of meetings with the man who would become one of the leaders of progressive education reform, Richard Austen Butler (Rab), and proposed Rab’s appointment as the President of the Board of Education.<sup>33</sup>

Overall, evacuation forced much of the British public to conclude that society could no longer turn an ignorant eye to the perils of an imbalanced educational system. While educational leaders had called for mandates for educational reform since the turn of the century, the trigger of evacuation exposed the great divide of educational access to many who had previously remained happily ignorant, and surged the debate of schooling into additional public popular forums. Conservative politicians representing constituencies strained by evacuation, such as Sir Howard Wood, reported looking for political remedies to assuage voters’ frustration. As was reported in the Trades Union Congress report from the time, several political leaders had begun to recognize that “the begrudging concessions of the 1936 Education Act would no longer be acceptable to a country where the demands of a massive war were challenging the social structure of so

---

<sup>32</sup> Dent, *Education*, 30.

<sup>33</sup> The dramatic meetings between Churchill and Butler are detailed in the third chapter of this thesis.

many institutions which had perpetuated the social divisions in place only a few years earlier”<sup>34</sup>.

The path towards the passage of the Education Act of 1944 had begun.

---

<sup>34</sup> Griggs, *TUC*, 87.

## Chapter 2: The Beveridge Report and the Labor Party

*“We have arrived at a stage where fundamental economic and social transformation must begin...Any attempt to restore traditional Britain will deny our power to fulfill the purposes for which we fight and, sooner or later, recreate all the grave problems of the inter-war years in a more acute and profound form. Such an attempt would be a tragic frustration of the heroism and endurance which will have gone to the accomplishment of victory.”*

-The Labor Party, *Reconstruction on War and Peace*, 1943<sup>35</sup>

It is an axiom of democratic systems that no significant social change can take place without accompanying political action and support. While the forced integration of different societal classes as a result of evacuation brought the conversation of social equality and educational imbalance to increased public attention across the United Kingdom, it is unfeasible that any modifications to the British educational system would have taken place if political leaders had not concurrently increased their arguments for Parliamentary action. Of course, as illustrated in the introduction of this thesis, pedagogical debate in Parliament was not new. The juxtaposing sides of the Labor and Conservative parties had been debating the role and aims of education in Britain for almost a century. However, with the outbreak of war in 1939, Labor leaders called for educational equality with accelerated vigor and necessity, viewing the wartime of confusion and disorder as a harmonious time to incept an era of social and educational progress.

One substantial governmental study helped mold Labor’s educational reform calls to the political atmosphere of the time, as well as interject a philosophy behind the

---

<sup>35</sup> Labour Party (Great Britain), *Reconstruction in War and Peace: Interim Report of the National Executive Committee of the British Labour Party, Approved by the Party Conference under the Title “The Old World and the New Society”* (New York: League for Industrial Democracy, 1943). Much of the Labor’s political philosophy quoted in this chapter is taken from this annual pamphlet issued by the party.

public's growing discussion of the possibility of social equalization and the necessity of state intervention. The "Social Insurance and Allied Services," a 1942 report written by Sir William Beveridge, a highly regarded economist and social theorist, gained widespread public popularity throughout Britain. Three hundred pages and priced at two shillings, it was summarized by all the leading British newspapers. Within two weeks of its publication, a Gallup Poll discovered that nineteen out of twenty people had heard of the report, and nine out of ten believed that its proposals should be adopted.<sup>36</sup> Surged by its positive public reception, the Labor Party used the Beveridge blueprint model to argue that societal welfare could not be achieved without simultaneous progressive education reform.<sup>37</sup>

Additionally, the Labor Party was invigorated to attain wartime progressive education before peace, as they believed that the wartime environment was the most receptive time to enact change. They pledged at their 1943 Annual Conference that they were aware of the promises made following World War I, and the absence of any fulfillment of those promises once the war ended. They must take advantage of the present environment, the Party proclaimed in its 1943 party manifesto, for "the war itself had changed the direction and tempo of [the country's] thinking far beyond those confines which accepted the principles of the Labor Party before September 3, 1939."<sup>38</sup> Immediacy in enacting legislative reform was required, for there could be no return, they promised, to the antiquities of pre-war Britain.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Angus Calder, *The People's War: Britain, 1939-45* (London: Cape, 1969), 528.

<sup>37</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, Prelude.

<sup>38</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 35.

<sup>39</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 14.

Ultimately, the head of the Board of Education Richard Austen Butler (Rab) would have been unable to push the Education Act of 1944 through the Conservative-dominated Parliament without the help of the vocal and passionate Labor Party. The three Labor ministers in the War Cabinet, Clement Attlee, Ernest Bevin, and Arthur Greenwood, were his most fervent supporters, and Rab consistently relied on his Junior Minister, Chuter Ede, a Labor politician and former schoolteacher, for support. Together, they formed “an energetic team; and they operated... [cohesively] in an atmosphere highly favourable to comprehensive educational reform.”<sup>40</sup>

The first impetus for the creation of Beveridge Report came from the Trades Union Congress in February of 1941. Founded in 1866, the Trades Union Congress (TUC) represented the united arm of hundreds of local, county, and national workers unions. The midwife to the formation of the Labor Representation Committee – later to become the Labor political party – in 1899, the line separating the TUC from the Labor party was indiscernible. For the members of the TUC, the Congress was “a living example of strength through unity; a unity made possible by the fact that unlike some European countries there was no division within the British trade union movement on religious or political grounds.”<sup>41</sup>

Concerned with the inadequacy of the existing provision for health insurance, the TUC sent a delegation to lobby for change to the Ministry of Health in February of 1941. Parliament responded with the announcement of the creation of the Interdepartmental Committee on June 10, 1941, an agency tasked with the mission of surveying the social

---

<sup>40</sup> Calder, *People's War*, 542. Many times when Butler became discouraged by partisanship and political difficulty, it was Chuter Ede who encouraged him and convinced him to continue with his progressive reform.

<sup>41</sup> Clive Griggs, *The TUC and Education Reform, 1926-1970* (London: Woburn Press, 2002), 2.

insurances and allied services. The public and governmental desire for such a survey was strong enough to lead to the announcement of the committee even at a time, as Dr. Karl Schweinitz explained, “while the country was in the darkest period of war, facing the imminent thread of invasion, and on the same day on which the Prime Minister reported to the House the details of the loss of Crete.”<sup>42</sup>

Appointed by the Minister Without Portfolio Arthur Greenwood, the committee included eleven civil servants representing the Government departments concerned. However, non-bureaucrat Sir William Beveridge, a renowned economist, educator, and insurance expert, chaired it. His impact on the report – exemplified by its common moniker “Beveridge Report” – is not overemphasized, for despite the work of the various commission members, the testimony and memoranda of over a hundred governmental organizations, and consultative services from the International Labor Office, the conclusions of the report were ones of which Beveridge announced - and his peers agreed – that he “alone am responsible.”<sup>43</sup>

Both the media and Parliamentary discussions reflected the enthusiasm with which the country waited for the findings of the report. Since the passing of the first insurance act in 1911, Great Britain had been modifying and expanding their federal insurance and assistance services. This process was one that – unsurprisingly – divided the political ideologies. During the Beveridge survey research, labor leaders rose to advocate for its potential to evoke national progress. Ellis Smith, member from Stoke, elucidated in the House of Commons on March 12, 1942, “from poor law to public

---

<sup>42</sup> Dr. Karl De Schweinitz, *England's Road to Social Security, from the Statute of Laborers in 1349 to the Beveridge Report of 1942* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 228-9.

<sup>43</sup> William Henry Beveridge and Great Britain, *Social Insurance and Allied Services* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), 3.

assistance, from public assistance to national assistance, from national assistance to social security – that is the road that this country should travel as quickly as possible.”<sup>44</sup>

Prominent Labor politician Ivor Thomas continued during the same session that every citizen had a right to “a reasonable standard of comfort and self respect...not subject to any test of means or needs.”<sup>45</sup> However, Henry White, a Liberal associated and proclaimed “Conservative sympathizer,” passionately refuted the Labor’s calls for social reform, stating that “it was necessary that we should have a clear idea of that for which we are fighting...[but] we are not fighting...for any...assistance which puts the Minister in the preposterous and indefensible position of having to be answerable for the activities...for whose daily administration he is not responsible.”<sup>46</sup>

White’s words reflected the concerns of numerous other Conservative and religious leaders who had witnessed nations shrink traditional religious authority in exchange for strong, expansive states, and were concerned that Britain – through increased federal intervention in social activities – would follow a similar pattern. For example, several other countries during the beginning of the twentieth century had intensively deliberated where and how state power and religious control should intersect, and in many states, such as France, Germany, and Mexico, this impassioned debate had led to the emersion of sweeping and comprehensive secular governmental frameworks.

In France, the distinction between state and religious domains was the result of an evolutionary development of secularization over a period of two centuries. Beginning in the 1600s, the national government employed military force to curb the Calvinist and

---

<sup>44</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>45</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>46</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)



Huguenots minorities and placed the Catholic French Church under the authority of the King. In 1789, the French Revolution and the subsequent reorganization of the country created new legislation that further aggravated the relationship between the state and religious leadership. The power struggle climaxed with the passage of the Law of 1905, which extolled and finalized the nation's secular identity and separated all federal and state activity from religious intervention. The Law mandated that the State would guarantee "freedom of conscience" by not granting any public legitimization to any religious authority, not providing public money to any religious associations, and creating a secular and free educational system. Overall, the French state promised that secularism would be the judicial standard used to exclude religious institutions in all fields of education, health, and societal activities.<sup>47</sup>

A similar development occurred in Germany – at the time known as Prussia – in the 1870s as the May Laws of 1873 curtailed clerical freedom of speech, abolished the Catholic Section of the Ministry of Worship, and limited ecclesiastical influence over education. While the May Laws affected the influence of the Prussian Catholic minority more than the power of the Prussian Protestant majority, it ultimately deepened the absolutism of a centralized bureaucracy and, as was written in the *Motive* attached to the government's bill, the idea that "churches only in so far as they are legal institutions, stand under the purview and power of the state."<sup>48</sup> Overall, the laws pledged that the state would have a greater influence in helping to meet "the daily needs of national life,"

---

<sup>47</sup> Jean Rene Bertrand, "State and Church in France: Regulation and Negotiation," *GeoJournal* 67, 4 (2006):295-302.

<sup>48</sup> Robert Lougee, "The Kulturkampf and Historical Positivism," *Church History* 23, 3 (Sept. 1954): 219.

as well as “simplifying the means through which an individual could separate from his religious community.”<sup>49</sup>

Finally, in Mexico, the debate between state intervention and religious control triggered an armed revolt and an eventual crackdown on all religious authority. The “Cristero War” of 1926 to 1929 was a violent rebellion between Catholic civilians and the Mexican state that was triggered by the deterioration of religious and federal relations in the early 1920s. As historian James Wilkie elucidated, “the conflict came in 1926 not because the Church wished to mix in politics, or because the revolutionaries were Bolsheviks (as some Catholics charged) but because the Church and state both wanted control of Mexican society, and neither was willing to share that control.”<sup>50</sup> Ultimately, the Mexican state was able to quash the armed religious rebellion, and no changes to the secular framework of the State were made. The power of the state remained supreme.<sup>51</sup>

Subsequently, in the first decades of the twentieth century, as British religious leaders watched their peers lose societal and political influence to the state, they – and their Conservative allies – became increasingly defensive about protecting their traditional roles, such as providing education, and were unwilling to compromise with political electors such as Fisher and Trevelyan. Additionally, as the socialist Soviet Union came to power in 1922, Conservative leaders became even more panicked at the possibility of a British totalitarian regime, which as elucidated by Prime Minister Stanley Martin, would create an “idolatrous conception of the state.”<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Lougee, “The Kulturkampf”, 232.

<sup>50</sup> James Wilkie. “The Meaning of the Cristero Religious War Against the Mexican Revolution,” *8 J. Church & St* 214 (1966): 215.

<sup>51</sup> Wilkie, “Meaning,” 214-233.

<sup>52</sup> Philip Williamson, “Christian Conservatives and the Totalitarian Challenge, 1933-1940” *English Historical Review* 115,462 (June 2000): 618.

However, it is necessary to recognize that conversations of religious control and state power in Britain are unique for the Church of England has enjoyed the status as the nation's state religion since 1534, and subsequently is immunized to the possibility of complete dissolution. Therefore, as the war continued and the publishing of the Beveridge Report loomed, several Conservative leaders recognized that the necessity of postwar reconstruction eclipsed a fear of a "monster," tyrannical British state that removed all religious influence.<sup>53</sup>

The Beveridge Report, known officially as Cmd 6404, was published on December 1, 1942. Characterized as "a scheme of social insurance against interruption and destruction of earning power and for special expenditure arising at birth, marriage, or death," the whole report was based on the assumption that social security should abolish "Want" by supplying every British individual with essential necessities regardless of the life he or she led.<sup>54</sup> While some may argue that the natural progression of law modification, such as what occurred in Germany, France, and Mexico, led to the desire for the more comprehensive analytical plan, other academia view the commissioning of the Beveridge study in Britain as triggered by the wartime environment. One such scholar was the prominent British social researcher and economic professor Richard Titmuss who explained in a 1955 University of Birmingham lecture that, "the waging of modern war presupposes and imposes a great increase in social discipline; moreover, this discipline is only tolerable if – and only if – social inequities are not intolerable."<sup>55</sup> He continued "the aims and content of social policy...are thus determined...by how far the

---

<sup>53</sup> Richard Morris Titmuss, *Essays on The Welfare State* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1958), 85.

<sup>54</sup> Robert Ulich, *The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 106.

<sup>55</sup> Titmuss, *Welfare*, 85.

co-operation of the masses is essential to the successful prosecution of war [for] if this co-operation is thought to be essential, then inequalities must be reduced and the pyramid of social stratification must be flattened.”<sup>56</sup>

Arguably, the most direct effect Beveridge’s plan had on the Labor-driven education reform was the child allowance system it theorized. Under this system, a family’s economic burden would be minimized, making it more possible for children to stay in the education system longer. Labor leaders argued that Beveridge’s children allowances made the extension of the mandatory school age realistic for every British family, irrespective of that family’s societal class.<sup>57</sup> Beveridge outlined the children’s allowance scheme in the second section of his report dedicated to social security that does not operate through insurance. Tactically, he explained that the children’s allowance would be administered under the program of social insurance by one governmental department, the Ministry of Social Security. This system of allowances, paid from the national treasury, would be allocated for every child after the first child in every family in the United Kingdom, irrespective of the head of household’s income. The allowances would continue for a child until the child is 16, *providing that the child is attending school on a full-time basis*.<sup>58</sup> Of course, as previously discussed in this thesis, the idea of extending the mandatory education age was far from new. However, with Beveridge’s explicit outline of leveling the economic situation of a man with more than one child toward equality to a man with one or no children was one of the first of its kind in terms of widely circulated plans of family economics.

---

<sup>56</sup> Titmuss, *Welfare*, 86.

<sup>57</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 19.

<sup>58</sup> Dr. De Schweinitz, *England’s Road*, 239. Dr. Schweinitz included excerpts from the Beveridge Report in his academic dissertation.

Overall, Beveridge's calls for state intervention in educational reform were obvious. In the first chapter of the report, he wrote, "[the] State in organising security should not stifle incentive, opportunity, responsibility, in establishing a national minimum" in health care, social services, and education of youth."<sup>59</sup> Federal financial schemes could "mak[e] it possible for parents who desire more children to bring them into the world without damaging the chances of those already born, and [be] a signal of the national interest in children, setting the tone of public opinion."<sup>60</sup> Beveridge concluded that change was necessary now for, "the purpose of victory is to live in a better world than the old world...[and] each individual is more likely to concentrate upon the war effort if he feels that his Government will be ready in time with plans for a better world."<sup>61</sup>

As was quoted in Professor Titmuss's lecture earlier, despite many of Beveridge's calls being similar to previous Labor legislative pushes pre-World War II, the popularity of his proposals surged directly from his connection of them to the "spoils of victory." His argument rested on the belief that British citizens had fought too long and too hard to not reap increased and substantial benefits from their State once victory came. The tragedy of war, he argued, must lead to the progression of change.<sup>62</sup>

An analysis of media reports and parliamentary discussions revealed, that despite its labor leanings, most politicians stood behind the popular plan, at least publicly. Even the staunchly Conservative *Yorkshire Post* praised Sir Williams "pioneering vision" and the implementation of Beveridge's plan "would be a most heartening affirmation of faith

---

<sup>59</sup> Beveridge and Great Britain, *Social Insurance*, 6-7.

<sup>60</sup> Beveridge and Great Britain, *Social Insurance*, 154.

<sup>61</sup> Beveridge and Great Britain, *Social Insurance*, 171.

<sup>62</sup> Beveridge and Great Britain, *Social Insurance*, 7.

in the future of Britain.”<sup>63</sup> The necessity of reconstruction after such a tragic war, this Conservative editorial proclaimed, mandated state intervention. However, behind closed doors, autobiographical accounts reveal that Conservatives such as Winston Churchill, while welcoming the report in principle, were concerned of its financial implications, and seemed to view it as a distraction from the task of winning the war, not as something that might strengthen the wartime nation. As long-time Conservative politician Harold Nicolson observed during the plan’s political reception, the Conservative Party mantra was to say the report was “all very splendid and Utopian, but we can only begin to know whether we can afford it once we have some idea what our foreign trade will be like after the war.”<sup>64</sup> However, paradoxically, it can be argued that the extensive Beveridge blueprint ultimately fostered a more positive Conservative environment for Rab’s educational reform plans. As Rab explained in his autobiography, “most of the issues of post-war reconstruction [promoted by Beveridge] impinged directly and immediately on the pocket, and appeared in one way or another to touch the sensitive political area of economic planning and control.”<sup>65</sup> Therefore, when Rab began to promote his education bill in Parliament, many Conservative politicians received it as “preferable to having to enact an equally complex, and far more expensive, measure based on the contents of the Beveridge Report.”<sup>66</sup>

The uniqueness of the Labor push for educational reform does not stem from the content of proposals the party supported, but the necessity and essentialness they placed

---

<sup>63</sup> Calder, *People’s War*, 527.

<sup>64</sup> Calder, *People’s War*, 530.

<sup>65</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, *The Art of the Possible: The Memoirs of Lord Butler* (London: Hamilton, 1971), 117.

<sup>66</sup> Anthony Howard, *RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler* (London: Cape, 1987), 132. This argument is further explored in the third chapter of this dissertation.

on the immediacy of reform. This was illustrated no clearer than in their 1943 pamphlet “Reconstruction on War and Peace,” issued at the end of their annual party conference. The annual conference of the Labor Party is customarily referred to as the “governing body” of the party and its “final authority.” The constitution of the Labor Party states that “the Party Conference should decide from time to time what specific proposals of legislative, financial, or administrative reform shall be included in the Party Programme.”<sup>67</sup> The findings of the Party are produced in an annual pamphlet that is used as the basis for all politically advocated reform in the coming year.

Fiercely apparent in the 1943 pamphlet is the Labor Party political philosophy that it was necessary for the nation to recognize that “the war has already, socially and economically, effected a revolution in the world as vast, in its ultimate implication, as that which marked the replacement of Feudalism by Capitalism.”<sup>68</sup> The nation had “arrived at a stage where fundamental economic and social transformation must begin” for “any attempt to restore traditional Britain will deny our power to fulfill the purpose for which we fight and...would be a tragic frustration of the heroism and endurance which will have gone to the accomplishment of our victory.”<sup>69</sup>

The pamphlet continued, relating its philosophy to Beveridge’s blueprint, that a democratic society needed to express itself through social services, such as community benefits, and most importantly, the party argued, through a unified education system. Specifically, the Labor Party called for the extension of the school leaving age to 16, the maintenance allowances outlined by Beveridge, obligatory part-time technical education

---

<sup>67</sup> Robert Trelford McKenzie, *British Political Parties: The Distribution of Power Within the Conservative and Labour Parties* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1963), 486.

<sup>68</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 15.

<sup>69</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 16.

for all teenage workers in industry and agriculture, endowments to universities and technical schools, and most importantly, the wider use of secular advisory educational committees to standardize and equalize educational access.<sup>70</sup>

It is obvious to any reader familiar with the history of educational reform in Britain that the ideas advocated for by the Labor Party in the 1943 pamphlet were not revolutionary. However, the united passion behind the need for educational reform was directly correlated to the wartime environment. Over and over again, in every section of the pamphlet, the Labor Party proclaimed that change had never been more important or necessary. The Labor Party rallied that societal pandemonium of war had triggered the most receptive environment in recent years for arguably monumental societal change, and “we have to [act] now because the character we give to the remaining period of this conflict itself determines the character of reconstruction, domestic, and international.”<sup>71</sup>

Furthermore, the Party wrote that they were “aware of the large promises that were made during the war of 1914-18 and the massive disillusion which followed when they were not implemented after its close.”<sup>72</sup> The Party pledged that they could not allow another missed wartime opportunity because specific and substantial legislative acts were never enacted. Instead, it was, they wrote in their pamphlet, “in the Labor Party’s judgment the same disillusion [following World War I] will follow the present struggle unless we begin, during its course, to organize the conditions which make it certain the promises this time will be implemented.”<sup>73</sup> For as a Trades Union Congress Report warned in 1943, “there was a body of opinion that rendered lip service to democracy and

---

<sup>70</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 18-19.

<sup>71</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 35.

<sup>72</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 14.

<sup>73</sup> Labour Party, *Reconstruction*, 14.



freedom during the war, but paid little regard to it when the country was not at – this was an element which the Trade Union Movement has got to watch.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Griggs, *TUC*, 108.

### Chapter 3: The Passing of the Education Act of 1944

*“Butler, generally considered to have been the father of the 1944 Education Act, had not been present at its conception. His role was rather that of the midwife, and his triumph was to deliver the infant safely after a prolonged and difficult labour.”*

*-R. G. Wallace<sup>75</sup>*

While Labor leaders’ united support for education reform was arguably more passionate than it had been previously, it was not unique. Instead, it was the Conservative leaders’ qualified support for educational reform during World War II that was the most novel.

It can be argued that much of their support for educational reform stemmed from a desire for political appeasement. Evacuation had made education a burning political issue for Conservative and Labor politicians alike, and many Conservative politicians represented rural constituencies outraged by the perils of evacuation. How, the public asked, could the education system have become so unbalanced? Would the ending of war bring increased societal equality, as advocated by Sir Beveridge? And would the chaos outside of Britain bring unity within its borders, or would Britain remain “two-nations”?

Subsequently, as the 1940s progressed, at least some members of the Conservative Party realized that they were seen as closely associated with the pre-World War II system of social privatization, means-tested federal benefits, and a desire to keep public expenditure minimal in order to maintain low levels of taxation. Especially due to the overwhelming popularity of the Beveridge Report, in order to retain their political majority in Parliament – as well as their individual seats – several in the Conservative

---

<sup>75</sup>R.G. Wallace, “The Origins and Authorship of the 1944 Education Act,” *History of Education*, 10, 4 (1981): 290.

party realized that they must attempt to remove this perception. One of these least expensive routes to improve social equality, it seemed, was through educational reform.<sup>76</sup>

By the middle of World War II, there was wide-ranging consensus among the Conservative party that the school leaving-age should be raised and equality of educational opportunity between town and country increased.<sup>77</sup> However, this would involve tackling the “dual system” of religious and secular schools. The question of how to structure such a proposal remained highly controversial.

As described in the introduction of this thesis, since the mid-nineteenth century, education had been the most prominent arena in which the religious sections of Britain had exerted their political and social influence. Schooling in Britain had begun merely as a religious responsibility – the state had not become involved at all until the passage of the W.E. Forster Education Act of 1870. This Act, which gave the Parliament the responsibility to provide compulsory primary education for British youth, was meant to merely fill the fissures of religious education, not as W.E. Forster explained in the House of Commons, “destroy the existing system... [by] introducing a new one.”<sup>78</sup>

However, the result was the creation of a “dual system” of education that allowed parents to choose between secular and denominational schooling for their children. This subsequently proved to have a negative effect on the equality of educational access, for despite the original importance of the Church’s participation in primary education, as Britain society became more technologically advanced in the twentieth century, the uneven financial balance between the modern secular schools and the more traditional

---

<sup>76</sup> Clive Griggs, *The TUC and Education Reform, 1926-1970* (London: Woburn Press, 2002), 113.

<sup>77</sup> Angus Calder, *The People’s War: Britain, 1939-45* (London: Cape, 1969), 542.

<sup>78</sup> Anthony Howard, *RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler* (London: Cape, 1987), 111.

Church facilities likewise increased.<sup>79</sup> Additionally, the Hadow Reports findings in 1926 mandated the importance of separating primary and post-primary schooling, which led to increased monetary strain on religious institutions that had to respond to the need for new school facilities.<sup>80</sup> Because secular schools were concentrated in more affluent areas, many parents had no choice but to send their children to less satisfactory denominational educational systems.

It can be argued, through the reported observations and reactions to evacuation, that before, much of the British public had preferred to be “blissfully ignorant” of the inequalities present in the education system due to these financial differences. But, now with the forced intermingling of youth from different regions, the result of the “dual system” was fully obvious. The Labor party aggravated any remaining ignorance with their passionate political calls in their party conferences, Parliamentary meetings, and media interventions. The Beveridge Report cemented this new focus on state intervention in social affairs, with its promise for a better Britain born from the horrors of war.

The final piece of the journey to the Education Act of 1944 began when Conservative representative Richard Austen Butler (Rab) was appointed President of the Board of Education in 1941. Relying on a passionate allied entourage of assistants from the Labor party, Rab believed upon appointment that the World War II environment triggered a unique openness where he would be able to negotiate an agreement with religious leaders in a way that previous Parliamentary leaders had failed, and craft a plan

---

<sup>79</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 112.

<sup>80</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, *The Art of the Possible: The Memoirs of Lord Butler* (London: Hamilton, 1971), 98.

that Parliament would accept. Rab was successful. In 1944, the landmark Education Act of 1944 was passed, so beginning a new era of British education.

Richard Austen Butler (Rab) was born on December 9, 1902 in a rest house attached to Fort Attock in British-controlled India.<sup>81</sup> Born into a family of distinguished Conservative academic scholars and politicians, it can be argued – with an admitted sense of dramatics – that his legacy was determined before he even entered Parliament. The Butler family had maintained a consecutive tradition at Cambridge since the mid-nineteenth century, beginning with his great-grandfather’s appointment as the Dean of Peterborough in 1853. In the generations that followed, the Butler family continued in prominent academia positions. A few “outliers” of the family entered professions of politics and law. As Rab’s official biographer Anthony Howard wrote in his study of Rab, the Butler family “might well be taken as exemplars of the age in which the middle and professional classes emerged as the backbone not just of Britain but of the Empire as well.”<sup>82</sup>

Rab’s father, Monty Butler, was a British Settlement Officer placed in India. As a result, Rab and his siblings spent their early childhoods growing up a world of British colonial imperialism. Years later, in his autobiography, Rab wrote how the enduring aspect about this experience was how he and his siblings learned to “regard[...] Indians, and by extension all coloured people, as friends.”<sup>83</sup> In the context of an analysis of his political leanings, this childhood experience may have been the first step towards Rab’s “new-Conservative” ideological look at British policy, as he consistently demonstrated

---

<sup>81</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 5.

<sup>82</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 1.

<sup>83</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 6.

throughout his career distaste for Britain's colonial reach and instead a hope for more progressive measures.

In 1911, Rab's parents made the decision to send their nine-year-old son back to England to attend a prestigious prep school. Like other children of the colonies separated from their families and sent to the Empire, it is difficult to distinguish specifically how much this prolonged distance affected Rab's psychological outlook and growth. However, much of his correspondence from school back to his family in India, Howard noted, "provide evidence of a strange sense of detachment," especially in his writings about the outbreak of World War I in 1914.<sup>84</sup> In an analysis of several letters that he sent to his father in 1914 – despite his cousin being killed five months into his service at the front – Rab seemed astonishingly calm in his description of wartime Britain. For example, in his first letter that addressed the outbreak of the war, Rab's only reaction was that he "saw some recruits shooting and others punching bags with their bayonets – they looked awfully funny."<sup>85</sup>

However, this detachment to worldly affairs seemed to minimize with passing years. While he had an original intention of pursuing an academic career, as Rab matured, he began to demonstrate a greater passion in political affairs. In a letter to his father quoted in Howard's biography, Rab wrote, "Dad, I must do something active, something which is going to help the world of today and not that of yesterday."<sup>86</sup> Taking

---

<sup>84</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 10.

<sup>85</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 10.

<sup>86</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 11. In college, Rab became involved in numerous Conservative political youth organizations, and ran for student government.

advantage of his family's reputation as well as his natural political finesse, Rab won office and entered the House of Commons in June of 1929 at the age of 26.<sup>87</sup>

In his maiden years as a Conservative politician, Howard analyzed that Rab "cast his lot as the type of politician who hugs the inside track rather than one who goes recklessly for the outside rails."<sup>88</sup> His speeches focused mostly on non-partisan issues, such as agriculture and international commodity prices, and relied on quotes from distinguished Conservative politicians such as Robert Peel and Stanley Baldwin. His beginning political career, Rab wrote in his autobiography, was focused on "the advantages of the long haul, namely the steady influence one may exert by being at all time on the outside."<sup>89</sup>

However, despite his measured and moderate political tendencies, Rab's leanings towards a more liberal political outlook were already apparent. Strongly influenced by his uncle Geoffrey Butler's essays in *The Tory Tradition*, Rab noted that upon entering politics, he was convinced of "the need in our modern democracy to associate the Tory party with progressive and humane causes."<sup>90</sup> For a man who had grown up learning about the power of academia, educational reform was the first and most important step towards progress. His passion became strengthened with the beginnings of World War II, as Rab represented a rural consistency uprooted and strained by the arrival of evacuated children. He increasingly saw education reform not only as a cause he believed in, but as a way to remedy his voters' resentment and protect his political aspirations. In a letter from his constituency chairman to Rab in December of 1940, the

---

<sup>87</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 8.

<sup>88</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 40.

<sup>89</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 31.

<sup>90</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 29.

head of the voting bloc wrote, “may we soon have peace, but what a socialistic mess we shall have to clear up!”<sup>91</sup> With his appointment as President of the Board of Education, educational reform became his top priority.

Rab was appointed President of the Board of Education on July 20, 1941. His appointment was part of a general reconstruction by the new Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, in creating a government led by younger men.<sup>92</sup> Judging from Rab’s account of his visit with Winston Churchill a week before his appointment, it can be argued that the Prime Minister did not expect that Rab would be the eventual leader behind a future progressive wartime education bill. During this meeting, Rab wrote that Churchill announced pityingly that Rab would be tasked with “mov[ing] poor children from here to here [Churchill lifted up and evacuated imaginary children from one side of his blotting pad to the other], this will be very difficult.”<sup>93</sup> Churchill continued, “I am too old now to think you can improve people’s natures [but] everyone has to learn to defend himself [so] I should not object if you could introduce a note of patriotism into the schools.”<sup>94</sup> Other than that task, Churchill proclaimed, Rab’s sole role as President would be to keep education under control and unexciting during wartime.

However, despite Churchill’s cavalier attitude towards reform, discussion between other Conservative leaders displayed that the Right was becoming increasingly receptive towards educational change. For example, surprisingly, the first steps towards the later imperative political negotiations between the Church and Rab came from

---

<sup>91</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 90.

<sup>92</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 107.

<sup>93</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 90. Churchill was eager to stabilize the educational system after its breakdown under Ramsbotham’s leadership.

<sup>94</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 90.



religious leaders. On December 21, 1940, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council wrote an editorial for the *The Times* entitled “Foundations of Peace.” In this column, they lamented that “extreme inequality of wealth and possessions should be abolished; that every child, regardless of race or class, shall have equal opportunities of education.”<sup>95</sup>

With qualified support from some of his Conservative political peers who were also eager to assuage their rural constituents’ qualms relating to the social chaos of evacuation as well as the recent *The Times* editorial demonstrating more religious openness, Rab believed that a negotiation with religious leaders was possible.<sup>96</sup> In his accounts of late 1939 and early 1940, Rab wrote that, in their governmental quarters, Conservative leaders spoke of how the concessions of past educational reform acts, such as the Education Act of 1936, would no longer be acceptable to the nation after a war that had clearly exposed and perpetuated social divisions.<sup>97</sup> Rab was not the architect of many of the ideas behind the 1944 Education Act, but he was its political schemer that brought the act into policy.

In the beginnings of crafting his plan to tackle the financial inequalities of the “dual system,” despite his arguably progressive attitude, Rab immediately discarded the radical calls from Left organizations such as the Trade Union Congress that called for the complete abolishment of all religious schools. Instead, relying heavily on the energy of

---

<sup>95</sup> Cosmo Cantaur, et al, “Foundations of Peace: A Christian Basis, Agreement Among the Churches,” Letters to the Editor, *The Times*, Dec 21, 1940.

<sup>96</sup> Griggs, *TUC*, 285.

<sup>97</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, “The Education Act of 1944 and After: The First Noel Buxton Lecture of the University of Essex” (lecture, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom, May 7, 1965).

his junior minister, Chuter Ede, a Labor politician and former schoolteacher, in 1941 and 1942, Rab employed a more moderate strategy of independent commissions of inquiry and Papers that he hoped would serve as the foundation for his gradual negotiations with religious leaders.<sup>98</sup>

Rab and his Education cabinet issued their first pamphlet in June of 1941. The pamphlet, which became known as the “Green Book” due to the color of its cover, was designed to serve as a basic outline of hoped for educational aspirations. Though many of the “Green Book’s” proposals did not ultimately come to fruition, Rab wrote that, “its production did stimulate thinking about educational reform and inspired a spate of booklets on the subject, each in its own distinctive colour.”<sup>99</sup> For example, the National Union of Teachers produced a pamphlet in an “ore somber and less vernal” shade of green, while the Association of Directors and Secretaries published an orange pamphlet.<sup>100</sup>

Inspired by the increasing receptiveness of Parliamentary leaders and public agencies to a discussion of educational reform, Rab sent Winston Churchill a letter on September 12, 1941 about his plans to negotiate a potential bill. Churchill replied the next day, exasperated, that he “certainly cannot contemplate a new Education Bill... [for] no one can possibly tell what the financial and economic state of the country will be when the war is over.”<sup>101</sup> Churchill continued that Rab’s sole responsibility should be “to get the schools working as well as possible under all the difficulties of air attack,

---

<sup>98</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 125.

<sup>99</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 93.

<sup>100</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 93.

<sup>101</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 94.

evacuation, etc.”<sup>102</sup> However, despite Churchill’s response, Rab decided to proceed with his plan. In his memoirs, he wrote later he had confidence that he could negotiate a cleanly negotiated and politically accepted bill, and that once this finished bill was presented to Parliament, Churchill would be won over. Understanding that the political environment of the early 1940s was uniquely receptive to educational progress, he noted his determination to continue at the time for “having viewed the milk and honey from the top of Pisgah, I was damned if I was going to die in the land of Moab.”<sup>103</sup>

The first step on Rab’s agenda was making the “Green Book’s” findings public while simultaneously introducing the question of equalizing educational access into Parliamentary conversation. The “Green Book” was made public in October of 1941, and in April of 1942, Rab presented the Report to the National Union of Teachers. After the conference, the Union’s President described the proposals as “the most progressive ever outlined by a President of the Board of Education.”<sup>104</sup> However, despite the December 1940 column published by the coalition of religious leaders advocating for educational change, parliamentary debate in the House of Lords on February 17, 1942 illustrated that negotiation with religious authorities – and their Conservative allies – would still be a challenge. Several Conservative leaders continued to voice their traditional nervousness at extensive state intervention and the repercussions of reform. As proclaimed by Lord Viscount Sankey, “do let us leave something in England to be do

---

<sup>102</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 94.

<sup>103</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 95. Rab believed that if this opportunity for educational reform were missed, there would never be as receptive an environment for reform again in the future.

<sup>104</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 96.

by voluntary effort! Why this passion for uniformity, or, if I may be forgiven for saying so, for creating a totalitarian State in England?”<sup>105</sup>

However, a breakthrough occurred in the summer of 1942, when Rab met with the new Archbishop of the Roman Church, William Temple, “one hot morning in the Conference Room at Kingsway, its windows blitzed out and covered with cardboard, no air in the room.”<sup>106</sup> During hours of discussion with Temple, and the several other religious leaders, including the Dean of St. Albans and the Bishop of Oxford, Rab recounted that he was able to describe to Temple the economic condition of the Church schools and the need for reorganization. Later in his memoirs, Rab wrote that Temple was “moved by the figures and said he had not realised what a bad state the Church schools were in.”<sup>107</sup>

In his meeting with Temple, Rab proposed the outline of what was to become the structure of the Education Act of 1944, and its predecessor the White Paper of 1943. After seeing the animosity of religious leaders to any type of plan that would require compulsory change, Rab decided that the only blueprint that could possibly evoke an agreement would be one that lacked any sort of obligation requirement. Instead, the proposed plan would place the burden of decision onto the backs of the Church leaders themselves. Only this, Rab believed, could lead to support from both Church religious leaders who vowed that they would preserve the sanctity of their educational institutes and from the Labor leaders calling for the equalization of educational access.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Lords, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>106</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 102.

<sup>107</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 102.

<sup>108</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 101.

As is often the bargaining chip in politics, the plan for equalizing access rested in access to money. In his meeting with Temple, Rab was able to convince the Archbishop of, as Howard explained, “the dimension of the financial challenge the Church of England would face if it sought to maintain its school system unimpaired... [as well as] the scale of the educational disadvantages it would be inflicted on the children within its care.”<sup>109</sup> Armed with monetary facts comparing the financial structure of religious schools versus the economical status of secular schools, Rab offered a plan that would allow Church officials to choose to opt into access of state-provided funds.<sup>110</sup>

The offer of federal assistance rested in a choice between two alternatives. If the leaders of a religious school were willing – and able – to contribute 50 percent of the necessary cost of state required improvements to school buildings, then they could apply for “aided” status. In this case, the religious leaders would continue to be free to appoint teachers and organize educational instruction any way they deemed fit. However, if the leaders were unable to provide the 50 percent contribution, then the school would become “controlled.” This would mean that the school, in exchange for the cost of improvements covered by the State, would become under the authority of the relevant “Local Educational Authority.” This state organization would automatically acquire a majority on the religious school’s board of managers and be able to exercise discretion on teacher choice and educational structure. However, even “controlled” schools would be

---

<sup>109</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 125.

<sup>110</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 102.

guaranteed the opportunity to still provide religious instruction – albeit, it would have to be conducted on the basis of a non-denominational “agreed syllabus.”<sup>111</sup>

Ultimately, the structure of this plan derived specifically from the desire to equalize access to satisfactory education. It did not follow simply one partisan side – neither the Labor calls for the elimination of denominational schooling nor the Conservative desire to preserve all religious control. Instead, it worked to equalize the monetary status of schools across Britain by eliminating and rebuilding the failing schools without diminishing the right of religious institutions to provide private education.<sup>112</sup>

While Archbishop Temple’s apparent openness to such an arrangement increased Rab’s optimism, three months later, at a meeting on September 15 with the first official Roman Catholic delegation at the Board’s headquarters in Kingsway, Rab actually faced greater animosity. Catholic officials reported that the plan was too “transparently tailormade” to Anglicanism for it disregarded the Catholic view that schools were an integral part of its “worshipping community.”<sup>113</sup> The Catholic schools were unable to apply for the “aided” alternative due to financial constraints, but the “controlled” status would eliminate their integral religious belief in the sovereignty of complete Catholic education. Rab, however, was not surprised at their reaction, and left the meeting

---

<sup>111</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 101. Because the Church of England enjoyed the status as Britain’s state religion, any “agreed syllabus” would most likely follow their frameworks. This helps explain why the Church of England more readily accepted Rab’s plan compared to the other Christian denominational minorities.

<sup>112</sup> Butler, “Education Act.”

<sup>113</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 126.

confident that the small Catholic denomination would not have a large impact on his continued political negotiations.<sup>114</sup>

Instead, with Temple's support, Rab continued to lobby a greater number of his political colleagues to support his educational reform blueprint. Still hopeful to keep his negotiations off Churchill's notice, Rab "launched a subtle campaign of persuasion aimed at rallying support for his Government colleagues – the objective, admittedly, was a limited one: not a bill at the beginning of the session but rather a commitment in the King's Speech to education reform, which would prepare the way for legislation by the summer of 1943."<sup>115</sup> His facile approach, however, proved to no avail, for a highly publicized letter from the Catholic Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster effectively brought Rab's proposed plan to public – and unfortunately for Rab, Churchill's, – light.<sup>116</sup>

The letter, published in *The Times* on August 23, 1943, criticized Parliament for promoting a plan that diminished minority rights for "the Catholic body in this country comes mostly from the workers and from the poorer sections of the community [and] [t]herefore our Catholic parents have a special claim for fair play, especially from any and every party or group that professes to uphold the just claim of the... rights of minorities."<sup>117</sup> Churchill's response the next day was equally as colorful. The next

---

<sup>114</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 127.

<sup>115</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 128.

<sup>116</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 128.

<sup>117</sup> Bernard Griffin, "The Interests of Catholic Children," *The Tablet*, *The Times*, August 23, 1943.

morning, he delivered Rab “the Archbishop’s letter cut out, stuck on a piece of cardboard... with the message scribbled on it, ‘there you are, fixed, old cock.’”<sup>118</sup>

However, even the Prime Minister couldn’t stand in the way of educational reform as the Beveridge Report – with the Labor Party’s drive behind it - garnered widespread publicity. In his accounts about early 1943, Rab wrote that the Government and its Conservative majority were soon realizing that they would have to devote some attention to postwar reconstruction. An education bill, they discussed in their quarters, would be far less expensive than many of the proposals advocated by Beveridge in his report. Rab noted that in the early spring of 1943 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Kingsley Wood, stopped him in the halls of Parliament and exclaimed that he “would rather give money for education than throw it down the sink with Sir Beveridge.”<sup>119</sup>

Additionally, only Rab had made substantial progress on drafting a legislative report. In his autobiography, Rab noted that the other Ministers on the home front had not even attempted to garner a legislative bill to progress their respective sections, even with the support of the Beveridge Report behind them. For example, he quoted running into Sir Granville Ram, a member of the Parliamentary counsel who was responsible for the paperwork of bills issued to the House of Commons, who explained that his office “had nothing else whatever on the stocks – not even a keel laid down.”<sup>120</sup>

However, despite the qualified support from within the halls of Parliament, Rab still faced a hefty obstacle in convincing Churchill to support his work. In his accounts of his appointment, Rab explained that Churchill never had much regard for the work of

---

<sup>118</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 129.

<sup>119</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 133.

<sup>120</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 117.



the Board of Education. He wrote that, “over dinner one night during the autumn of 1941, [Churchill] claimed that thirty-five years earlier Campbell-Bannerman had told him, ‘you are the brightest and best of our under-secretaries... [and] I should like to offer you the Presidency of the Board of Education [but] I do not think you are suitable for smacking children’s bottoms and blowing their noses.’”<sup>121</sup>

After Rab’s failure to convince Churchill to include any substantial information about education reform in the King’s speech of Christmas, 1942, Rab was adamant that in order to keep the political vitality of his hoped for educational bill alive, he would need to persuade Churchill to include specific detail in the Prime Minister’s oration entitled “A Four Year Plan For England,” which was to be broadcast from London over the British Broadcast Channel (BBC) on March 21, 1943.<sup>122</sup> As he drove down with Lord Cherwell to Churchill’s home for dinner the night before Churchill was to make his speech, he drafted the educational bullets he hoped to convince Churchill to include.<sup>123</sup> In his autobiography, Rab reported that he was nervous of Churchill’s response, even despite Lord Cherwell’s promise that the Prime Minister “would be wanting to talk about education.”<sup>124</sup>

After a rousing dinner filled with “exaggerated gusto”, Churchill sent all the dinner guests away from the table besides Rab and Cherwell.<sup>125</sup> Rab wrote that Churchill explained casually that there was a portion in his speech “about the need for refreshing

---

<sup>121</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 108.

<sup>122</sup> Winston Churchill, “A Four Year Plan for England,” copy of oration transcript, London, March 21, 1943, radio broadcast, BBC. The link to the transcript is found in the bibliography.

<sup>123</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 109.

<sup>124</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 110. Frederick Alexander Lindemann, known as Lord Cherwell, was an English physicist and renown advisor to Winston Churchill.

<sup>125</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 113.

the House of Commons as soon as Hitler was defeated, at which time it was necessary to put the country on a four-year plan, involving such subjects as agriculture and education.”<sup>126</sup> Churchill then proceeded to “read four pages on education, which were in a flowing style and derived from Disraeli’s view that a nation rules either by force or by tradition.”<sup>127</sup> Finally, Churchill remarked that his daughter Mary had told him that he must include in his speech the assertion that the school-leaving age be raised to 16 “because it has been promised and that he agreed with her as this would keep people off the labour market where ‘blind-alley occupations’ started so fair and often ended so foul.”<sup>128</sup>

At the end of Churchill’s monologue, it was 1:00am, and Rab wrote that he was disappointed in Churchill’s obvious intention that he still would not introduce any specific measures of reform until peacetime. However, he refused to be discouraged, and convinced Churchill to allow him to “spend the night” with the portion of Churchill’s speech addressing education.<sup>129</sup> Rewriting until 9:00am, Rab added a paragraph that addressed religion and its place in schools as well as a statement “about the need for every type of school and every type of tie.”<sup>130</sup>

In his account of the following morning, Rab wrote that “at a quarter to eleven my presence was demanded and I found [Churchill] in bed, smoking a Corona, with a black cut curled up on his feet.”<sup>131</sup> Rab continued that Churchill “began aggressively by claiming that the cat did more for the war effort than I did, since it provided him with a

---

<sup>126</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 112-3.

<sup>127</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 113.

<sup>128</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 113.

<sup>129</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 114.

<sup>130</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 114.

<sup>131</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 114.

hot-war bottle and saved fuel and power...Didn't I agree? I said not really, but that it was a very beautiful cat. This seemed to please him."<sup>132</sup> Eventually, Rab was able to present his edits to Churchill.

To Rab's surprise, despite Churchill's vague philosophizing the night before, most of his amendments were received favorably. Rab reported that Churchill believed the edits were an improvement, and while he did not agree with Rab's wording about religion, he "allowed that there were people in the country who would have noticed its omission...[and] he would...express the idea in his own way."<sup>133</sup> Butler then asked Churchill if he wanted to thank British teachers for the crucial part they had played in evacuation proceedings, but Churchill "dismissed this with a jocular reference to the long and boring list of acknowledgments in theatre programs, 'Wigs by Clarkson. No.'"<sup>134</sup>

Eventually, Rab reported that his discussion with Churchill came to what was "the most crucial part of our conversation."<sup>135</sup> With poetic garnishment, Churchill advised Rab that he should "not come out too much on education immediately, because they will only drag you down in the present political atmosphere."<sup>136</sup> Ever the politician, Churchill cautioned Rab that his attempts to negotiate a bill in Parliament at the current stage would lead to Rab's political demise. Rab, however, unfazed, staunchly told Churchill that he was currently drafting an education bill that he intended to present. "Without raising his head from the papers before him on the counterpane," Churchill shrugged and replied that

---

<sup>132</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 114.

<sup>133</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 114.

<sup>134</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 115.

<sup>135</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 115.

<sup>136</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 115.

Rab should “show him [the] plans when they were ready and that he was sure they would be very interesting.”<sup>137</sup>

In his eventual speech later that day, Churchill words of education still contained the poetic, vague philosophizing of Disraeli. Rab’s specificities, however, were apparent, as Churchill advised that “schooling of the great mass of our scholars must be progressively prolonged and for this we must both improve our schools and train our teachers.”<sup>138</sup> He lamented that “we must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges.”<sup>139</sup> He continued that this did not mean that the religious element of schools should be eliminated for “religion has been the rock in the life and character of the British people.”<sup>140</sup>

Invigorated by Churchill’s speech and increased openness, the forty-year-old President of the Board of Education left the Prime Minister’s home that evening and immediately began preparing what was to become the famously positive politically-received White Paper of 1943. This report, officially presented as the “Education Reconstruction” paper to Parliament on July 16, 1943, was based on the findings of the Papers and studies issued by Rab and his Board in 1941 and 1942.<sup>141</sup> The paper, a report into the hoped for British educational reforms, contained the popular advocated and accepted proposals of raising the school leaving age, the increase of nursery schools, and

---

<sup>137</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 115.

<sup>138</sup> Winston Churchill, “A Four Year Plan for England.” Coming from a Conservative Prime Minister, Churchill’s words about the importance of state intervention represent the growing mitigation of traditional Conservative fears of a radically interventionist, extensive state.

<sup>139</sup> Winston Churchill, “A Four Year Plan for England.”

<sup>140</sup> Winston Churchill, “A Four Year Plan for England.” These words further highlight the uniqueness of the Church of England’s role in British society.

<sup>141</sup> Board of the Education, *Education Reconstruction*, July 16, 1943, Cmd. 6458. The link to the Government document is found in the bibliography.

the requirement of compulsory part-time education up to eighteen for those already at work as well as a provision to promote “the necessary amendment of the existing law so as...to enable the schools provided by the voluntary bodies to play their part in the proposed developments.”<sup>142</sup> It included Rab’s proposed educational structure, the same that he had advocated for to Archbishop Temple a year back, with an explanation into the choice and structure of “controlled” and “aided” status. This, the paper advocated, would mitigate the current system by restoring the possibility for “equal standards in all forms of...education.”<sup>143</sup>

In a two day debate on the paper, the House of Commons, as *The Times* observed on July 31, 1943, “showed itself of one mind, to a degree rare in parliamentary annals...Not a single vote was raised in favour of holding up or whittling down any one of the proposals for educational advance embodied in the White Paper.”<sup>144</sup> Overall, Rab seemed to view the positive Conservative reception of the White Paper as vindication for his beginning strategy of papers and commissions that “test[ed] the temperature of the water before taking the plunge.”<sup>145</sup> This is also apparent in Rab’s confident answers to Parliamentary inquires during the debate that he had reached “a wider measure of agreement than has ever been obtained before” with all necessary parties.<sup>146</sup>

However, the Catholic party continued to speak out against Rab’s proposals. A week later, Rab noted in his autobiography that he attempted to explain at a Conference with the Catholic Bishops, that “if the Catholics were patient and accepted this

---

<sup>142</sup> Board of the Education, Education Reconstruction, July 16, 1943, Cmd. 6458.

<sup>143</sup> Board of the Education, Education Reconstruction, July 16, 1943, Cmd. 6458.

<sup>144</sup> Parliamentary Correspondent, “Political Notes,” *The Times*, July 31, 1943.

<sup>145</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 136.

<sup>146</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

settlement, they could in my view...hope for more within generation [but] if, on the other hand, they placed themselves athwart the stream of national progress, they would be doing their cause so much harm, especially in some districts, that it might never recover.”<sup>147</sup>

However, Rab’s disagreements continued with the Catholic leadership throughout the year. His success finally came in May of 1944 when he offered favorable government loans to finance Catholic capital expenditure, allowing several Catholic schools to attain “aided” status, rather than “controlled.”<sup>148</sup>

On the other hand, on the Anglican side, immediately following the White Paper’s presentation, Temple spoke highly of it, claiming it as a “glorious opportunity” at his diocesan conference at Canterbury in August. In a letter to *The Times*, he continued his support, warning the Christian population that any substantial negativity towards Rab’s proposals would lead to a “postponement or withdrawal of a measure so important to the welfare of the country.”<sup>149</sup> With a breadth of support behind him, the next step for Rab and his Board was the preparation and presentation of a legislative act.

The Education Act of 1944 was formally published on December 15, 1943, beginning with its first Reading in the House of Commons. As expected, it deviated minimally from the White Paper of 1943. It was introduced by Rab as legislation that would simply “reform the law relating to education in England and Wales,” and that “Mr. Attlee, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Sir Archibald Sinclair, Mr.

---

<sup>147</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 106-7.

<sup>148</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 138. This shows again that, as we as modern readers know all too well, money is the key to almost all political compromise.

<sup>149</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 135. The importance of Temple’s support for Rab’s reform cannot be overstated. In both public media discussion and in political negotiation, having Temple behind him gave Rab immense respect.

Winnik, Sir William Jowitt, Mr. Ernest Brown, the Attorney-General, Mr. Ede” and even “the Prime Minister” all formally supported it.<sup>150</sup>

A debate on the bill was not held, however, until its second reading on January 19 and 20, 1944. Rab chose to divide his reading into two halves, the first half concentrating on the part of the Act that contained the least controversial legislative proposals, and the second half on the issues most debated. In his introduction to the members of the House of Commons, Rab justified this decision by explaining that he hoped to “adopt the technique of school life...[by] treat[ing] it more as a match; I hope in the first half to play with the wind and in the second half I shall probably be playing against the wind.”<sup>151</sup>

The first half of the reading included the following proposals: containing all “Local Education Authorities” under the umbrella of a newly created Ministry of Education, the expansion of the educational advisory councils’ powers, the replacement of the traditional elementary code with a continuous process of education conducted in success stages and suited to “age, ability, and aptitude,” extending compulsory school age in successive stages to the eventual age of 16, dividing primary and secondary education at the age of 11, and offering special schools for children suffering from physical or mental disability.<sup>152</sup>

The only substantial disagreement Rab faced from Parliament in this first half was comedic banter between Sir G. Shakespeare and Sir Patrick Hannon. Shakespeare, in his support for Rab’s proposals, quoted that he had “visit[ed] the constituency of the Foreign Secretary, down in Warwickshire..[and] he said to a row of senior children: ‘Who is your

---

<sup>150</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80).

<sup>151</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>152</sup> Butler, *The Art of the Possible*, 118.

Member of Parliament?’ They looked blankly at me. They had never heard of him and of what he had done. But when I asked them ‘Who won the fight last night?’ they all held up their hands and said, ‘Max Baer.’”<sup>153</sup> Hannon, a representative of the neighboring constituency, Birmingham, responded, “May I interrupt the hon. Gentleman for a moment? I am afraid he is taking rather liberties with the intellectual status of the children of Warwickshire. Believe me, the Foreign Secretary is a very popular person in Warwickshire.”<sup>154</sup>

However, expectedly, Rab’s presentation of his religious and secular school structure of “controlled” and “aided” schools faced greater Parliamentary discussion. In his introduction of this blueprint, Rab quoted “God, of his abundant grace, hath sent copious plenty of children, but not plenty of money to maintain them.”<sup>155</sup> He then proceeded to briefly summarize previous educational reforms in Britain, the history of religious school influence, and eventually, his outline of the “controlled” school and the “aided” school. Rab concluded that “we wish these new terms, which we regard as generous, to be fully examined and discussed but in return I would ask those who feel deeply to dismiss from their minds the wholly unwarrantable view that the Government desire either to tear away church schools from unwilling managers or to force them inhumanely out of business.”<sup>156</sup>

While, not surprisingly, Rab immediately faced calls from Labor leaders that the Act did not go far enough, in a general analysis of the days speech, most Parliamentary

---

<sup>153</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>154</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>155</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>156</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80). Rab had no interest in following the lead of his political counterparts in Mexico and France.



leaders were receptive to the Act as a way to help unite wartime Britain.<sup>157</sup> Several leaders noted that Rab was the first politician to succeed so successfully in navigating the process of religious negotiations. For example, Sir G. Shakespeare proclaimed, “[Rab] is like a sapper. He has waved his hand of good will and compromise very skillfully... [while] I have seen more than one President of the Board of Education blow himself up on the mines of religious controversy.”<sup>158</sup>

In terms of its relation to a new postwar social system, George Muff, a Labor politician, defended that Rab’s presented bill attempted “to break down a class barrier – and when this war is finished we shall be so sick of war that we shall not want a class war.”<sup>159</sup> Hannon, a Conservative leader, agreed, as he explained “I would like to say at once how cordially I agree with my hon. Friend in his wholesome admonition that there should be no class war after the present struggle... It is true, that in many of our Dominions, education is at a disadvantage.”<sup>160</sup> Similar words were echoed by Conservative politician Henry Broke, who explained that he was not concerned with the “niceties of education law, and still less... with education jargon” but for his constituents to have “good teaching and real opportunities.”<sup>161</sup> He continued, praising the Church of England for “ma[king] arrangement[s] for the drawing up of a Report on its religious education in relation to the circumstances of the time” and for “the ability, pep, and drive of the brilliant administrator now at the head of the Board of Education.”<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80) . Especially since Rab had now gained Catholic support, all traditional religious concerns had mostly been assuaged.

<sup>158</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>159</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>160</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>161</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>162</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

However, financial and religious controversy was acute. Conservative member John Stokes raised the concern that because the counties would be financially responsible in delegating funds, it is likely that aid would be concentrated on the center, not the periphery, and there would be “bitter fights on local councils which would fully prevent the fulfillment of what [we all] desire[...] at heart.”<sup>163</sup> Colonel Arthur Evans remarked that “in a nutshell... where there are enough Catholic children to fill a school – and a school which would in any case exist – then that school should be Catholic in religion,” regardless of that school’s ability to fully financially support itself.<sup>164</sup> However, even Evans conceded that “I am not for one moment decrying the educational benefits which the Catholic and non-Catholic child will get under this bill [for] we are all agreed that so far as that is concerned it is an immense step forward.”<sup>165</sup>

Nevertheless, the most controversial debate on a section of the Act did not occur until its Third Reading on March 28, 1944, as the bill reached the 82nd of its 111 clauses. This clause was concerned with the salary scale of teachers. Raised, surprisingly, by a Conservative member of Parliament, Thelma Cazelet moved an amendment to the bill that would “not differentiate between men and women solely on grounds of sex and shall.”<sup>166</sup> She continued “men and women enter the training colleges at the same age, with the same entrance qualifications... [and] when they get into the schools they are confronted with the same problems, responsibilities and conditions of work.”<sup>167</sup> While several members of Parliament immediately voiced support for her amendment, Rab

---

<sup>163</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>164</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>165</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>166</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

<sup>167</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

defended the bill as is, stating that he would like the Parliament to “take a businesslike attitude on this bill.” He argued, the object of the Clause was not to substitute the Minster into the “present machinery which negotiates teachers’ salaries...[for] the Committee must keep in mind...that I do not employ the teachers, nor does the Committee.”<sup>168</sup> The state, he argued, had no right in deciding the fair salaries of teachers. That was up to either the “Local Education Authorities” in a “controlled” or secular school, and the religious leaders in an “aided” school.

However, despite Rab’s argument, no sooner “did the Tellers appear at the Bar of the House,” did it become clear that the first challenge of amendment to the bill had succeeded.<sup>169</sup> The majority was as small it could have been, with 117 votes recorded for the amendment and 116 against. While Sir Arthur Greenwood announced that the passing of the amendment “did not mean any lack of confidence in the President of the Board of Education,” Rab was reported to have “slammed his documents into his dispatch case, banged its lid, and walked out.”<sup>170</sup>

The equal pay controversy evoked a fierce retaliation as both Conservative and Labor politicians pledged to restore the original clause to the bill as a way of returning confidence both in the bill and in Rab. Two days later, a massive majority in a vote of 425-33 deleted the two-day-old clause from the bill.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80). Despite the progressiveness of Rab’s reform, these words show Rab’s conservatism at heart. State intervention was necessary, but to him, there was a fine line that could not be crossed.

<sup>169</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 133.

<sup>170</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 134.

<sup>171</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 136. Subsequent historians have probably been correct in detecting the equal pay revolt – and the massive retaliation it called forth from the Conservative Party – as one of the contributory factors to the Labor majority victory in the election the following year.

Rab's bill continued to wind its way steadily towards the Statute Book. Even the House of Lords scarcely amended it, with its only substantial change substituting the title of "Minister" for "President."<sup>172</sup> It was royally assented into law on August 3, 1944. With all its original clauses in print, as Conservative politician Edward Campbell remarked in Parliament on May 12, 1945, "we called the old Act, the Fisher Act. How are we not going to remember this bill? Shall we not call it the Butler Act?"<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Howard, *RAB*, 138.

<sup>173</sup> Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

## Conclusion:

Historian Correlli Barnett argues in *The Lost Victory*, “like so much of the industrial, institutional, and mental furniture of postwar Britain, the dream of New Jerusalem was essentially a late-Victorian survival, even though it had taken the Second World War to inspire its final vivid immediacy.” Barnett continues that much like during the Victorian age, British intelligentsia in the years following the end of World War II became convinced that “morality and reason could prevail over ruthless pursuit of material interest, that faith and dedication could build an ideal society at home...and so usher in an era of harmony among men.”<sup>174</sup>

While Barnett’s words simplify the complicated partisan debate over state intervention and the importance of societal equalization raging in local councils, state committees, and Parliament, it is undeniable that at the end of World War II, the centrists of both political parties attempted to associate themselves with philosophies of “positive liberty” and “One Nation.”<sup>175</sup> Several leaders believed that to gain a majority in a postwar government, they would need to highlight and emphasize their support for these ideals.<sup>176</sup> This is demonstrated clearly in the 1943 educational negotiations led by Richard Austen Butler that led to the passage of the Education Act of 1944.

However, despite the progressiveness of Education Act of 1944, evidence shows that it was not enough to appease the postwar electorate of Britain. In 1945, Churchill and his Conservative majority lost in a landslide election to Clement Attlee and his Labor

---

<sup>174</sup> Correlli Barnett, *The Lost Victory: British Dreams, British Realities, 1945-1950* (London: Macmillan, 1995), 114.

<sup>175</sup> Barnett, *Lost Victory*, 116.

<sup>176</sup> David Marquand and Anthony Seldon, *The Ideas that Shaped Post-War Britain* (London, Fontana Press, 1996), 135.

government. During the election, Labor maintained that the Conservatives' claim that there was a change in their party philosophy towards a "new progressive" right was largely fictional. This "New Conservatism," Labor argued, was accompanied neither by a new basis of popular public support nor a radical change in party strategy.<sup>177</sup> Instead, Labor reasoned that only with their party in power could Britain exchange prewar hallmarks of "charity" and "dependency" for new promises of modernity and social citizenship. Subsequently, upon gaining a majority, the Labor party implemented several extensive Beveridge-based legislative acts on a wave of reforming zeal, furthering British state intervention into society.<sup>178</sup>

Despite the failure of the Conservative party to use the Education Act of 1944 as a tool for their own political gain, it is notable that the Act remains a landmark success in terms of British twentieth century educational reform. The financial framework organized by Rab's compromise between different partisan agencies initiated a new era of school rebuilding that modernized British facilities in the decades following the war. The monetary grants authorized by the Education Act of 1944 financed the construction of new and updated buildings in stark contrast to the prewar educational system where many students in low-economic areas learned in antiquated and single-teacher facilities. In fact, by 1964, only one in every hundred children of secondary age was still at an all-age school.<sup>179</sup>

Ironically, in a 1965 lecture at the University of Essex, Rab proclaimed that the government had gone too far by exercising too much influence in British education and

---

<sup>177</sup> Marquand, *Ideas*, 122.

<sup>178</sup> Marquand, *Ideas*, 141.

<sup>179</sup> Richard Austen Butler, Butler of Saffron Walden, "The Education Act of 1944 and After: The First Noel Buxton Lecture of the University of Essex" (lecture, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom, May 7, 1965).

cautioned that the “perfunctory and uninspired nature of the religious instruction provided in all to many [secular] and controlled schools has begun, in the opinion of people well qualified to judge, to imperil the Christian basis of society.”<sup>180</sup> Rab continued that “Parliament and local government are becoming obsessed with secondary school reorganisation, and educational policy is tending to put more value on equality than on scholarship.”<sup>181</sup>

Despite Rab’s pleas, Circular 10/65 was implemented a few months later, mandating a further standardization and equalization of the British school system. This extensive reform, led by Labor Minister of Education Tony Crosland, put an end to the previous tripartite system that separated students based on a test at the age of 11 that evaluated their “technical,” “modern,” or “grammar” aptitude.<sup>182</sup> Secondary schools would no longer be able to separate students based on assessment or skill.

Radical change did not occur again until 1980s, when the 1988 Education Reform Act created a “national curriculum” and the introduction of “national curriculum assessments.”<sup>183</sup> Furthermore, the Act provided that schools could, if enough of their pupils’ parents agreed, opt out of the control of their local educational agency and become grant-maintained centers funded directly from the central government.<sup>184</sup>

In recent years, pedagogical conversation has reached a consensus that education should be focused on catering education to each child’s ability. Arguably, this modern

---

<sup>180</sup> Butler, “Education Act.”

<sup>181</sup> Butler, “Education Act.”

<sup>182</sup> Board of Education, Circular 10/65: The Organisation of Secondary Education, July 12, 1965. The link to this Act is found in the bibliography.

<sup>183</sup> “Education Reform Act 1988,” *UK Parliament*, March 18, 2015, <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/livinglearning/school/overview/educationreformact1988/>.

<sup>184</sup> “Education Reform Act 1988,” *UK Parliament*.

idea demonstrates a return to the philosophy of the tripartite system. The creation of contemporary programs such as specialist schools, the introduction of “Curriculum 2000,” and “interventionist” academic guidance illustrates a strong national focus on ensuring that every child succeeds.<sup>185</sup>

However, conversation about the role and purpose of education persists, both in the United Kingdom and globally. Partisan disagreement continues and will likely trigger future debate on this topic. Nevertheless, the Education Act of 1944 provides a shining example of how bipartisan compromise can lead to reform with expansive public benefits.

---

<sup>185</sup> Derek Gillard, “The Blair Decade: Selection, Privatisation, and Faith,” *Education in England: A Brief History*, 2011, March 18, 2015, <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/history/chapter10.html>.



## Bibliography:

- Arthur Worchester, "Religious Education," Letters to the Editor, *The Times*, Jan 11, 1941, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T003&docPage=article&>.
- Barnett, Correlli. *The Lost Victory: British Dreams, British Realities, 1945-1950*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Bernard Griffin, "The Interests of Catholic Children," *The Tablet, The Times*, August 23, 1943, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/browseEdition.do?prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T004&method=doBrowseEdition&mcode=3FDQ&dp=19430823&docPage=browseissue&fromPage=browseIssuePage>.
- Bertrand, Jean Rene. "State and Church in France: Regulation and Negotiation." *GeoJournal*. 67, 4 (2006): 295-306.
- Beveridge, William Henry, and Great Britain. *Social Insurance and Allied Services*. New York: Macmillan, 1942.
- Board of Education, Circular 10/65: The Organisation of Secondary Education, July 12, 1965, <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/des/circular10-65.html>.
- Board of the Education, Education Reconstruction, July 16, 1943, Cmd. 6458, <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/wp1943/educational-reconstruction.html>.
- Butler of Saffron Walden, Richard Austen Butler. "The Education Act of 1944 and After: The First Noel Buxton Lecture of the University of Essex." Lecture, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom, May 7, 1965.
- Butler of Saffron Walden, Richard Austen Butler. *The Art of the Possible: The Memoirs of Lord Butler*. London: Hamilton, 1971.
- Calder, Angus. *The People's War: Britain 1939-45*. London: Cape, 1969.
- Cosmo Cantaur, et al, "Foundations of Peace: A Christian Basis, Agreement Among the Churches," Letters to the Editor, *The Times*, Dec 21, 1940, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T003&docPage=article&searchType=&docId=CS85014421&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.
- Churchill, Winston. *A Four Year Plan for England*. Read by the author. London: BBC, March 21, 1943, <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1943/1943-03-21a.html>.

- Conekin, Becky and Frank Mort, eds. *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain, 1945-1964*. London: Rivers Oram Press, 1999.
- Dent, H. C. *Education in Transition, a Sociological Study of the Impact of War on English Education, 1939-1943*. Edited By Dr. Karl Mannheim. New York: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Derrick Wilde, "London Evacuation 'Fun', Boy Refugee, 8, Declares." *The Washington Post*, September 3, 1939, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/151120707?accountid=14667>.
- De Schweinitz, Karl. *England's Road to Social Security, from the Statute of Laborers in 1349 to the Beveridge Report of 1942*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943.
- Editorial, "Health and Safety," *The Times*, Dec 20, 1940, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T003&docPage=article&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&docId=CS84359060&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.
- "Education Reform Act 1988." *UK Parliament*. March 18, 2015. <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/livinglearning/school/overview/educationreformact1988/>.
- Gillard, Derek. "The Blair Decade: Selection, Privatization and Faith." *Education in England, A Brief History*. 2011, March 18, 2015. <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/history/chapter10.html>.
- Griggs, Clive. *The TUC and Education Reform, 1926-1970*. London: Woburn Press, 2002.
- Howard, Anthony. *RAB: The Life of R.A. Butler*. London: Cape, 1987.
- John A. Ryle, "A.R.P Plans, The Evacuation of Children," Letters to the Editor, *The Times*, May 9, 1938, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/infomark.do?&source=&prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T003&docPage=article&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&docId=CS252654249&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.
- Labour Party (Great Britain). *Reconstruction in War and Peace; Interim Report of the National Executive Committee of the British Labour Party, Approved by the Party*

*Conference under the Title "The Old World and the New Society"*. New York: League for Industrial Democracy, 1943.

Lougee, Robert. "The Kulturkampf and Historical Positivism." *Church History*. 23, 3 (Sept. 1954): 219-235.

Marquand, David, and Anthony Seldon. *The Ideas That Shaped Post-War Britain*. London: Fontana Press, 1996.

McKenzie, Robert Trelford. *British Political Parties; the Distribution of Power within the Conservative and Labour Parties*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.

Parliamentary Correspondent, "Political Notes," *The Times*, July 31, 1943, <http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ttda/infomark.do?&source=ale&rodId=TTDA&userGroupName=umuser&tabID=T003&docPage=article&searchType=&docId=CS34290943&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.

*Volume Numbers and Dates are Included to Help The Reader Find the Desired Transcript in the Hansard Parliamentary Debate Database*

Parliamentary Debates, Commons, 5th series (1909-80)

HC Mar 12, 1942 Vol. 378.

HC July 16, 1943 Vol. 391.

HC Dec 15, 1943 Vol. 395.

HC Jan 19, 1944 Vol. 396.

HC Jan 20, 1944 Vol. 396.

HC Mar 28, 1944 Vol. 398.

HC May 12, 1944 Vol. 399.

Parliamentary Debates, Lords, 5th series (1909-80),

HL Feb 17, 1942 Vol. 121.

Titmuss, Richard Morris. *Essays on The Welfare State*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1958.

Ulich, Robert. *The Education of Nations; A Comparison in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Wallace, R.G. "The Origins and Authorship of the 1944 Education Act." *History of Education*. 10, 4 (1981): 283-90.

Wilkie, James. "The Meaning of the Cristero Religious War Against the Mexican Revolution." *J. Church & St* 214 (1966): 214-233.

Williamson, Phillip. "Conservative Conservatives and the Totalitarian Challenge, 1933-1940." *English Historical Review*. 115, 462 (June 2000): 607-642.