~~MAR 3 1975~~ 247

~~APR 30 1975~~ 201

E — 336

2 — 33

ABSTRACT

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JAMES MILL AND ROBERT OWEN
TO A STATE PHILOSOPHY OF POPULAR EDUCATION
IN ENGLAND 1800-1839

By

David Paul Ruggles

The problem examined in this work is the relationship between the educational philosophies of James Mill and Robert Owen and the emergence of a State philosophy of popular education in England.

The methods employed to accomplish this study were: a detailed study of the works of James Mill and Robert Owen to identify their philosophies of popular education and an analysis of the Parliamentary debates and papers dealing with popular education for their philosophic content. The last part of the study is an interpretation of the role that the philosophies of Mill and Owen played in the actual formulation of State philosophy on popular education.

The conclusions drawn in this study suggest that the educational philosophy of James Mill was dominant in the formation of a State philosophy of popular education.

An argument is constructed that the creation of the Committee of Council on Education adopted its policies from the fundamental features of James Mill's educational philosophy. The policies of the Committee of Council on Education became the first State philosophy of popular education. The Council's adoption of an Inspectorate without legal powers, the absence of State institutional involvement in the operation of popular education schools, and the absence of a compulsory school attendance law was the embodiment of James Mill's philosophy of popular education.

While present in Parliamentary debates and popular literature, Robert Owen's educational philosophy is not found in adopted State policies for popular education. Owen's contribution, as assessed by this study, is that of a presenter of educational ideas that were adopted by many workingmen's organizations. Owen's philosophy, exposed and popularized as it was, was not reflected by the educational philosophy adopted by the State when it established an agency for popular education.

A suggestion for further investigation resulting from this work would be a study dealing with the political manipulation surrounding early nineteenth-century Parliamentary decisions on popular education. Also an examination of the educational philosophies of Owen and Mill with John Locke's thought would be useful.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JAMES MILL AND ROBERT OWEN TO A STATE PHILOSOPHY OF POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND 1800-1839

By

David Paul Ruggles

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my advisory committee; Dr. Keith Anderson, Dr. George Ferree, Dr. Russel B. Nye, and Dr. J. G. Moore for their guidance and encouragement throughout the doctoral program. I extend special thanks for the assistance given me in editing this dissertation to Dr. Moore who patiently polished my rough efforts.

I would also like to thank the staff of the University of London Senate House Library for their cooperation during my research there in 1969.

Thanks is also in order for my colleagues at the Leslie Middle School, Nancy Ficnerski, Jeff Hartnell, Charles Benson, and Betsy King who have both tolerated and encouraged me during the writing.

Final thanks goes to my wife whose faith in my ability was the spur that kept me going.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Historical Problem and Thesis Organization

This dissertation examines the contributions of James Mill and Robert Owen to the development of a philosophy of popular education in England. This topic had been selected because little has been done with this aspect of either Mill or Owen. Both men are mentioned prominently concerning education in general, but little is said about their impact on the origins of mass public education. It is the contention of this paper that the work of both men was influential in the direction and practice of early English popular education. Though neither Mill nor Owen were ever governmental officials, they had great exposure to the decision-making process of each of the governments in power.

This paper will not deal with the complex internal structure of English politics and the problems of direct influence of Parliamentary acts, but rather will define the educational ideas and activities of both Owen and Mill and show how they were incorporated into the emerging philosophy of popular education. The task is to show that

many of the philosophical and practical directions of English popular education were advanced by Robert Owen and James Mill and in effect the emergent product illustrated a combination of their positions.

To begin, I will illustrate what each means by "popular education." To accomplish this I will present evidence from their personal and published papers plus examples from their active participation in education. The problem is to assess and interpret the historical evidence.

Following this introduction, the thesis will be divided into two parts. The first is a definition of the educational philosophies of Robert Owen and James Mill, containing points of philosophic analysis and a comparison of their positions. The second part speaks to three historical questions:

1. What was the role of each man as an educational thinker in English Society?
2. What was the nature of the philosophical controversy surrounding the origins of English popular education?
3. In what ways did the emerging forms of popular education embody the philosophies of Owen and Mill?

The Bibliography will follow the above sections and will consist of three parts. The first will be a

discussion of the literature available on nineteenth century English popular education. The second discusses the sources used in researching this thesis. The third part is a bibliography of the sources used in this thesis.

James Mill and Robert Owen

What permeates almost all writing and activity regarding popular education during the first third of the nineteenth century is the tremendous emphasis on it as a means to a social end. For the first time in England, education was being viewed as an instrument of social change. Mill and the utilitarians dreaded the possibility of non-rational institutions extending their influence through the control of education. In essence the negative definition of state authority, to safeguard individual rights, was translated into education by James Mill. He was a middle class scholar whose circumstances made him a contributor to modern popular education. He has been picked for this study because he represented the utilitarian position. Others represented this position as well, and it is not my claim that Mill alone advanced utilitarian ideas on popular education. What is sought is a greater knowledge of the contributions of utilitarian thought, as represented by Mill, to the origins of English popular education.

The main reason for including Robert Owen in this study is that he represented a new approach to English

social and educational problems. He presented social problems as essentially the product of miseducation. His appeal was mixed. His writings and speeches were made for mass consumption, not a scholarly audience. I will contend further that he was the first educational reformer in England to attempt to reach all elements of society. Mill and the others wrote for the literate middle and upper class, while Owen represented the first truly universal appeal for popular education.

This study is not intended to be an analysis of all the political movements that supported popular education. The scope of this paper is to assess the individual contributions of two men to the origins of a social institution. The broader context of their lives is important for it provides the historical perspective needed for interpretation. Also an awareness of the existing forces in popular education during the first part of the nineteenth century is necessary.

Before beginning an interpretation of either Robert Owen's or James Mill's contribution to English popular education I would like to acquaint the reader with a brief history of English popular education.

A Brief History of English Popular Education

Popular Education in England Before 1800

When modern historians attempt to study movements or concepts of the past decades particular problems may arise regarding language. In this study a problem arises with the use of the term "popular education." Harold Silver concludes that, "The concept of popular education, in its British environment, appears as a range of attitudes, of sub-concepts, at one historical moment, and is demonstrably something else at another."[1] In the historical period with which we are concerned the phrase "popular education" hardly existed. Instead the phrase "education for the poor" was used to label tracts concerning education for those without educational opportunity.

The title of tracts on popular education reflect a charitable view toward popular education before the nineteenth century. Efforts to extend literacy were assumed, in the main, by those with a moral or religious commitment to better his fellow man for his own salvation.

In England two principle movements attempted to spread literacy to the unprovided for mass population. They were: (1) The Parochial Charity School movement, which was particularly vigorous during the first thirty

---

[1]Harold Silver, The Concept of Popular Education (London: Macgibbon and Kee Ltd., 1965), p. 13.

years of the eighteenth century and may be dated from the founding of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698; (2) The Sunday School Movement which spread rapidly after 1784 under the leadership of Robert Raikes.[1] At its peak, the Parochial Charity School Movement probably never exceeded 30,000 students.[2] The reasons for the limited appeal of this movement are easily discernable. An examination of the course of study and administrative structure of these schools exposes them to be poorly run by persons whose qualifications in many cases was only membership in the Church of England.[3] The curriculum was devoted almost solely to Bible study and in most cases was little more than religious indoctrination. Modern readers may wonder how the schools attracted any students at all.

The intent was, as Bishop Butler put it " . . . not in any sort to remove poor children out of the rank in which they were born, but, keeping them in it, to give them the assistance which their circumstances plainly

---

[1]Charles Birchenough, History of Elementary Education (London: University Tutorial Press Ld., 1932), p. 12-19.

[2]Ibid., p. 15.

[3]Mary Sturt, The Education of the People (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), pp. 8-12.

called for, by educating them in the principles of religion as well as of civil life."[1]

While reading was stressed in the eighteenth century Charity school movement, writing was almost totally neglected. The reason for this may be understood in simple economic terms. Writing materials cost too much for the school to provide them. In addition, the moral-religious objectives of the schools could be attained by reading alone.

The Sunday School Movement

The Sunday School Movement replaces the Parochial Charity School movement in importance by 1780.[2] The immediate popularity and large attendance with Sunday schools may bespeak more of changing social and economic forces than a birth in the masses of a craving for formal education. The nature of Sunday School instruction varied little from the earlier Parochial School, but what was different was the time of instruction. Sundays did not, in general, interfere with the economic employment of the work force as week day schools did. Economic change was taking place in England. The nature of the emerging factory system was making child labor an essential part

---

[1]Sturt, Education of People, p. 8.

[2]Birchenough, History of Education, p. 18.

of the work force. Growing urban areas, with their incumbent social dislocation problems, spurred Robert Raikes and others to the Sunday School concept. It was perfectly acceptable to businessmen and factory owners alike. One day a week to improve the Poor's morals without the loss of work time must have been attractive to civic-minded businessmen, particularly with the salvation of good works theology dangling in front of them.[1]

Some other eighteenth century forces acting upon popular education should be mentioned. One was the tremendous flow of population into towns to provide a work force for the developing factory system. Another factor, one that this work is more directly concerned with, was the changing intellectual climate of the country. The French Revolution and the challenge of empiricist philosophy directly affected popular education in England.

The growth of a concentrated illiterate population in urban areas caused many new problems for English society. The power structure sought to resolve these growing problems during the eighteenth century by providing moral education in the classroom. What took place there was little more than religious catechism. The social objective of maintaining the status quo was not being accomplished. Toward the end of the century,

---

[1]M. G. Jones, The Charity School Movement (Cambridge: The University Press, 1938), p. 10.

problems were growing rather than subsiding. The Sunday School movement, regardless of the impressive numbers they boasted, was not doing the job. The social leaders viewed the products of social change as moral decay and looked to the church for help. The church responded to the changes the only way it could, through its existing structure. It was not enough.

Empiricist philosophy affected popular education very little in the eighteenth century. The works of Locke, Godwin, Helvetus, Malthus, Paine and Adam Smith were, however, presenting a new view of man and his relationship with his environment. The traditional conceptions of social authority and the role of the citizen were being challenged. With great emphasis on reason and rational application of intelligence to all problems, it logically followed to many empiricists that stress on mass education would be the method to cure the social ills that had arisen. The great belief that social problems could be solved by an exposure to rational methodology is a great legacy of the eighteenth century mind to the popular education movement in England.

The Thrust for Popular Education

As the first decade of the nineteenth century was nearing a close, the forces of change within English society were beginning to emerge from their wartime

repression. Social change caused by the industrial revolution, which had been openly repressed in the name of national security during the Napoleonic Wars now began. New industrial wealth demanded representation in government. Academic rebels sought institutions free from religious domination. Robert Owen and James Mill were in this vangard seeking change.

The following is a brief outline of the positions taken by various factions of English society on popular education during the early nineteenth century.

1. The reactionary political view was that popular education was dangerous. It was feared that raising the working man above his station would cause unrest, hence the reactionaries attacked all proposals. Most Tories and many Whigs fell into this category.
2. The religious view was that education enough to read and learn from the Scriptures was needed to preserve social tranquility. The believers in this viewpoint worked for church run popular education modeled on the Parochial Charity School movement of the eighteenth century.
3. The Utilitarian view, which Mill was instrumental in forming, was that popular education was needed for political and social needs. This view, briefly stated, was that any forms of training should be incouraged that would make for social progress and yet be fitted into individualistic economics. It also was the wish of the utilitarians to keep religious teaching separate from academic and vocational skill training.
4. The working class view, to which Robert Owen strongly contributed, was that society was dependent and responsible for the education of each of its citizens.[1]

---

[1]T. L. Jarman, Landmarks in the History of Education (London: John Murray, 1963), p. 245.

Problems occur in lumping all working men together and calling their points of view consistent. By some criteria there was no working man's point of view. Very few working men had a chance to express a point of view.[1] Much of the socalled working class point of view is in fact the utterances of those concerned for the working man. The positions held by former working men would be a more accurate discription of the body of thought and action here labeled the working man's point of view. The political views ranged from the acceptance of orthodox economics, as in the case of Francis Place, to the collectivist political utopianism of Robert Owen. Their views on education were less diverse; however on one point they agreed, that all men should be allowed to develop their mental capacities in order to participate in society as active citizens. In most cases they agreed that society could not afford to allow ignorance to exist as it caused social decay.

Popular Education Schools

Many of the schools that provided popular education during the first two decades of the nineteenth century were influenced by the work of two men, Andrew

---

[1]R. K. Webb, The British Working Class Reader (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1955), pp. 63-64.

Bell and Joseph Lancaster.[1] Their organizational patterns were seized upon as the answer to popular education. The major attraction of these systems was the modest cost per pupil they projected.

The Monitorial Systems of Bell and Lancaster.--It should be noted first of all that neither Bell nor Lancaster were great educational philosophers. They viewed education as a mechanical skill or tool to be learned.[2] Their major objective was to provide a basic skills education as cheaply as possible. To achieve this goal, organization and careful attention to graded subject class matter was stressed. Short lessons and strict adherence to a time table were essential features of the system. Each school was divided into small classes which were put in charge of a "picked boy" or monitor. Its greatest claimed virtue was the utilization of unpaid instructors to teach large numbers of students very cheaply.

The curriculum of the school was mechanically organized and strictly adhered to. To work successfully, both Bell and Lancaster contended that all the children must be occupied all the time. Bell was explicit, "To attain any good end in education the desideratum is, to

---

[1] Birchenough, History of Education, p. 281.

[2] Ibid.

fix attention, to call forth exertion, to prevent the waste of time in school."[1] To accomplish this, the monitorial school sought to replace the traditional methods of corporal punishment as a means of discipline. Bell and Lancaster spoke of the process of "emulation" by the younger students of the older students to effect order.

The English Common School at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century.--Little information is available on common schools of popular education at the turn of the nineteenth century. The declining Charity Parochial Schools and Sunday Schools were available for the poor who were unable to pay. The common schools did not follow any prescribed pattern or system of organization. Professor Birchenough has ventured a few general descriptions of these schools:

> Everything was calculated to foster mean educational ideals, harsh discipline, and wooden methods. Schools in the main were small, composed of pupils of all ages, and numbering anything from a dozen upwards, in charge of a single teacher, confined to one room, often enough ill-lighted, overcrowded, and with a minimum of furniture and apparatus, a few benches, books, pens, and paper being all that was required. In successful schools an assistant or usher was employed, but large establishments employing a number of teachers were unusual. Schooling seems to have been entirely a matter of limitation, memorising, and getting off of tasks with no attempt at exposition, though doubtless many a schoolmaster here and there with the instinct

---

[1]Bell, The Madras School (London: 1797), p. 10.

> of a born teacher did his best as far as circumstances would allow to touch the understanding of his pupils.[1]

I would now like to turn to the societies that were to play a central role in the development of English popular education.

The National Society.--The Church of England had long been looking for a way to rejuvinate the degenerating Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Looking at the experiments of Andrew Bell, they decided to act on his model. In the fall of 1811, "the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales" was formed.[2] Religious instruction was to be an essential part of the curriculum. Within a month of the society's founding, L 15,000 was subscribed by the church and private donors.[3] The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge even donated L 500 apiece to the new society. Over 120 grants for new school construction were made in the period from 1811 to 1815. The conditions for a grant from the National Society were:

---

[1]Birchenough, History of Education, p. 279.

[2]W. H. G. Armytage, Four Hundred Years of English Education (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), p. 91.

[3]Birchenough, History of Education, p. 43.

1. The Bell system of monitorial instruction and school organization must be used.
2. The children must be instructed in the liturgy and catechism of the Church of England.
3. The children must attend the Church of England regularly on Sundays.
4. No religious tract could be brought into the school unless it was approved by the "Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge."[1]

Two years of schooling was thought to be enough for each child even though the ages of attendance were set between seven and fourteen. No fees were charged until 1824 when a fee of 1d a week was suggested.[2]

Fluctuation of the economy caused periodic financial crises within the Society. However, Royal support and Church money managed to expand the system so that in 1831 it was claimed by the National Society that 900,412 children were receiving instruction in Society schools.[3]

The work of the National Society was an attempt at systematic popular education. Their objectives were clearly presented in their requirements for grants. Their work represented the established church in popular education.

---

[1]Birchenough, History of Education, p. 44.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Great Britain, Public Record Office, Report of the Select Committee on Education, 1834 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1834), pp. 138-39.

The British and Foreign School Society.--The British and Foreign School Society was formed by the directors of the bankrupt Royal Lancasterian Association.[1] Some committee members, at the time of this action, were Henry Brougham, Samuel Whitbread, and James Mill. The Society was supported by the political utilitarian group favoring popular education. They supported schools using Lancasterian instructional techniques and maintained a model training school on Borough Road in London. All schools supplied with teachers by the Society were to be opened to children of all denominations. Although no catechism of any particular sect or denomination was allowed to be taught reading lessons came from the Bible. The children were required, as in the National Society schools, to attend church of their own choice on Sunday not, as in the case of the National Society, the Church of England.

The size and backing of the British and Foreign School Society never approached the National Society, yet it was another system of popular education.

The London Infant School Society.--The infant school was largely the product of Robert Owen. In 1818 he, along with James Mill and Henry Brougham, started

---

[1]Birchenough, History of Education, p. 45.

a successful infant school in London, and from this was formed the London Infant School Society in 1824.

The Infant School Society schools were designed to accommodate at the most 300 children. A large amount of space was to be set aside for playgrounds to be used as a means of training the pupils in good habits. The stress was to be on the attainment of useful knowledge through play. Wilderspin became a master at one of these schools and carried the message across England.[1]

Informal Popular Education Associations.--The term informal popular education refers to attempts made to carry on an educational program outside traditional school settings. Falling into this category were the working man's organizations and private agencies. Adult popular education comes under this heading. The mechanics institutes, trade unions, and the press made efforts in this area. Political organizations such as Chartism, the Grand National Trades Union, and the Anti-Corn Law League all fall into this category even though their objectives were much different. They all attempted to communicate

---

[1]Frank Smith, A History of English Elementary Education 1760-1902 (London: University of London Press, 1931), p. 110.

with the previously untouched mind of the illiterate or semi-literate working population.[1]

The beginning of Mechanics Institutes was an informal series of separate occurrences. The working men of a community or specific factory would band together and form a small subscription library for their own use. The topics of the books involved, however, were carefully selected by a selection committee. This selection committee was often controlled by local officials who had donated either books or space to set up the library originally. Many times rules were drawn up to govern the selection of books and forbade the purchase of books dealing with theology or politics.[2] Books in these libraries tended to be religious tracts and various moral preachments, which dimmed much of the original furvor that the movement once had.

The literature of the middle class did not attract large numbers of workers, it just was not relevant to their interests.[3]

---

[1]Webb, The British Reader, pp. 62-4.

[2]Ibid., p. 66.

[3]Ibid., p. 159.

CHAPTER II

THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES OF JAMES MILL AND ROBERT OWEN

Introduction

The educational theories of James Mill and Robert Owen are the topic of this part of this study. To present each man's position evidence will be presented from their works. Each position will consist of two divisions; the first will be the statement of their moral philosophy, in a statement of the social aims of education, stating these in terms of what ought to be or what should be the most desirable product of education; the second will be the implementation of this moral philosophy into action. The second part will stress each conception of man in relation to society and his environment.

The Aims of Education

James Mill viewed education as the total preparation for life. He expands the concept of education far beyond the procedures of the formal classroom, and the school, to include all the environmental forces acting

upon the individual. He makes this very clear in the opening passage from his essay "Education,"

> . . . Everything therefore, which operates, from the first germ of existence, to the final extinction of life, in such a manner as to affect those qualities of mind on which happiness in any degree depends, comes within the scope of the present inquiry.[1]

Given this expanded view of what education entails, Mill argues that improving the educational shortcomings of a society should receive the highest priority.

> . . . the power of education embraces every thing between the lowest stage of intellectual and moral rudeness, and the highest state, not only of actual, but of possible perfection. And if the power of education be so immense, the motive for perfecting it is great beyond expression.[2]

Who should be educated? Mill resolves this question using the utilitarian argument in favor of universal education. He argues that the power of education is so great that virtually all people can improve themselves into rational happy beings by proper exposure to it.

> . . . The question, whether the people should be educated, is the same with the question, whether they should be happy or miserable. The question, whether they should have more or less of intelligence is merely the question whether they should have more or less misery, when happiness might be given in its stead.[3]

---

[1] James Mill, Seven Essays--from The Encyclopedia Britanica, 7. Education (London: 1825), p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 28.

[3] Ibid., p. 67.

The next question, in view of the stated positive qualities of proper education as stated above, is what body is responsible for education in society. On this point Mill is less clear. He fears state control for reasons of indoctrination and abuse of the power of education. In his essay, "Schools for All, in Preference to Schools for Churchmen Only," which appeared in 1812, he argues that state control is church control; for the historic position of the church-state relationship depends upon the power of church education to maintain government. Where he believes that this has been a bad basis for government from the beginning, and to extend church-state influence by starting new educational programs would be a step in the wrong direction. Mill is very skeptical as to whether the clergy of the Church of England really intend to teach even the young of the Church of England.

> Let not any part of the clergy of the Church of England attempt to disguise the disgraceful fact that the children of the poor belonging to that church are untaught.[1]

Mill's concern over the dangers of the misuse of state-church power over the individual was consistent with his view that the ultimate end of education was for the whole of society to realize as much happiness as possible.

---

[1]James Mill, "Schools for All, in Preference to Schools for Churchmen Only," Philanthropist, II (1812), p. 19.

> As the happiness, which is the end of education, depends upon the actions of the individual, and all the actions of man are produced by his feelings or thoughts the business of education is, to make certain feelings or thoughts take place instead of others . . .[1]

The question of whose happiness comes first; the individual or the society, is quickly resolved by Mill who simply states;

> The end of education is to render the individual, as much as possible, an instrument of happiness, first to himself, and next to other beings.[2]

He further amplifies this position in this general statement of the human condition:

> Men must be happy themselves before they can rejoice in the happiness of others; they must have a certain vigour of mind, before they can, in the midst of habitual suffering resist a present pleasure; their own lines, and means of well being, must be worth something before they can value, so as to respect the life, or well being, or any other person.[3]

The Church of England being eliminated as an institution to attempt universal education, what then does Mill propose? His only proposal, other than private philanthropy, is for the clergy of the Church of England to undertake the education of all the children of the poor. This seeming contradiction by Mill is only to illustrate the hopelessness of either the church or the

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, p. 11.

[2]Ibid., p. 1.

[3]Ibid., p. 47.

state as educator of all the people, for Mill realized that the church would never allow dissenters to attend church schools. This was before the repeal of the Test Acts which in effect disenfranchised all but confessors of the Church of England from office.

> Let them the clergy unite, and let them come forward to parliament with a well considered scheme for affording schooling to the children of all the poor; let the measure be supported with all the power and influence . . . they . . . can exert.[1]

What he views as the only practical alternative is "voluntary contributions" and self-supporting private education.[2] From his position, we infer that he thought that the ultimate responsibility to obtain education was the same as all others, and hence fell to whom it would bring the most happiness, the individual. As we have previously seen the central agent for obtaining happiness is the individual thus the central responsibility must rest upon him to obtain his own education. He illustrates this clearly in this passage concerning state control of education.

> When the legislature undertakes to do for every man, what every man has abundant motives to do for himself, and better means than the legislature; the legislature takes a very unnecessary, [Sic] commonly a not very innocent trouble.[3]

---

[1]Mill, "Schools for All," p. 36.

[2]Ibid., p. 37.

[3]Mill, Seven Essays, p. 70.

There is no doubt that Mill linked existing educational institutions with the interests of the established church and political power structure. He argues that educational institutions based on traditional curriculum and organizational structures can only be enemies of social progress. Before reading the following quotation, which is quite lengthy, but quite to the point; I would like to point out that this was written about seven years after the quotation earlier cited to the effect that legislative provision for the education of all the poor would be a satisfactory solution to the problem. More will be made of the effects of time on Mill's thought, in part III but for the present, note the harsh language of his position on formal educational institutions.

> With respect to the education of that class of society who have wealth and time for the acquisition of the highest measure of intelligence, there is one question to which everybody [Sic] must be prepared with an answer. If it be asked, whether, in the constitution of any establishment for the education of this class; call it university, call it college, school, or any thing else; there ought to be a provision for perpetual improvement; a provision to make the institution keep pace with the human mind; or whether, on the other hand, it ought to be so constituted as that there should not only be no provision for, but a strong spirit of resistance to, all improvement, a passion of adherence to whatever was established in a dark age, and a principle of hatred to those by whom improvement should be proposed; all indifferent men will pronounce, that such an institution would be a curse rather than a blessing. That he is a <u>progressive</u> being, is the grand distinction of Man. He is the only progressive being upon this globe. When he is the most rapidly progressive then he most completely fulfils his destiny. An institution for education

> which is hostile to progression, is, therefore, the most preposterous, and vicious thing, which the mind of man can conceive.[1]

That Mill was skeptical of the value of established formal educational institutions of our times as a means of educating the poor is the logical extension of his position concerning on institutions run by the establishment.[2] The founding of new institutions is one alternative he views with possible favor, if, they make provisions for continual improvement and progressive change. The utility of the old established institutions is always to be questioned for they have gained their power merely from tradition.[3]

Mill does not view with favor any expanded social role of educational institutions. Mill does not see the school itself as a powerful institutional force for the social education of the society. He contends just the opposite, that the society in which we live tends to have the greatest influence on the formation of our characters.

> . . . the actual rewards and punishments which society has to bestow, upon those who please, and those who displease it; the good and evil, which it gives, or withholds, are so great, that to adopt

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, pp. 70-71.

[2]The term establishment in Mill's writings refers to the church-state political social complex.

[3]Mill, Seven Essays, pp. 73-74.

> the opinions which it approves, to perform the acts which it admires, to acquire the character, in short, which it 'delighteth to honor' can seldom fail to be the leading object of those whom it is composed.[1]

In Mill's view, the power of educational institutions was very limited. Social and political education took place, at least in the most part, outside any educational institution. In effect what Mill says is that the quality of a society ultimately depends on the political power structure which a society possesses. Simply, his argument runs, individuals seek the pleasures and happiness that society has to bestow, and since the political machine has the power to reward members of society, then the means and behavior of a society are ultimately determined by the nature of the political machine. If the machine is corrupt, then corruption is rewarded. If virtue, talent and honesty are incumbent in the political machine then these traits are reflected by the rewards a society bestows.[2]

Mill views the education of all the people as essential for a progressive happy society. He also states true happiness can only be found when one learns to "rejoice in the happiness of others." To do this we must be "educated" to select the proper actions to

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, p. 77.

[2]Ibid., pp. 78-79.

accomplish this end. The conflicts between individual interests and community interests are never completely resolved, for Mill, other than in terms of the individual coming first which really leaves us in a state of contradiction. The relegation of institutional education to a position of minor social and political significance introduces more inconsistencies into his position. However, before we attempt to explore these conflicts further, let us now turn to part II of the analysis; the nature of reality assumptions Mill has made about human beings and learning. These ideas may help our moral questions of who ought to come first or why we should even worry about institutional education.

Learning Theory

Mill's theory of learning is more accurately a catalogue of his view of reality. The human mind, the forces of society, and the forces of nature are all given a weight and position in his theory.

James Mill's learning theory follows essentially the same course as other English empiricists; that all knowledge is derived from sense experiences and from the introspective experience of our own feelings. To this premise he adds the concept of the association of ideas as the means by which we advance from simple to complex knowledge. He argues that as one gains more and more simple sensations they become associated to each

other to form complex feelings or thoughts which in turn are themselves given names. For example, if we look, smell, feel and taste an apple we are in fact compiling a list of simple sensory reports which collectively are titled an apple. Hence, when at a future date someone says apple we immediately associate the simple sense reports into a total apple. Mill called these associations "trains" and said that knowledge consisted of a combination of simple and complex "trains." In classifying mental trains he divides experience into two types;

> In regard to all events, relating to mind or body, our knowledge extends not beyond two points: The first is, a knowledge of the events themselves; simple sense experiences, the second is, a knowledge of the order of their succession. The expression in words of the first kind of knowledge is history; the expression of the second is philosophy.[1]

Learning becomes, to Mill, a rather mechanical function of ordering the sequences of experiences to achieve a particular train of associations. Mill uses the illustration of the learning of language as a practical test of his theory.

> It is not pretended that the example of language is exactly parallel to the case which it is brought to illustrate. It is sufficient if it aids the reader in seizing the idea which we mean to convey. It shews [Sic] the analogy between the analysing of a complex sound, namely, a word, into simple sounds of which it is composed, to wit letters; and the analysing of a complex feeling, such as the idea of

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, p. 8.

> a rose, into the simple feelings of sight, of touch, of taste, of smell, of which the complex idea or feeling is made up.[1]

Since Mill has reduced Learning to his above stated experience-association theory, the job of education seems quite obvious.

> As the happiness, which is the end of education, depends on the actions of the individual, and as all the actions of man are produced by his feelings or thoughts, the business of education is, to make certain feelings or thoughts take place instead of others. The business of education, then, is to work upon the mental successions.[2]

However until now we have said nothing about what motivates the individual to choose those "certain feelings or thoughts" that will lead to happiness. Mill's theory, as we saw in section one, begins to show some inconsistencies. Evidence from Mill's writings supports psychological hedonism[3] as his attributed motives for the actions of people within a social context. He contends that two things have power over the choice of sequences; Custom, and Pain and Pleasure.[4] Custom he defines as the associations between trains and how all trains are joined together.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 11.

[3] Psychological hedonism is the position that all individual acts are motivated by self-interest in order to maximize individual pleasure.

[4] Mill, Seven Essays, p. 17.

> that which leads most surely to the happiness, first of the individual himself, and next of his fellow creatures, are by custom effectually united with them, a provision of unspeakable importance is made for the happiness of the race.[1]

What Mill means is that people will always decide in terms of what brings them pleasure as opposed to pain on an individual basis, but this does not mean that it necessarily follows that by selecting pleasure that they must cause pain to others. Custom determines what means the individual employs to obtain pleasure. The question of where the power of custom resides, with the individual or with society, is an issue for Mill to directly address himself. This he does, but not in the sections of his work which deal directly with learning theory and motivation for learning. I take this as a significant omission. Since Mill claims that society is most powerful in shaping Custom values for the individuals within it, then the formal learning process itself is an undertaking which can have at most a limited effect, in the long run, on those who under go it.[2] The education of poor children, and not a change in the structure of society reward system would do little to change their behavior.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

[2] Ibid., p. 56.

Moving on to some classroom applications of Mill's theory of education, we see a definition of pleasure as power which can be used in the learning process. He contends, in the following passage, that all human desires are ultimately political and that education should be used to exploit this desire for the greatest benefit of mankind.

> The grand object of human desire is a command over the wills of other men. This may be obtained, either by qualities and acts which excite their love and admiration, or by those which excite their terror. When the education is so wisely conducted as to make the train run habitually from the conception of the good end to the conception of the good means; and as often, too, as the good means are conceived, viz. the useful and beneficial qualities, to make the train run on to conception of the great reward, the command over the wills of men; an association is formed which impels the man through life to persue the great object of desire, fitting himself to be, and by actually becoming, the instrument of the greatest possible benefit to his fellow men.[1]

We can infer from the use of the terms "love" and "admiration" as the force to gain control over other's wills, that the concept of positive modeling or emulation of behavior to gain individual recognition was supported by Mill. The Lancasterian system, which he supported fully,[2] was based completely on the theory of emulation and immitation by students both toward the monitors and the best students in their own class section. The concept

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Mill, "Schools for All," p. 2.

of ordinal ranking based on a merit system is consistent with this position.

Mill did not contend that all people should have the same level of education, but did claim that all should be educated to a certain degree. What this level was is not stated directly in terms of an exact chronological age or a specific level of academic competence in particular subject matter areas, but his intent is made quite clear in the following arguments.

Consistent with his theory of the equal intellectual potential for all people; Mill states that the only reason that all people cannot develop the same level of intelligence is that of economic necessity. He separates higher intellectual attainments from other achievements most specifically.

> . . . The difference between intelligence and other qualities desirable in the mind of man is this, that much of the time exclusively devoted to the fixing of the associations on which the other qualities depend is not necessary; such trains may go on while other things are attended to, and amid the whole of the business of life. The case is to a certain extent, the same with intelligence; but, to a great extent it is not. Time must be exclusively devoted to the acquisition of it; and there are degrees of command over knowledge to which the whole period of human life is not more than sufficient. There are degrees, therefore, of intelligence, which must be reserved to those who are not obliged to labour.[1]

The question then is what is the level that should be attained by all? Mill's position is strongly stated

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, pp. 66-67.

in favor of education for all people until they had reached the age of maturity. The nature of his argument shows the characteristic utilitarian twist. He argues that men, like animals, should be held from labor until they are mature. "There is an actual loss, therefore, even in productive powers, even in good economy, and in the way of health and strength, if the young of the human species are bound close to labour before they are fifteen or sixteen years of age."[1] Further supportive of this position against child labor is Mill's view of the harmful effects of factory labor on the mind.

> When the greater part of a man's life is employed in the performance of a few simple operations, in one fixed invariable course, all exercise of ingenuity, all adaptions of means to ends, is wholly excluded, and the faculty lost, as far as disuse can destroy the faculties of the mind, great harm is done.[2]

Curriculum

Mill divided the educational process into what he considered to be four essential parts.

1. Domestic Education
2. Technical Education

---

[1] Ibid., p. 67.

[2] Ibid., p. 48.

3. Social Education

4. Political Education[1]

These divisions do not necessarily follow each other in sequence, but rather are used to identify forces acting upon the individual. To Mill each had a different period of greatest influence in one's education. We are concerned more with the first two, for these are what Mill considered the domain of formal full-time education. Mill considered the home and the school as the agency of Domestic and Technical education and the society in general as the Social and Political educators. Mill says very little about the means of society as an educator other than the economic forces of adaptation by individuals to society's means of reward. Mill considers this as a very strong force in the over-all education of the individual.[2] But for our purposes what Mill says about the areas of education related to conscious efforts by others to influence the individual in specific directions, is more to the point.

Domestic education translates more into infant care than any other phrase that comes to mind. Mill defines it as "all that the child hears and sees, and more especially all that it is made to suffer or enjoy

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

[2] Ibid., p. 76.

at the hands of others, and all that it is allowed or constrained to do, in the house in which it is born and bred, . . ."[1] Consistent with his environmentalist position, he considers all the sense experiences from the very first to be crucial in the formation of individual character. He suggests that early sensations have the most lasting or semi-permanent effect but does not assume that they are unalterable at a later date. Mill states;

> The original features are fabricated here; not indeed in such a manner as to be unsusceptible of alteration, but in such a manner, desidedly, as to present a good or bad subject for all future means of cultivation.[2]

What Mill suggests is that from the earliest period of a child's development, great attention should be paid to sequences of impressions so that they lead to orderly anticipations of the ends of education. That the events that surround a child have a profound effect on his conception of value whether intended or not. In short, children should be viewed as learning traits of behavior from the earliest period, and care should be exercised in structuring their environment to promote the objectives of education from the first.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 51.

[2] Ibid.

Technical Education is Mill's designation for what he considers formal education. He defines the problem of technical education within a society quite simply. "The first question, as we have said before, respects what is desirable for all,--the second, what is desirable for each of the several classes."[1] The means of instruction that Mill claims will best accomplish the objective of universal education is the plan called Chrestomathia which was devised by Jeremy Bentham.[2] Mill's support of this school and curriculum design is complete.[3] The elements of Chrestomathia are as follows:

1. The monitorial system of instruction
2. Curriculum based on practical subjects which excluded religion, art, physical education and poetry.

The emphasis of the curriculum was on logic, mathematics, and natural science. Its organization was precise and formal. The discipline, within the institution, must be strictly adhered to by the students, both mentally in their studies and physically by their

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63.

[2] Jeremy Bentham, Chrestomathia (London: 1817).

[3] Mill, Seven Essays, p. 67.

actions. Mill considered, as did Bentham, that physical activity detracted from the powers available for mental activity; hence, provision for physical education was not made in the Chrestomathic school. Mill's position on this issue is clearly stated as follows:

> It is a common observation, that muscular strength is apt to withdraw the owner from mental pursuits, and engage him in such as are more of the animal kind; the acquisition and display of physical powers.[1]

The Chrestomathic curriculum had a utilitarian function to perform in society. That function being to inculcate the greatest number of students with knowledge of the greatest possible value to them and society. To accomplish this, Mill saw the need to organize, regiment, and standardize instruction. Education for all the people meant an exposure to a series of basic skills with which the individual was to make of himself what he could.

Mill's educational theory has some areas which contain contradiction. A problem arises concerning Mill's position about the power education has over future behavior. Basic commitment is given, by Mill, to the position of association psychology as the basis for all learning. Using statements such as "primary habits are the fundamental character of man" to support his position, he then chooses to contradict its

---

[1] Ibid., p. 39.

implications. The position would imply that since one's character had been so strongly influenced in the formative years later social forces would have a lesser effect on one's behavior. However, this is not the case with Mill's statements concerning the effect of later social forces on one's behavior. His statements are quite clear in this: "These inducements operating upon us continually (everyday social forces), have an irresistible influence in creating habits, and in moulding, that is educating us, into a character conformable to the society in which we move."[1]

This position contradicts directly the implications of Mill's appeal for infant and early childhood education as an instrument for social improvement. What it does imply is that motivational factors change as the individual matures, that the learning principle of association psychology is replaced by the principle of psychological hedonism, and that the individual will maximize his pleasure by the means that society directs, regardless of his prior conditioning. If the means of society are corrupt then the individuals within it will also be corrupt. This argument soon becomes circular.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75.

[2] W. H. Burston, James Mill on Education (Cambridge: The University Press, 1969), p. 33.

To explain this inconsistency we need to look to Mill's utilitarian view of the individual as an instrument that ought to seek pleasure for himself and for others by the same act. Mill's philosophy is bound to the position of a duality of interests being served by a singular action. The means of the action becomes primary in the instance of society and the end becomes primary for the individual. Hence any inconsistency between means and ends must cause a situation in which pleasure is not fully maximized for both parties. It seems clear that Mill never conceived a real situation, at that time, where the existing social ends-means conflict could be overcome completely. He sought to compromise his social utilitarianism into an educational scheme which, while calling on the doctrines of utilitarianism, was practical and plausible. He did not see an instant solution to the social problems of the day through either educational reform or political reform. His educational theory reflects the philosophical dilemma he saw between the individual and society; the problem of individual rights and social responsibility and the means of achieving it.

Robert Owen

As in the case of James Mill, earlier, this section will define Robert Owen's moral philosophy and educational theory. The first part will deal with the moral aspects of responsibility and position of education within

society, the second with Owen's estimation of reality and physical action to accomplish his moral objectives. The purpose here, is to construct, as clearly as possible, what Owen's philosophy was and how he translated it into an educational plan.

The Aims of Education

Robert Owen presents a moral philosophy that is dependent upon the basic assumption that all persons have their lives shaped for them by their environment and are helpless to battle against the forces that act upon them. From this basic concept he derives his definition of education as the total of environmental forces acting upon an individual. Owen repeatedly asserts this principle:

> . . . the character of man is, without a single exception, always formed for him; that it may be, and is, chiefly, created by his predecessors; that they give him, or may give him, his ideas and habits, which are the powers that govern and direct his conduct. Man, therefore, never did nor is it possible he ever can, form his own character.[1]

Owen's moral philosophy consists of a universal application of his environmentalist assumptions about society. Society is what it is because men have educated and shaped future generations into modes of behavior which reflect their environment. Humans have the power to control their environment only through the application

---

[1]Robert Owen, A New View of Society (London: Cadell and Davies, 1813), p. 45.

of reason as rational beings. The extent to which contemporary society was rational was for Owen, as well as other empiricists, a continual point of attack. Owen looked upon his present day society as containing large paradoxes. From his view, bad environments could only produce bad people and since legally being poor was a crime (debtor's prisons), the children of the poor were being taught to be criminals. Owen's thoughts on this situation are clearly stated in the passage below from his "Essays on the Formation of Character":

> The characters of these persons [the poor] are now permitted to be very generally formed without proper guidance or direction, and, in many cases, under circumstances which directly impel them to a course of extreme vice and misery; thus rendering them the worst and most dangerous subjects in the empire; while the far greater part of the remainder of the community are educated upon the most mistaken principles of human nature, such, indeed, as cannot fail to produce a general conduct throughout society, totally unworthy of the character of rational beings.[1]

The paternalist nature of Robert Owen's thought, illustrated by his social humanitarianism and political conservatism, leads to a direct statement of responsibility for education or the formation of character which he considers one and the same. In Owen's view the government, which is ultimately responsible for its citizens, is the agent for the purpose of education.

> . . . the governing powers of all countries should establish rational plans for the education and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

> general formation of the characters of their subjects. These plans must be devised to train children from their earliest infancy in good habits of every description (which will of course prevent them from acquiring those of falsehood and deception.) They must afterwards be rationally educated, and their labour be usefully directed. Such habits and education will impress them with an active and ardent desire to promote the happiness of every individual, and that without the shadow of exception for sect, or party, or country, or climate.[1]

Owen claimed that society was as it was because the formation of its character, like its individual members, had not been directed or guided in the proper direction. This direction was the responsibility of all; but those who had influence to change society, he charged more specifically with this task.

The proper direction of the formation of character was, for Owen, quite simple. He contended that human beings were totally flexible and did in fact gain their identity from those around them who taught them who they were. As for the individual, Owen always considers him as a part of a collective community. For Owen, the term happiness could only be had through a group experience.

> . . . [the] principle is the happiness of self, clearly understood and uniformly practised [Sic]; which can only be attained by conduct that must promote the happiness of the community.[2]

As an illustration of the flexibility with which communities could be shaped, Owen states:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 17.

> Any general character, from the best to the worst, from the most ignorant to the most enlightened, may be given any community, even to the world at large, by the application of proper means; which means are to a great extent at the command and under the control of those who have influence in the affairs of men.[1]

Owen's social philosophy as stated in these passages remained basically unchanged throughout his writings. For him social development was a product of environment and experience for both the individual and society. To him the position is a revelation of truth. He bases his argument on his own empirical evidence as an observer of human nature and reason. The centrality of education as the agent of character formation is in relation to his environmentalist position on human nature. The majority of his works deal with the translation of these few principles into social action. He was sure he had discovered the truths of society. His objective, after stating his principles or truths, was to convince society of the practical and beneficial results of his new society based on his rational empirical view of mankind. Central to this objective was his theory of education.

Learning Theory

Robert Owen's psychology of learning or theory of character formation, as he chose to call it, was based on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

the principle of unlimited human progress. What was necessary for human progress was proper understanding of human nature. After human nature was correctly interpreted then the means of development could be insured, by structuring the environment in such a manner as to not allow misguidance or error to take place. In this section three main areas of Owen's thought will be explored. First will be an analysis of his concept of human nature; then an account of his conception of the proper means to accomplish their goals, in two parts; the curriculum and the method of instruction.

The basic assumptions that Owen makes about human nature were the product of his own empirical observations. His attempt to systematize is best evidenced in his "Third Essay" in the New View of Society. Here he sets down a series of "facts" to govern the operation of an institution to form character. Central to this list are his assumptions on human nature. He begins with the condition of man at birth, and builds a theory of learning from these basic conditions. The logic of his arguments will be discussed and compared with Mill in Section V of this chapter; so present comment on his position will be presented in his own language.

Owen's first assumption is that man had an innate desire for happiness of self.

> . . . man is born with a desire to obtain happiness, which desire is the primary cause of all his actions, continues through life, and, in popular language, is called self-interest.[1]

From this position Owen states that man has no control over his development.

> . . . the desire of happiness in man, the germs of his natural inclinations, and the faculties by which he acquires knowledge, are formed unknown to himself in the womb; and whether perfect or imperfect they are alone the immediate work of the Creator, and over which the infant and future man have no control.[2]

Learning takes place when the individual perceives the relationship of objects around him. Consistency with the empirical facts establishes the truth for new knowledge.

> . . . The knowledge which man receives is derived from the objects around him, and chiefly from the example and instruction of his immediate predecessors.
>
> That this knowledge may be limited or extended, erroneous or true; limited, when the individual receives few, and extended when he receives many ideas; erroneous when those ideas are inconsistent with the facts which exist around him, and true when they are uniformly consistent with them.[3]

Owen's empirical learning theory embodies reason as the central element of discovering truth. ". . . man has no other means of discovering what is false, except by his faculty of reason, or the power of acquiring [Sic]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 54.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 55.

and comparing the ideas which he receives."[1] The test for truth is consistent with the physical realities which surround the individual. For Owen the truth is easily arrived at in nature by simple empirical observation. Error is the product when . . . the individual is taught or forced to believe and not to think or reason, and partial insanity or defective powers of judging ensue.[2]

The essence of Robert Owen's theory of human nature lay in his assumption that man is a collective species who, if not forced to believe and act otherwise, would seek happiness through association with others. Truth, provided by reason and observation of his environment, would dictate that he select a cause of action consistent with mutual community happiness.

> . . . When these truths are made evident, every individual will endeavor to promote the happiness of every other individual within his sphere of action; because he must clearly, and without any doubt, comprehend such conduct to be the essence of self-interest, or the true cause of self-happiness.[3]

The New Lanark School

Robert Owen invisioned an institutional answer for the needed education of the people. The school or

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 56.

Institution for the Formation of Character would be made to serve the needs of socialization for all the population. What he proposed was an expanded comprehensive institution which would replace the present institutional void and misdirection of religious attempts in this direction. It was argued, by Owen, that only an extended exposure, which this type of instruction would provide, could have the overall shaping influence necessary to raise society from its present state of social misery and chaos. His position challenges the traditional concepts of education as a series of academic exercises, and claims the necessity of social relevance and consistency between school and society. His position on both issues is clearly stated in the following passage:

> The essence, however, of national training and education is to impress on the young, ideas and habits which shall contribute to the future happiness of the individual and of the State; and this can be accomplished only by instructing them to become rational beings. . . . Reading and writing are merely instruments by which knowledge, either true or false may be imparted and when given to children are of little comparative value, unless they are also taught to make proper use of them.[1]

Fundamental in Owen's plan, for implementing popular education for all, was the necessity of maintaining consistency between the methods of teaching and the objectives of the subject matter. It is with this failing that he charged the attempts of Bell and Lancaster in his

---

[1]Owen, A New View, p. 74.

attacks upon the Charity school movement. The mass techniques of monitorial instruction were considered by Owen as a great breakthrough, but the subject matter and motivation for learning were the same as the false tenents of the past generations. What was missing from the curriculum was social philosophy, or social studies, that would begin socializing the student for his role in society.

> The systems of Dr. Bell and Mr. Lancaster, for instructing the poor in reading, writing, and arithmetic, prove the extreme ignorance which previously existed in the manner of training the young; for it is in the manner alone of giving instruction that these new systems are an improvement on the modes of instruction which were formerly practiced . . .
>
> It must be evident to common observers, that children may be taught, by either Dr. Bell's or Mr. Lancaster's system, to read, write, account, and sew, and yet acquire the worst habits, and have their minds rendered irrational for life.[1]

The changes Owen advocated in the curriculum of popular education meant a complete change of the institution as it then existed. The tone and nature of the activities that would take place in The Institution for the Formation of Character would make it a center of community activity. The focus of social activity for the whole community would revolve around the skills taught in the curriculum of school. He reasoned that a partial reform of education would amount to reinforcement of the present false direction of society and would do more

---

[1] Ibid.

harm than good for persons for whom it was supposed to help. In very direct language he advances this argument as follows:

> Either give the poor a rational and useful training, or mock not their ignorance, their poverty, and their misery, by merely instructing them to become conscious of the extent of the degradation under which they exist. . . . In proof of this statement, enter any one of the schools denominated national, [schools run by the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church] and request the master to show the acquirements of the children. These are called out, and he asks them theological questions to which men of the most profound erudition cannot make a rational reply; the children, however, readily answer as they had been previously instructed; for memory, in this mockery of learning, is all that is required.[1]

Curriculum

The school program that Robert Owen thought would accomplish his objective, of positively structured character formation, was to be divided into two parts. First the infant school for children between the ages of two and six, and second the senior school for children between the ages of six and twelve. Attendance would be mandatory to the age of ten.[2]

The subjects taught in the infant school were to be of a very basic social nature. Owen wished the school curriculum to exemplify human kindness and good

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75.

[2] Robert Owen, Report to the County of New Lanark-In-A New View of Society and Other Writings (London: Dent, 1927), pp. 281-83.

will. He therefore sought to gain the children's esteem from the very earliest exposure to institutional education. All school teachers were to be trained in methods consistent with Owen's humanitarian theory of human nature and not be allowed to exhibit bad habits for the young children to emulate. The teaching methods and manner of conduct of classes was an important part of the infant school curriculum. Formal lessons and traditional "book learning" were to be avoided for it might serve to alienate the children and lead them in a false direction in their path to knowledge. An illustration of this tone and direction that Owen sought in the infant school is this description of the instructions he gave to his first infant school teachers at New Lanark:

> The first instruction which I gave them was, that they were on no account ever to beat any one of the children, or to threaten them in any manner in word or action, or to use abusive terms; but were always to speak to them with a pleasant countenance, and in a kind manner and tone of voice. That they should tell the infants and children . . . that they must on all occasions do all they could to make their playfellows happy . . . and the older ones should take especial care of the younger ones . . . [1]

The emphasis on play and natural curiosity as the basis for the curriculum in the infant school, as opposed to rote or other artificial exercises involving memory, is further stressed by Owen in his statement:

---

[1]Robert Owen, The Life of Robert Owen (London: Effingham Wilson, 1857), p. 139.

> The children were not to be annoyed with books; but were to be taught the uses and nature or qualities of the common things around them, by familiar conversation when the children's curiosity was excited so as to induce them to ask questions respecting them.[1]

The schoolroom itself was to be filled with objects that would generate curiosity from the young. Objects such as paintings of animals, maps, garden plants, real animals and other common objects were used to excite individual interest on the part of the children.[2] For example, the maps were very popular because the first lessons that were taught on map reading were made very useful to the children. One of the maps on the wall of the classroom was of the village of New Lanark with each child's house identified. The object of the first lesson was for the child to be able to find his own way home by the use of the wall map in the school.[3] This is an example of the type of lesson the infant school at New Lanark used.

A great departure from charity school practice in the New Lanark curriculum was the inclusion of dancing, music, and military exercise as integral parts of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 140.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Frank Podmore, Robert Owen, A Biography (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1906), p. 127.

curriculum. Teachers started children in dancing classes at age two and began singing lessons at age four.[1] These activities would remain part of the school life, of the children, for their entire length of study. Also after the children finished school, in the sense of daily attendance, they were encouraged to return in the evenings to dance and sing in the school facility. This points out a crucial element of Owen's curriculum for popular education; that being the sustaining of contact between the school and the community.

The teachers in the infant school were instructed to make use of community resources by taking field trips to promote inquiry and curiosity in the children.[2] Also this practice would yield a large amount of practical knowledge for the student about the environment in which he was to live. Underlying these features of Owen's curriculum is the concept of community respect and credibility for the school. The school was to be useful, pleasant, and a necessary agent of socialization for the community. The social values of the community were to be reflected and promoted by an institutionalized education process. The Institution for the Formation of Character would be the social focus of the community.

---

[1]Owen, Life of Owen, p. 141.

[2]Ibid., p. 140.

The building itself would be available to the community for use in its own entertainment. Dancing, singing, and concerts would be produced by the community for their own consumption. Owen's ideal is the socially self-contained community.

The classrooms were made as attractive as possible featuring teaching aids in form of pictures, maps, and scrolls of painted linen cloth which contain music and elementary language symbols.[1] The rooms were to be well lighted, heated, and ventilated to make the environment as pleasant as possible. All the children wore clothes supplied by the school. This clothing was changed three times a week. Cleaning and maintenance of the building fell to the students as an active part of their education not as a punishment. In fact the discipline system of the whole school was based on non-coercive techniques. Physical force was absent completely in the curriculum as a means to shape action.

The motivation for learning in Owen's curriculum was to come from the natural curiosity of the students and their wish to emulate the older children in the school. As we have seen earlier, this second point is one of the central principles of the monitorial systems of instruction introduced by Lancaster and Bell. The upper divisions of Owen's system were structured after

---

[1] Ibid.

the Lancasterian monitorial system using military type rankings to organize the instructional units. The curriculum, however, was modified to include music and dancing as opposed to the original Lancasterian plan. To Owen errors in the systems of Bell and Lancaster were not in the manner of pupil management, but in the nature of the subject matter taught. Owen concluded that the teaching of morals by the abstract rote method of scripture study produced as bad a product as the old system or no instruction at all.[1]

Owen's school, as a translation from his philosophy, was designed to make his institution reflect the community around it. The curriculum was to make use of community resources when possible to support the program of the schoolroom. The methods of instruction were to reinforce the social values and humanitarian ideals of community life. The process of education would be continuous. Social expression by participation in artistic forms such as dance and music would be taught for a lifetime of use. In essence, the concept of education for all was to be a preparation for a useful life within an ordered community.

---

[1]Owen, A New View, pp. 74-75.

A Comparison of the Educational Philosophies of Owen and Mill

The comparison of the two philosophical positions of Robert Owen and James Mill, for popular education, will point first to the similarities of their positions and second will examine their points of difference.

Both Owen and Mill were heavily influenced by the empirical tradition of the eighteenth century rationalist philosophies. Mill gives credit in his works to Hartley, Condillac, Locke, Helvetius, and other empiricists as pioneer thinkers to whom he is indebted. Owen omits such direct acknowledgement in his writings, but the fundamental positions he adopts give direct evidence of Helvetius' influence to a large degree.[1] However, the origins of Owen's and Mill's thought is not the question here. What is the issue is the centrality of an environmental theory of learning in both their positions. The basic tenets of both philosophies claim that learning is solely the product of environmental interaction between the individual and his environment. Habits, modes of inquiry, and methods of thinking are all the product of empirical activity.

Coupled with this environmental condition for learning was the assumption, in both men, that individual hedonism was the motive force for individual action, and

---

[1]Burston, Mill on Education, p. 33.

that the individual would seek action that would serve to promote his individual happiness at the cost of other actions. Beyond this assumption both men contended that true happiness could come only from actions the individual undertook to promote the happiness of others as well as himself. The primary motivation for action then should be the ultimate well being of his fellow man. Where their philosophies disagree is in the method and mode of action man was to take in society to accomplish the common objective of individual action to promote community welfare.

The points of difference between Owen and Mill on the role of popular education as an instrument of social reform in English society are numerous. Their philosophies suggest diverse courses of action to accomplish mass education. Both deemed educational reform necessary for the improvement and survival of an industrial society, but the control, means, and influence of mass education was different for each. First let us examine each man's position on the role of the state in popular education and as an agent of social reform.

Mill's position is that agents of reform must be contrary to the incumbent power and controlling structure of society. His logic is that reform means change in the status quo and since the present powers (the Church of England and the State) are those most profiting from it,

they are unlikely to allow any change. Popular education in Mill's view could only effect social change after escaping the control of the establishment which surely in his view would not permit its own destruction by a force under its own control. Mill thought that a rational intelligent population would not permit the corruption of its government. Since he deemed the present government totally corrupt, reform would not be in their interest; and would remain undone until external pressures forced change.[1] In summary, state control over popular education, which would in turn cause reform of the state, and threaten the established channels of power, was considered by Mill impossible.

Owen's position on state control of popular education is quite opposite from Mill, and demonstrates the different perspective of the two positions. Owen's conception of the state is one of benevolent paternalism; that only enlightened to the needs of the people would act in their behalf. Owen's position is that the state not only should, but was the only logical agent to provide popular education reform for the whole of society. Government has the institutions available to turn the direction of social development into humanitarian areas. The misery and social displacement caused by industrial

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, pp. 111-18.

progress could be best coped with by government action.[1] The school should establish the first association between the state and the individual at the earliest possible time; their common interests would become obvious and community harmony would result.

Analysis of these two positions reveal some important points of difference the two philosophies. The first is the conception of power held by Owen and Mill. Owen thought that implementation of a new system could be accomplished almost overnight, without regard to past practices, on the strength of sound rational arguments and evidence offered in support. Society once converted to his point of view, becomes the agent for change through mass education. His thought carries a simplestic appeal to a person's sense of realization of a great new idea.

James Mill held no such view of the power of reason and logic over men's actions. His view of the state and established order of society was based on a view of self-interest, on the individual basis, which would not yield to reason, unless threatened by economic power or the loss of power sources. Power to obtain reform could not come from the bottom through education, as Owen contended, because the power of reason was not strong enough to overcome the power of economic considerations afforded by a corrupt sociopolitical structure.

---

[1]Owen, A New View, pp. 63-66.

Power must come from individuals outside the system who can wield enough economic power to influence the system. Popular education would accomplish little, in the absence of political reform, to allow the new source of rational expression an outlet.

Mill was constantly thinking in Macro terms about educational questions while Owen was busy proving the Micro implications of his workable model at New Lanark. The difference in scope of their positions on social power is in part the result of their difference in perspective.

The question of means for Owen and Mill provide another area of contrast. Owen saw popular education as a product of an institution. Just as material could be manufactured from raw ingredients into a finished product, within the walls of a factory, why not people. Owen argues that popular education should be used to construct a society with perfect institution for the betterment of mankind. The name Owen gives to his school, The Institution for the Formation of Character, reflects the view that Owen held for institutionalized society. The scale necessary to achieve his objectives could only be achieved by institutional means. What Owen wanted was an enlarged institution that would be responsible for the whole life of the individual. The community school

concept he advances suggests such a role for The Institution for the Formation of Character.

James Mill holds quite the opposite view from Owen on the issue of institutional roles in popular education. His argument focuses against existing educational institutions as an example of the inherent weaknesses that exist in institutions that are established to educate man. In Mill's view educational institutions encumbered to such an extent by tradition that the real job of education cannot be accomplished.[1] Vested interests use institutions; hence the utility of an institution is judged by who controls it and for what purpose. If popular education was to be a vehicle for social reform, as Mill contended it was, then the government certainly was not to control it. New institutions are just as prone to the same faults as older ones. This led Mill to the conclusion that all educational institutions, to be worthy of calling themselves that, must build into themselves machinery to promote and allow change.[2] What he did suggest was an increase of intellectual skills he made available to individuals in the manner of their own choice.

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays.

[2]Ibid.

It is interesting in passing to note that Mill's mistrust of educational institutions was so great that he did not allow his own children to attend any. He took charge of his children's education; teaching his oldest, John Stuart, and then having John Stuart teach the next youngest and so on.

The question of what impact or influence popular education could have on society produces a third area of disagreement between the educational philosophies of Owen and Mill. Owen's position was that error and unwanted modes of behavior could be eliminated by never exposing people, starting as young as possible, to the behavior in question. The all encompassing nature of the educational institution, Owen claimed, could redirect society. The power of early education, as a lasting shaping device, was central to Owen's scheme of popular education. Children once trained in habits of good character would never revert to modes of behavior from which true happiness could not be gained.[1] The social influence of mass education in Owen's thought was so great that complete social change was possible.

Mill's view was that popular education, while certainly a strong factor, was not going to achieve any immediate changes in society. Again we see Mill thinking in Macro terms in areas of social reform. He argues that

---

[1]Owen, A New View.

only by changing the political system at the top is any real progress in social reform going to occur. An enlightened rational population, if disenfranchised or excluded from the avenues of political power, can do little to effect changes or reform. Teaching all people virtuous habits in school would not be sufficient to counteract the forces of political and economic reality.[1] The influence of education would be always linked, in matters of social reform, to the political environment surrounding it.

Mill never conceived the idea of expanding the institutional influence over individuals to the extent of changing their lives completely. Owen, in his life, observed the great control over the lives of the workers that the factory system exerted. He reasoned that institutional control was not only possible to a very great degree, but was in fact taking place everywhere, and should be used to promote the welfare of mankind.

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, pp. 116-19.

CHAPTER III

THE STATE AND PHILOSOPHIES OF POPULAR EDUCATION

Introduction

To interpret the contribution of two men's thought to the emerging philosophy of popular education in England is the remaining task of this work. Their individual philosophies have been illustrated in the past chapter; what remains is to integrate their positions into English educational and social thought. What was their role in English Society? What was the nature of the philosophic controversy surrounding the origins of English popular education? To what extent does the emerging philosophy of popular education involve the contemporary, political and economic thought?

The suggested conclusions on each of these questions compose the rest of this study.

The Role of Each Man as an Educational Thinker in English Society

Robert Owen and James Mill had a significant role in the formation of English thought on popular education. Each's position was presented to English society in a manner which influenced the impact to a great degree.

In the next pages the manner of social exposure of each man's philosophy will be analyzed for its possible shaping influence on English thought.

Robert Owen

Robert Owen was for many years actively involved in operating a popular education institution. He planned curriculum, hired faculty and directed the total operation of the school.[1] From this background, the title of educator would be in order. It is important to record the practical experiences of Owen because it is shown in his writings and future activities. He thought he had proven his educational contentions in his working model at New Lanark. Time after time he offers his past experiences as proof of the truth of his philosophic position.[2] The empirical arguments supporting drastic social change, with the educational institutions assuming the shaping quality of society, are referred to by Owen as fact not theory. His own background as an educator reinforced his philosophic arguments by providing physical proof of their feasibility. Being totally consistent with his empirical truth validation process, Owen then expands his interests

---

[1]Podmore, Owen, A Biography, pp. 126-60 and Owen, Life of Owen, p. 154.

[2]Owen, Life of Owen, p. 77.

to matters beyond separate educational development to total social reform along his proven lines.

Owen's thought was transmitted to English society from 1813 when his first publication, A New View of Society; or Essays on the Principle of The Formation of the Human Character, and The Application of the Principle to Practice[1] was printed. His efforts to spread the message of his philosophy were great by any contemporary standards. His initial design was to convert the power structure to his position. He sent copies of his essays to all the crowned heads and political leaders of consequence in Europe and North America.[2] His efforts, while unsuccessful, show some of Owen's naivete in contemporary political matters. He assumed political arrangements and misgovernment, that caused social misery, were caused by ignorance of the laws of human nature in those in positions of power.[3] Owen viewed his role as educator of the power structure in behalf of the society.

Owen's attempts to secure reform by this tactic met with little success in terms of overt reform at his behest, but it did provide a great deal of exposure for his philosophic position. His height of influence, among

---

[1]Podmore, Owen, A Biography, pp. 242-46.

[2]Owen, Life of Owen, pp. 156-60.

[3]Ibid., p. 159.

established political figures, was during the summer of 1817. He appeared before Brougham's committee, that was gathering information which would later be used to support social legislation on child labor,[1] and held a series of public meetings in the City of London Tavern which drew a great deal of attention.[2] In both of these arenas Owen presented his social philosophy and urged reform according to his plans. Owen's effectiveness as a reform agent among the establishment, however, was lessened as a result of his appearances at the City of London Tavern. His frontal attack on organized religion caused an outcry from churches that made Owen appear a radical revolutionary.[3]

The great importance of Owen's appearances were not that they brought immediate reform or acceptance of his philosophy, but rather that he introduced empirical arguments in favor of cooperative popular education to English thought. Owen's efforts to persuade English society, by rational empirical arguments to alter its course, to educate all the people, to make government the central agent for institutionalized education were

---

[1]Podmore, Owen, A Biography, pp. 242-46.

[2]The Times (London), August 14, 1817, p. 1.

[3]G. D. H. Cole, The Life of Robert Owen (London: The University Press, 1965), pp. 280-300.

significant contributions to the intellectual melting pot of social theory. His eighteenth century rational empirical thinking was applied to the current social and economic problems of his period. He devised and presented a social program that could cure the misery of the industrial depression that followed the Napoleonic wars.[1] His role was as a presenter of a philosophic position which stressed popular education as a vehicle of social progress.

Owen's later years, after his American adventure at New Harmony, Indiana,[2] beginning in the late 1820's saw a shift in his activities. While he still advocated the same basic philosophy, he shifted his emphasis from a rational appeal for the enlightenment of the power structure to a program of political and economic education dealing with working men's organizations and benefit schemes.[3] These later phases of Robert Owen's career are not our immediate concern. The contention advanced here is that Owen's philosophic contribution to the emerging philosophy of popular education was real. His presentation of a system of social reform embodying a

---

[1]Cole, Life of Owen, pp. 179-85.

[2]Arthur Bestor, Backwoods Utopias (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950).

[3]Cole, Life of Owen, pp. 293-95.

central concept of popular education was fundamental in the history of English popular education. Owen grasped the institutional relatedness of an emerging industrial society, with its absence of popular institutions, for the industrial worker. He was the first English educator to realize the possibility of using the tools of industrialization, organization and integration, to benefit the over-all life style of the community. His role as presenter of this philosophy qualifies him for prominent consideration when the origins of popular education are searched.

James Mill

James Mill was not the public figure that Robert Owen was. His life style and activities did not use exposure of his person as a means of expression. James Mill was a man of letters. His life produced an identity of great dimension through the things he wrote and published. His education was formal and Scottish.[1] As an educator his associations are limited to serving on the boards of the London Infant School Society and the British and Foreign School Society. Evidence suggests that in both instances his participation in these capacities was

---

[1]Ian Cumming, "The Scottish Education of James Mill," History of Education Quarterly, II, 157-60.

not very great.[1] His contribution to English popular education came from his writings supporting it rather than a direct personal association. Mill, unlike Owen, spoke without the benefit of a direct institutional relationship with popular education.

Mill arrived in London in 1802 after an unsuccessful attempt to become the minister at Craig, Scotland.[2] He had letters of introduction from a few of his University of Edinburgh friends and was soon able to gain "literary employment" writing for various journals.[3] His success was such that by 1804 he gained the editorship of a new publication, The Literary Journal which published weekly at the cost of one schilling per copy.[4] From his position within the English literary community, Mill was exposed to the intellectual ferment of the period. Articles on many subjects were authored by Mill during this period. From 1802-1819 Mill wrote primarily for income. In 1819 he was appointed to India House as an Assistant Examiner of

---

[1]Alexander Bain, James Mill; A Biography (London: Longmans, 1883), pp. 80-86.

[2]Bain, Mill; A Biography, pp 32-36.

[3]Letter to Thomas Thompson, Mill MSS, British Museum, March 13, 1802.

[4]Bain, Mill; A Biography, pp. 38-51.

Indian Correspondence at L 800 per year.[1] After this date his volume of general tracts dropped.

Through his connections in the English literary world, Mill formed personal associations with many of the intellectual and political figures of his day. His correspondence in his Commonplace Book revealed his personal acquaintances to be: Joseph Hume, David Ricardo, Jeremy Bentham, Francis Place, Sir Samuel Romilly, Lord Brougham, Francis Burdett and William Allen to name some of the most influential.[2] James Mill was a member of the emerging intellectual political and social reform elite who were to provide the shaping philosophy for the direction of English society. His contribution to English popular education comes through his influence within this group.

As a writer on popular education, Mill produced two major tracts. One appeared in 1812 in the reform journal, The Philanthropist.[3] In this article Mill attacks the established church for its desire to control popular education. The second is his celebrated tract

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 184-85.

[2] James Mill, Commonplace Book, City of London Library (an unpublished collection of James Mill's clippings and correspondence in four volumes).

[3] James Mill, "Schools for All, in Preference to Schools for Churchmen Only," Philanthropist, II (1812).

"Education" which appears in The Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica 1816-1823. Mill contributed seven articles to the supplement which stated the Utilitarian view. The nature of these articles caused quite a controversy over the implications of their philosophy.[1] Mill integrated popular educational thought into his scheme of social reform.

The Philosophic Controversy

The Institutional Void

The field of popular education was not dominated or controlled by any particular group at the dawn of the nineteenth century. What did exist in the name of popular education supported varying philosophies. A general division may be made between those institutions supporting religious creeds, in various form, and those which did not. The largest and best organized groups were the religiously oriented societies, The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church (henceforth referred to here as the National Society) and the British and Foreign School Society.

---

[1]Between 1826 and 1830 a lively exchange grew in the Westminster Review from the articles on social philosophy by James Mill and the Quarterly Review. While the controversy was essentially over political representation in government forms, the general philosophical issue between the Utilitarians and the Establishment over political reform and social structure became the real issue.

The philosophic position taken by the religious societies reflects a Perennialist's[1] view of society. The intent of the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society was not to change the structure of English Society. Their argument for popular education came from motives other than the social development of all persons into active enfranchised citizens. The National Society, a Church of England institution, found itself dedicated to the maintenance of the present system for its own existence.[2] Dedicated to a basically Perennialist social philosophy, the major objectives of National Society schools could be seen as to subordinate the laboring classes. The virtues taught were: humility, contentment and above all a willingness to remain in that state of life to which God had called you.[3]

The content and structure given to popular education by the National Society was consistent with the

---

[1]Philosophic Perennialism, as used in this work, will refer to the social philosophy associated with religious Thomism. This position suggests that social problems may be solved by turning back to values that are consistent with the fact that the source of authority is external to man. The evidence gathered by the senses may be marshalled to support revelation; but in the absence of such testimony, or where it chances to be at odds with revelation; what has been revealed must be accepted as an objective fact.

[2]Mary Sturt, The Education of the People (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 4.

[3]Ibid.

traditional Perennialist view that, "The lower schools have little to do with social change since the school must transcend society and deal with the teaching of first principles, the permanent bases of Eternal Truth which is true in all time and in all times and in all places."[1] Truth validation in the Church of England schools ultimately depended upon revelation, not rational examination of evidence. The monitorial teaching methods also illustrate the underlying philosophy of a fixed society.

The British and Foreign Schools Society was composed of many different dissenting sects. They sought to maintain their religious identity by teaching children the basic literacy which was necessary in the practice of their religion. This group drew many humanitarian reformers and anti-establishment political reformers who saw education as a vehicle to attack the existing power structure. James Mill was among the many financial subscribers of the British and Foreign School Society. His participation in Society activities must have been minimal for there is little record of it.[2] To some reformers the objectives of the British and Foreign School Society were

---

[1]F. Bruce Rosen, Philosophic Systems and Education (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1968), p. 57.

[2]Bain, Mill; A Biography, pp. 82-85.

less favorable toward established authority than those of the National Society. This, however, is not supportable when examining the two institutions in operation. The political reformers did not have the institution they wanted, in the British and Foreign School Society. The curriculum and structure of the two societies' schools in operation were virtually the same, except for the absence of Church of England catechism in the British and Foreign School Society's curriculum. The same philosophic assumptions were present in both systems. It reflected a society of static dimension. Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth summed up the religious societies' point of view in this passage:

> There are men who believe that the labouring classes are condemned forever, by an inexorable fate, to the unmitigated curse of toil, scarcely rewarded by the bare necessities of existence, and often visited by the horrors of hunger and disease--that the heritage of ignorance, labor and misery is entailed upon them as eternal doom.[1]

The Perennialist's philosophy of the religious societies was consistent with the current social decision on whom should be educated and for what social role. There was no direct attack on the political power structure by their translation of popular education. They sought to re-establish Scriptural morals as answers to the problems of the emerging industrial society. To a Perennialist, social ills are the product of moral decay within the

---

[1]Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth as quoted in Mary Sturt, The Education of the People, p. 4.

individual. The philosophic mission of the religious societies was to make men again moral through revealed truths.

One of the second category, of an institutionalized attempt at providing popular education, was the religiously oriented Mechanics Institutes movement. This group numbered several loosely associated working men's organizations centered around the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge which was founded in 1828.[1] These organizations dealt with adults almost exclusively. The Mechanics Institutes had both technical and political objectives. As Educational institutions, they stressed Mill's view of informal higher education. R. K. Webb argues that the Mechanics Institutes were established by conservative Middle class reformers who sought to control the political thought of the workers. His analysis of Mechanics Institutions is:

> The Mechanics' Institutions of the twenties [1820's] were efforts to organize advanced education of the type that Mill intended; but despite the enthusiasm of their founders and some notable successes, the movement was a sad failure. . . . In several cases they were torn apart by management struggles between middle class and working class groups. . . . The basic deficiencies in elementary education among those who did come meant that working men stayed away more and more. Infiltration from above turned many of them into middle class clubs. . . . Clearly the chief resources

---

[1] R. K. Webb, The British Working Class Reader (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1955), pp. 62-70.

> of educators were self-instruction and the press; effective education for the time being, had to be "informal."[1]

The ineffectiveness of the middle class to provide a popular education institution was the result of the Utilitarian philosophy they espoused. The working man was not interested in the manipulation of his brain to convince himself he was doomed to be the slave of a market economy. The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge was promoting the philosophy of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, James Mill, and the other laissez-faire classical liberal social theorists. These literal translations of the natural empirical laws of physical science to fit society were unattractive to the extremely poor and semi-literate. The arguments of Adam Smith take a rational sophistication to comprehend. The appeal of this socially atomistic philosophy is to the aspiring middle class. The chance to advance on one's own merit is very attractive to those who have merit and skills to market. The English laborer, for whom the Mechanics Institutes were intended, was not receptive to this form of popular education.

A second non-religiously oriented attempt at popular education was the co-operative movement. As popular educators, the movement relied on developing communities

---

[1]Webb, The British Reader, pp. 63-64.

of mutual assistance to act as institutions of education.[1] This was an undisciplined movement of many contradictory social philosophies, however, Owenite thought was the heart of many of the co-operative societies. Harold Silver asserts:

> The role of Owenism was in this period to arm popular movements with a diamentrically opposite philosophy, and to assert educational values which opposed such restricting and sterile models of thought.[2]

Silver, however, fails to recognize that Owen's New Lanark experiment served as the model, for workingmen's organizations, from which to pattern their ideas on socio-economic institutions. The concept of a self-contained economic and social unit was the center of the co-operativists' thought on social reform. In effect, this position put the co-operative workingmen's movements into the position of opposing both the other philosophies competing for the popular mind through popular education. The Owenite position was championed by Mr. William Thompson, who contested both the church-government and Mill's political and economic position in London between 1825 and 1830.[3]

---

[1]Harold Silver, The Concept of Popular Education (London: Macgibbon and Kee, 1965), p. 160.

[2]Ibid., p. 162.

[3]John Stuart Mill, Autobiography (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), pp. 104-06.

The nature of the ideological conflict between the Owenites and the rest of the reform movement was fundamental. John Stuart Mill considered the Owenites as "Their most inveterate opponents."[1] The utopian paternalism offered by Owenite co-operatives societies did not offer political power sharing. This put the movement in opposition to Parliamentary reform as a vehicle to achieve their goals. This issue caused division among workingmen's organizations. By 1832, on the eve of the Reform Bill, a polarization point had been reached. The only thing all the workingmen could agree upon was that they were all concerned with their own welfare. The following exerpts from The Poor Man's Guardian illustrates the general positions within the workingmen's reform movement.

> . . . The various schemes [here referring to Owenite positions] of the leading co-operators, who are avowedly indisposed to confer upon the industrious classes their Political Rights, and who, indeed seek every opportunity to speak snearingly and contemptuously of their possession, as a consideration of no value. We, on the contrary, contend that till the industrious classes become possessed of political power . . . no permanent improvement will or can take place in their condition.[2]

The division felt by the editors of The Poor Man's Guardian was expressed by this appeal for unity three weeks later:

---

[1]Mill, Autobiography, p. 105.

[2]The Poor Man's Guardian, I, No. 64 (1832), 513.

> Let us all unite against the common enemy [the established power structure]. . . . Above all, let the RADICAL take the OWENITE by the hand, and the OWENITE so the same by the RADICAL [radical in this context refers to workingmen's groups who sought the same type of reform as the Utilitarian political economists], for both parties are the real and only real friends of the working people. . . . The disciples of Mr. Owen may differ from us as to the means, or "modus operandi," but they have precisely the same eventual object in view, namely, to establish for the workman dominion over the fruits of his own industry . . . if we cannot agree to march together, let us at least throw no obstruction in each other's way.[1]

The reason the Owenites were not actively working for political reform can be found in their philosophy. Owen did not view active political responsibility as the function of the laboring class. Harold Silver concludes in the following paragraph that Owen's role was ambivalent as a social reformer.

> At no stage in his career did Owen directly advocate political action to improve the position of the working class. His rationalist philosophy kept him bound in the belief that the question was one of ordered social reorganization plus education. He never abandoned his belief that agitation for political reforms went both too far and not far enough: too far in that it inflamed passions and led to social disharmony, which to his tidy rationalist outlook, was anathema; not far enough in that political reforms merely touched the fringe of the problem. He advocated the cooperative community . . . in order to by pass all the unnecessary, dangerous and misleading paraphernalia of political action.[2]

There were three different philosophies competing for the popular mind in early nineteenth century English

---

[1] The Poor Man's Guardian, I, No. 67 (1832), 538.

[2] Silver, Concept of Education, p. 168.

popular education. Generally the three positions were: the religiously affiliated societies representing the Perennialist position, the Mechanics Institutes representing the rational empiricism of the Utilitarian middle class, and the cooperative societies representing empirical collectivism. It should be noted that of these three positions two were consistent with the changes being brought upon society by the industrial revolution. These were the empirical positions of the Mechanics Institutes and the cooperative societies. Their programs embraced the tools of the emerging industrial society, such as the printing press, and sought to use them to better society. Mill's concept of individual development, viewing men much as an industrial commodity,[1] was central to the Utilitarian position. Competition between man and his environment for domination over others was the chief motivational factor for popular education. The Owenite position stresses an institutionalized community welfare concept as the central philosophic position. The individual motivation for education was cooperation as opposed to competition. What both had in common was a positive empirical approach to social problems.

In contrast, the religiously affiliated school societies were advocating a regressive social philosophy

---

[1]Mill, Seven Essays, p. 107.

which advocated a return to a moral society of an earlier epoch. The changes in society and ensuing social problems were to be solved by applying the moral truths of the past.

To illustrate how these philosophies were expressed in the political forum, the next section will discuss the consideration of popular education by Parliament. The object of this discussion will be to trace the philosophies expressed in Parliament on popular education.

Parliament and Popular Education

Popular education ultimately has become the responsibility of the government in England. This section will explore the actions on the floor of Parliament which dealt with actual state entrance into popular education. The evidence presented will illustrate the philosophic positions held by the various factions of Parliament. Since the English government eventually moved into the area of popular education, the debates over entry, and the form that entry should take, are of great interest. The interpretation of these debates will begin with Samuel Whitbread's education bill of 1807 and conclude with the actual establishment of the Committee of Privy Council on Education in 1839.

Samuel Whitbread.--The initial nineteenth century Parliamentary Bill dealing with popular education was

submitted by Samuel Whitbread on February 19, 1807.[1] At that time no government money or efforts of any kind were being expended on popular education. All support for popular education was coming from private subscriptions and direct grants from organized religion. Churches of all denominations supported various forms of popular education, but nothing organized at any higher level than the parish. Support and control of popular education in 1807 was left completely to local authority.[2] There was no universal education law for compulsory school attendance. In the law there was no provision made for or opposing expenditures for popular education. With this absence of educational legislation the first education bill passed would serve to set precedence and set policy. Let us now turn to popular education as it appears in Parliament.

Discussion in Commons that introduced popular education came on February 19, 1807. Samuel Whitbread spoke proposing an education for the laboring classes that would remove them from the ranks of the poor. Whitbread viewed his plan as a cure for the existing Poor Laws which were seemingly unable to cope with the new industrial urban problems of pauperism. The objectives

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 1 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 7 (1807), p. 865.

[2]Sturt, Education of People, p. 6.

of Whitbread's Bill is stated in the following quotation from the floor of Commons:

> [Popular education's objectives were] . . . to exalt the character of the labouring classes of the community. . . . To excite him to acquire property, that he may taste its sweets; and give him inviolable security for that property, when it is acquired. . . . To hold out hope of reward to his patient industry.[1]

To accomplish this Whitbread proposes a national system organized through the Church of England's existing parish system. He advocates the use of monitorial methods for teaching and compulsory attendance for two years by all children at some point between the ages of seven and fourteen. All schools were to be free. Support for schools would come from the local poor rate.[2]

During Whitbread's speech in support of his bill he cites the work of Malthus and Adam Smith as supportive to his plan.[3] The following excerpt from his closing argument is filled with philosophic implications and assumptions about popular education.

> In the adoption of the system of education I forsee an enlightened peasantry, frugal, industrious, sober, orderly, and contented because the enlightened understanding abhors crime. The practice of Christianity prevailing, because the mass of your population can

---

[1] Hansard's Debates, Vol. 7, p. 875.

[2] Great Britain, Parliament, 1 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 9 (1807), p. 538.

[3] Hansard's Debates, Vol. 7, p. 878.

> read, comprehend, and feel its divine origin and the beauty of the doctrines which it inculcates.[1]

The philosophic stance of this position places Whitbread in the Perennialist category. His assumption is that reason is the product of education. If the people could be educated they would, as the course of simple logic, act within the social roles defined by the church. The product of popular education in Whitbread's philosophy is the maintenance of the value system defined by Christianity. The assumption that rationality would reinforce the present social structure was not uniformly held by other members of Parliament. The following arguments were advanced against Whitbread's bill:

Mr. Rose advanced the concept that popular education might be injurious to the social structure because the social structure was dependent upon a certain amount of ignorance. He asserts:

> To carry a system of education to the poor might raise their minds above their lot in life, and by no means strengthen attachments to laborious pursuits.[2]

Other doubts about the practicability of such a large scale scheme as proposed by Whitbread were advanced along more pragmatic lines by Spenser Stanhope. His arguments against Whitbread's system were based on the availability

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 1 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8 (1807), p. 917.

[2]Hansard's Debates, Vol. 9, p. 539.

of trained teachers to operate the schools. Secondly, Stanhope advanced a cost product relationship argument that inferred that Whitbread's system was sure to cost a lot of money but would there actually be a product? Stanhope doubted the relationship between education and moral industrious behavior.[1]

The Utilitarian position was advanced by Pole Carew in a position opposing the establishment of additional social institutions. He argued that government had no business increasing the number controls over individuals by creating additional institutions. His view was that education was something to be individualized and kept away from large-scale production. He states:

> . . . education was certainly best which was nearest adopted to the particular sphere of each individual. Institutions for education are increasing daily and I see no need for increasing their number. [bypassing Whitbread's Bill][2]

The arguments against Whitbread's Bill in the House of Commons were representative of three basic philosophies. Mr. Rose advanced the most conservative position advancing the position that the poor were uneducated because they were not supposed to be for their social position had been determined. The philosophy was of a static social structure. Spenser Stanhope represented

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 543-47.

[2] Ibid., p. 1,050.

a pragmatic philosophy toward education. His position challenges the capacity of society to fulfill the content of Whitbread's Bill in action. Pole Carew's position was representative of emerging Utilitarian thought on popular education. However, these combined positions could not secure enough support to defeat the bill in the Commons and upon the third reading, August 6, 1807, the bill in substantially the same form passed and was sent to Lords for action.[1] There Whitbread's attempt to establish a system of state popular education died without coming to a vote. There was little support in Lords for the bill and what opinions were expressed in its limited consideration were of the conservative variety similar to those that were expressed in the house by Mr. Rose.[2]

With the death of Whitbread's Bill, Parliament did not consider popular education on the floor of either house for the next nine years. During this period the competing philosophies had set into motion attempts to achieve their goals outside government action. Central to all the philosophies of popular education was the concern for the condition of the poor. All of the philosophies saw popular education as a vehicle to rid English society of the mass poverty that was accompanying

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1,067.

[2] Ibid., pp. 854-859.

industrialization. The Perennialist sought to return to the moral world, pre-industrial England, by education the people in the values of the established social system. The establishment of the two societies, the National and the British and Foreign, between 1807 and 1816 were physical attempts by the Perennialists to implement their philosophies. Their success in meeting the overall educational problem is considered by Henry Brougham when he reports to Commons on the educational plight of the London poor. He asked, and was granted, permission to form a committee to inquire into the education of the poor.[1]

Henry Brougham.--The findings of Brougham Committees between 1816 and 1820 tell us much of what we know about the urban poor during this period. The committee's conclusions on the state of popular education were bleak. In the London area alone they found 120,000 children totally without means of education. Also the Committee found the corruption of the older popular education attempts such as the Dame schools, Common schools, and Sunday schools to such a state as to consider them as of negligible value.[2] However, more important than the facts

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 1 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 34 (1816), p. 633.

[2]Ibid., pp. 1,230-33.

reported by the Committee was the key recommendation for action. The Committee recommended that the government ought not make annual grants for education for it might harm the charitable work then being done and the entire burden would then fall on the national income. They suggested; "Assistance, . . . should not be communicated as an annual grant, but merely in aid of private charity, to build schools, to prepare rooms, etc . . ."[1] This suggestion as a precedent for future action is a large step toward the emergence of the Utilitarian philosophy of popular education as state philosophy.

Irish Education.--The next Parliamentary consideration of national popular education comes about after the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1828. This act stopped political discrimination against Catholics by abolishing the Church of England loyality test as a condition for holding any public office. On April 9, 1829, a petition signed by "The Irish Catholic Bishops" was presented requesting Parliament, "To adopt a system of national education calculated to benefit the community, without interfering with their religious opinions."[2] The petitioners expressed their willingness to cooperate in any way in such a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1,234.

[2] Great Britain, Parliament, 2 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 21 (1829), p. 608.

program. The petition was received by Commons but no action ensued.

The Irish popular education isue again comes before Commons in the form of long heated debate in September of 1831. The issue is whether to withdraw support from the Kildare-street Society which had been receiving support, from the Lord-lieutenant in the form of an annual grant, for the past twenty years. During the course of the argument a detailed account of the Kildare-street Society's activities and objectives revealed that political control had corrupted much of the original philosophy.[1] The objectives of the Kildare-street Society as outlined in the following excerpt, would seem to give it the open appeal that popular education should have. The three basic rules for the operation of the Kildare-street Society were:

> . . . The appointment of masters and tutors, and the admission of scholars without regard to religious distinctions. The second rule was the exclusion of all books of theological controversy, and the allowance of sufficient time to the children to receive religious instruction out of school. . . . The third rule was that the Sacred Scriptures should be read without note or comment in the schools by such scholars as had obtained a suitable proficiency; and that such parts only should be selected as were best suited to the capacity and attainments of the readers; and the Society recommended that the Sacred volume should

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 6 (1831), pp. 1,252-60.

> not be used as a mere school book, from which to teach the children to read and spell.[1]

The debate exposed the operation of the Kildare-street Society to be not as open as it would seem. In practice the Society was an Anti-Catholic agent of the government and served to antagonize much of the population by its discriminatory actions. For example, in 1831, in a country that was five-sixths Catholic, of the last 150 school masters appointed by the Society, only twenty-seven were Catholic.[2] This practice was defended by supporters of the Society who contended that education could be used to lure away from Catholicism the young and into a "less foreign" Christian religion.[3]

Irish popular education established a Parliamentary precedent for English popular education. The precedent was government support of popular education through private institutions. By 1830, the Kildare-street Society was receiving L 25,000 per year to support 1,620 schools with an enrollment of 133,896 students.[4] The principle suggested by Brougham's Committee in 1816 had slowly been implemented in Ireland to finance a system of popular

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1,262.

[2] Ibid., pp. 1,270-300.

[3] Ibid., p. 1,299.

[4] Ibid., p. 1,252.

education. The philosophy of public support of private institutions had been established in Parliament before any governmental support to English popular education had begun.

J. A. Roebuck.--The first Owenite argument to appear in Parliament in behalf of popular education came in 1833. Following the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832 the nature of Parliament was changed. J. A. Roebuck was one of the members of Parliament who sought to make the new Parliament responsive to the needs of the people.[1] Elected from Manchester, Roebuck brought to Parliament the point of view of the new industrial society. His conclusions on social issues reflect the same position, on the basic institutional changes within society, as Owen. Roebuck viewed popular education as public necessity and a governmental obligation. He openly challenged the concept of government to promote only private interests. The following excerpts from his speech in Commons, in support of his own resolution on popular education, illustrate his position.

> [On governments role in popular education he asserts]: . . . The government does not often immediately inflict misery on the people by any brutal or barefaced oppression--but by obstaining from its duty, by shrinking from doing the good that it ought to do, enormous misery is allowed to continue. By fostering and perpetuating ignorance among the people,

---

[1]Asa Briggs, Victorian People (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 52.

> it inflicts more injury than by any or all of its direct oppressions . . .[1]

What Roebuck wanted is a useful education that is not just a simple transfer of a few basic skills.

> Education means not merely the conferring of necessary means or instruments for the acquiring of knowledge, but it means also the training or fashioning the intellectual and moral qualities of the individual, that he may be able and willing to acquire knowledge, and to turn it to its right use. . . . The actual training of the human being in his moral and intellectual being, whatever that training may be, good or bad, is education.[2]

Roebuck wanted to establish free public education that would act as a socialization agent for society. He wanted the institutions of popular education removed from the charity school category and replaced with secular institutions.

> The children of the poor man would receive instruction and incure no obligation but to the State--no painful feeling of degradation would attach to it; whereas now a stigma is affixed to every one who receives gratuitous instruction.[3]

Roebuck's plan for a national system of popular education shows how integrated he thought the school and community should be. From his statement, "Every portion of the whole great scheme of education is ultimately bound together--and all are necessarily associated with

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 20 (1833), p. 142.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 150.

the everyday business of life,"[1] he develops the concept of local control of school curriculum. Each school would be run by a local school committee who would hire the schoolmaster and decide on curriculum. Each head of household who had a child in the school would have a vote to elect the members of the local school committee.[2] The whole system would come under the jurisdiction of a member of the government who would have cabinet rank. His duties would be to dispense money to local school committees in the operation of their school. School attendance would be made compulsory for all children between the ages of six and twelve.[3]

The only Parliamentary action Roebuck sought immediately was to pass a resolution that would open the door for further action. However, his resolution;

> That his House, deeply impressed with the necessity of providing for a due education of the people at large; and believing, that to this end the aid and care of the State are absolutely needed, will, early during the next Session of Parliament, proceed to devise means for the universal and national education of the whole people.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 157-58.

[2] Ibid., p. 163.

[3] Ibid., pp. 153-64.

[4] Ibid., p. 166.

was not brought to a vote and was withdrawn at his own request after the lack of support on the floor made defeat a certainty.[1] Roebuck was not totally without support but his resolution was too sweeping and general for the House to pass. What Roebuck did accomplish was to present a different philosophy of popular education for future consideration. The Owenite strains of responsibility residing in national authority, compulsory school attendance, and expanded community participation in their institutions were given political forum.

The first direct grant to popular education came eighteen days after Roebuck's speech in Commons. The event, while the long-term ramifications were great, was hardly noticed at the time. No formal Government position of popular education was taken in the sense of a stated policy or adoption of a system. All that took place was the inclusion in a general appropriation bill of a provision for the expenditure of not more than L 20,000 for education.[2] No provisions were made on how the money was to be spent other than in "accordance with the recommendations of Commissioners of 1818."[3] These recommendations were that aid be dispensed through private school societies. The precedent set by this allocation

---

[1] Ibid., p. 174.

[2] Ibid., p. 737.

[3] Ibid., p. 733.

determined the tone of future state participation in popular education. The Utilitarian philosophy of Brougham's committee was being implemented.

Thomas Wyse.--Popular education did not drop from legislative consideration as soon as the first money was voted in 1833. The nature of the provision guaranteed future consideration for it was non-directive to the exact method of disbursement of the allocated funds. Thomas Wyse presented a plan to institutionalize education in the Owenite conception. He argued to the house that:

> The great point, then, was not whether they were to have education, but of what kind that education was to be. . . . People seem to think that, because, they did not educate, no education is going on; but did they know what education meant? Every thing was education; everyone, in reference to the young mind, was more or less, an educator. Sit as neutral and as idle as they pleased, the child was still educating, in one way or other and at every instant before their eyes.[1]

Given the central power of education to influence people, even by its absence, Wyse urged that educational reform from the present society system was imparitive. The changes he saw in English society caused by industrialization are analyzed in the following excerpt. Note the emphasis he places on institutional changes caused by economic factors:

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 27 (1835), pp. 1,206-07.

> Steam has produced a great, and is likely to produce a still greater change in the combination and action of society. --Space seems annihilated--towns have melted into each other--men lived almost like one great family, in the presence of each other--facility of communication rendered men more sensible to every impulse . . . combination, for any given cause, was infinitely more easy. Add to these the wholesale changes in the power of production, the new markets created; the old which they displaced, the innumerable vicissitudes which all these created, not only in individual families, but in very large masses of the community; some estimate might be formed of the mighty, and in some degree perilous power of this moral, as well as mechanical agent upon society.[1]

Arguing from what he considered fundamental changes in society, Wyse concludes basic institutional change had already taken place in the passage of the Reform Bill in 1832.[2] The responsibility for the public to become capable voting citizens now must fall on the national government.

> The very day the Legislature passed the Reform Bill, it bound itself by a solemn moral compact to provide for the proper working of the measure; otherwise it confened upon the country, not a blessing, but a cause. And how was it possible the measure should work well, with such instruments to work with as an ignorant population? They might as well trust fire

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1,203.

[2] The effect of the Reform Bill of 1832 was to eliminate some of the corrupt seat districting in the House of Commons. The middle class was granted sufferage on the basis of a monetary qualification of property owend or rent paid. The Act did not enfranchise workingmen, but it did make the emerging industrial-commercial middle class the potentially most powerful political faction in English politics.

> arms to the hands of a child. Parliamentary Reform . . . has rendered Educational Reform indispensable.[1]

To provide the reform necessary, Wyse suggests a National Board of Education to oversee popular education. Since his view of education was essentially to expand the capabilities of the population, he suggested an institution of popular education far beyond the simple literacy expectations of existing popular education. The Church of England's role would be changed drastically since Wyse saw it as basically miseducative. He states, " . . . The object of the Church, and therefore of the State, which was but its servile instrument, was not education, but submission."[2] The other suggestions contained in Wyse's proposal were; the community center concept offering continuing education through loaning libraries in each school; a local board of control to share responsibilities with the National Board on matters of everyday operation; and to create a "fourth profession" by expanding Universities to include teacher training.[3] In his arguments for adoption Wyse points to the efforts of the Kildare-street Society in Ireland as a failure of the practice of supporting private societies for the purpose of popular

---

[1] Hansard's Debates, Vol. 27, p. 1,204.

[2] Ibid., p. 1,210.

[3] Ibid., pp. 1,222-33.

education. He concludes that the societies system should not be supported by additional grants, a failure could only result.[1]

The result of Wyse's speech ended much as Roebuck's had two years earlier, nothing was done. The retorts, of the few who bothered to rise to question, were general negative statements which either the Utilitarian or Perennialist positioned. To the represented Perennialist, the removal of Church of England influence and control over popular education was a sign of moral decay.[2] Hence the establishment of an agent of control, such as a National Board of Education was to be combatted. The support of private societies was an acceptable practice for the Church of England so long as no interference was made in the operations of the schools. This position may easily be understood in view of the size of the National Society which could stand in a position to obtain a large percentage of the funds made available.

Lord Brougham.--The Utilitarian position, on the relationship popular education should have with government, was given political voice by Lord Brougham. As we have seen, the suggestions made by the Committee he

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 39 (1837), p. 428.

chaired to investigate social misery and education were made the basis for entrance of the state into popular education in 1833. The Utilitarian position of Mill was reflected in Brougham's action. The following excerpts show the dilemma the Utilitarians found themselves faced with in dealing with the problem of state power and individual rights in national popular education programs. The Utilitarian recognized that education of the whole population was a desired objective, but how were they to obtain it? Use the state as a coercive agent to make school attendance compulsory? Whose rights came first, the state or the individual? For the Utilitarian, the decision must be in favor of individual rights. What is the primacy of the individual translated to in political positions on popular education?

Brougham proposed a National Board of Education which would have the duty of distributing funds to private societies.[1] In no way did Brougham desire the proposed Board to have any powers over curriculum or operations of the schools. In his proposal speech he makes the point:

> . . . that no Government should appoint instructors--that no Government ought to be intrusted with the power of naming those from whom the public at large were to receive the benefit of secular instruction.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 445-46.

[2] Ibid., p. 437.

His position on passing a compulsory school attendance law was stated in the following excerpt:

> . . . there should be no compulsion exercised and no interference on the part of the Government as regarded who should or who should not be educated at all, but that there should be no power given to the Government to educate the people. . . . With regard to the question of what course of education ought to be chosen, he would look with greatest disfavor at the government of any country in deciding it. . . . He was for no interference on the part of any authority whatever, but for leaving all parties uncontrolled and ungoverned. He would have no rules laid down either by law, or by boards, or by the joint operation of law and board together; neither would he have the executive Government or the Legislature to prescribe a coarse of instruction, and teach the people according to its own model.[1]

If the Utilitarian position was so anti-government participation in popular education, the question must arise as to why there was support at all for any grants to education. To a Utilitarian, the responsibility for the education of children was that of the parents. It was obvious to the observers of the day that this responsibility had not been taken by the working population. The economic system of the factory had successfully destroyed the family as the prime educative institution. The Church also had been weakened as an effective moral influence. The Utilitarians' empirical truth validation process told them that assistance was needed to build a basic intelligence in society so that it might perpetuate itself. What they wanted to do was encourage

---

[1] Ibid., p. 436.

self-improvement without the use of coercive methods. By their definitions, any interference by Government on the individual's right to choose for himself constituted a violation of liberty. The Utilitarians thought education was essential for the elimination of the social problems society faced; but they did not wish to establish a coercive institution to promote it. Brougham makes reference to this position:

> Thus, though decidedly against compulsion, against forcing parents to educate their children, he would be disposed to say, not that he would hold out inducements or encouragement to them to neglect the education of their children, because that it was a duty on their part to have them instructed, and that the breach was in one sense a moral offence, an offence, however, which ought not to be visited by law, for that the obligation was imperfect, was admitted on all hands; but he felt that this made it the more necessary if they could, without any violation of principle of undue interference, without infringing on the liberty of the subject, without committing any innovation on his rights, or without any such risk, to hold out an incentive, an encouragement, and to give facilities of every sort to enable the parent to discharge his duty, and to induce him by all possible means no longer to neglect it. . . . Accordingly, first of all, these inducements and facilities should consist in making education cheap, good, and easily acquired: . . . [1]

The Utilitarians balked at state entrance into education in a manner that might infringe on the individual's personal rights and duties. The whole education question was viewed as part of the larger question of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 437.

State and the Individual authority and responsibility. Brougham poses this question in debate on the education issue.

> The propriety of the penal interference of the State, however, even in matters of acknowledged utility, [popular education] had been a matter of much controversy. He remembered an illustration on this point which had been employed in the discussion of a question of political economy that had been often broached--namely how far a government was justified in interfering with the industry of the people in point of policy or in point of right.[1]

The utility of education for the people was not a question for the Utilitarians as it was for the Perennialists. To the Utilitarians education meant an employable individual; that the State neither care for, nor regard as an economic liability. Hence to have the least amount of State interference with individuals, the goal was to make people independent and able to care for themselves. The need for State-run social institutions would diminish as the working man's ability to fend for himself improved.

Consistent with the position that the least amount of state intervention in the affairs of individuals the better; Parliament had enacted a new Poor Law Bill in 1834 which was designed to discourage the poor from seeking State relief. The new Poor Law established a series of administrative districts called "unions" which replaced the old church-parish system which had been

---

[1] Ibid., p. 438.

established in the Elizabethan era. The major change brought about by the new system was to eliminate outside relief. To obtain relief under the new system one must enter the Union workhouse; live and work in its confines in return for their subsistance. While in the workhouse, families were separated and men segregated from women. Life in the workhouse was made as intentionally bleak and undesirable as possible. The new Poor Laws embodied the Utilitarian philosophy of negative state involvement. The alternative of seeking state relief was made so distasteful as to spur the greatest possible efforts on the part of the poor to avoid seeking relief.

The suggestion was made in Parliament that the Poor Law bureaucracy be used to administer popular education monies supplied by the State.

> The Poor-law Bill . . . would sooner or later extend over the whole country, and why not, therfore, take advantage of the arrangements of that important measure for the purpose of enabling the establishment of schools under the provisions of the Bill . . .[1]

Brougham rose to attack this concept on the basis that the voluntary principle in popular education depended upon making the school as attractive as possible and that associating popular education with the Poor Law would defeat that purpose. He argued that the Poor Law was not yet popularly received by those who were to benefit from it most. Since voluntary popular education was dependent

---

[1] Ibid., p. 452.

upon favorable associations between the school and the individual, tying popular education to an unpopular institution, the workhouse, would be counterproductive. He states;

> A general system of education, whether under the Bill he then proposed or under any other Bill, could not possibly be extended and improved, much less made universal over the country, unless the affection and respect of the people were, by all possible means, conciliated. That being the case, it would be one of the least prudent and least safe causes that could be taken to load this new measure, and through the medium of this measure to load education generally, with anyone atom, however small, of the unpopularity which at present, and only at present, attended the other measure.[1]

By 1837 the need for some machinery to dispense popular education funds was becoming necessary. Brougham's ill-fated attempt to establish a National Board of Education even in this failure illustrated the problem. How could the state support and promote popular education without actually becoming a dictatorial force? The Utilitarian philosophy of private responsibility and the privacy of individual freedom from legal restraints did not translate into centralized national system of education.

State entrance into popular education finally comes in 1839. Lord John Russell, Home Secretary at that time, led the floor battle over the establishment of a state administrative structure for the popular education.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 453-54.

The political effort in Commons to pass the measure was tremendous.

Committee of Council Debates.--Because of the severe floor battle, parts of Russell's original proposal were eliminated. The greatest loss was the provision for State operated non-denominational normal schools to be used for teacher training. His plan recognized the existing private education societies as integral to English society and did not intend to disrupt any present educative practices.[1] He saw the role of the State as the agent of all the people, not just the agent of the Church of England. When it came to popular education, Russell saw the Church of England's position as contrary to the public welfare.

> . . . On the contrary, the principle was, that there should be general admission of all persons, without distinction of religion, to an equal participation of civil rights. In applying this principle to the subject of education they . . . must . . . conclude that this principle of exclusiveness which had been set up, this assumption that the State ought not to recognize or to encourage any education but that which was carried on by the clergy, [the Church of England] was an assumption of variance with the general spirit of our laws, and with the existing feeling of society.[2]

What Lord John Russell's proposal sought to do was to set up an agency to distribute State money to

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 45 (1839), pp. 275-76.

[2]Ibid., p. 278.

charity societies to assist them in their efforts in popular education. He was not trying to establish a system of state operated popular education to compete with the private societies. However, the Church of England fought the establishment of this agency with all the political power it could summon. The Owenite members of Parliament rose to support the Government's proposal even though they thought it far too little. Thomas Wyse;

> . . . called the proposition of the noble Lord a forward step; it presented, it was true, nothing complete, nothing adequate, but it was the first which had yet been made in a right sense . . . it [the proposition] was one which was the pledge and guarantee, sooner or later, no matter how much it might now be opposed, to a truly national system.[1]

The debate raged in its final days in Commons. The Church of England tried all possible arguments to stop the final vote on the educational appropriation for 1839. Lord John Russell stood his ground, however, and brought it to a vote. Popular education won 280 yes to 275 no.[2] One of the closest divisions of the house in that decade.

The victory of Utilitarian philosophy was not complete in Parliament. The clergy, smarting from the narrow loss in Commons, sought redress from the House of Lords. The Archbishop of Canterbury introduced a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 282.

[2] Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 48 (1839), p. 681.

petition against the establishment of any secular board of education to control state supplements to charity funds for education. The resolution, despite the attacks of Brougham, passed easily, 229 yes to 118 no.[1]

The Government was then faced with an odd sort of problem. Money had been voted by Commons for popular education, yet Lords had gone on record as being opposed to the creation of an agency within the government to administer the money. Clearly any joint action to create such an agency would be most difficult, time consuming, and politically dangerous considering the thin final vote margin the issue had gained in Commons.

There was a way out of this situation and the Government took it. Russell conferred with young Queen Victoria and suggested that this charitable undertaking be handled by a Committee of Privy Council which could be created by executive order and thus not cause another confrontation with the Church of England in Parliament. She agreed and the following address was returned to the House of Lords.

> I duly appreciate your zeal for the interests of religion and your care for the Established Church.
> I am ever ready to receive the advice and assistance of the House of Lords, and to give to their recommendations the attention which their authority justly deserves.
> At the same time, I cannot help expressing my regret that you should have thought it necessary to take such a step on the present occasion.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 1,234-36.

> You may be assured that, deeply sensible of the duties imposed upon me, and more especially of that which binds me to the support of the Established Church, I shall always use the powers vested in me by the Constitution for the fulfillment of that sacred obligation.
>
> It is with a deep sense of that duty that I have thought it right to appoint a committee of my Privy Council to superintend the distribution of the grants voted by the House of Commons for public education. Of the proceedings of this Committee, annual reports will be laid before Parliament so that the House of Lords will be enabled to exercise its judgement upon them . . . [1]

So the entrance of the State into popular education comes by executive action in the form of a Committee of Privy Council. The duties of the Committee were simple enough ". . . to superintend the distribution of the grants voted by the House of Commons for public education." The means of action were left to the Committee of Privy Council to decide.

The Committee of Privy Council implemented the proposal of Lord John Russell for requiring all schools which were to receive state funds to be open for inspection. It was stipulated;

> . . . that no further grant be made, now or hereafter, for the establishment and support of Normal schools, or of any other schools, unless the right of inspection be retained, in order to secure a conformity to the regulations and discipline established in the several schools with such improvements as may from time to time be suggested by the Committee.[2]

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 49 (1839), p. 128.

[2]Great Britain, Minutes of the Committee Council on Education, 1839, p. 2.

This meant that a professional group of inspectors was to be recruited and employed by the Council to perform the task. Lord John Russell appointed Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth as Secretary of the Council and charged him with this task. The philosophic direction reflected by the Committee's establishment of an Inspectorate as its primary means of operation, is a Utilitarian one. The duties of the Inspectorate were to enhance private activity in popular education. The Inspectorate was not to enforce specific regulations but to promote educational advancement. The following excerpt from the first meeting of the committee of council gives an indication of the philosophic direction the Council wished the Inspectorate to take.

> In superintending the application of the Parliamentary grant for public education in Great Britain, my Lords have in view the encouragement of local efforts for the improvement and extention of elementary education. The employment of Inspectors is therefore intended to advance this object, by affording to the promoters of schools an opportunity of ascertaining, at the periodical visits of inspection, what improvements in the apparatus and internal arrangements of schools, in school management and discipline, and in the method of teaching, have been sanctioned by the most extensive experience.
>
> The inspection of schools aided by public grants, is, in this respect, a means of cooperation between the Government and the committees and superintendents of schools by which information respecting all remarkable improvements may be diffused where ever it is sought; you will therefore be careful, at visits of inspection, to communicate . . . to them that one main object of your visit is to afford them your assistance in all efforts for improvement in which they may desire your aid; but you are in no respect to interfere with the instruction, management, or

> discipline of the school, or to press upon them any suggestions which they may be disinclined to receive.
>
> . . . It is of the utmost consequence you should bear in mind that this inspection is not intended as a means of exercising control, but of affording assistance; that it is not to be reguarded as operating in restraint of local efforts, but for their encouragement; and that its chief objects will not be attained without the co-operation of the school committees;--the Inspector having no power to interfere, and not being instructed to offer any advice or information excepting where it is invited.[1]

The victory of Utilitarian philosophy regarding the role of the state is demonstrated in the above charge to the future Committee of Council school inspectors. Their role was to be non-coercive. They were to act as resource persons for local school committees. Consistent with the Utilitarian position, that individuals were primarily responsible for the education they received, the state assumes very little direct responsibility for popular education through the Inspectorate system outlined above. The phrase " . . . inspection is not intended as a means of exercising control, but of affording assistance"; illustrates the Utilitarian position of the Council. The concept of assistance to local school committees by inspectors only at the request of the local committee is evidence of a non-interference philosophy.

The whole Committee of Council program for popular education was a Utilitarian package. Aid to private schools, no compulsory school standards or attendance

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

laws, and an Inspectorate which could only report conditions or supply assistance when asked, represent the main tenents of Utilitarian educational philosophy. The stress on individual efforts to found and select his own educative institutions, the position of primary decision making responsibility being located in the parent for the education of his child, and the concept of a non-prescriptive government in the institutions of its people were basic in Utilitarian philosophy and were found in the committee of Council's founding statement of regulations and philosophy.

Summary.--From the first nineteenth-century mention in Parliament, in 1807, until the Government took its first formal step in 1839, the level of Parliamentary interest in popular education gradually rose. This rise in interest was caused by the changing nature of the debate over popular education. The debates were between three basic social philosophies that had political representation in Parliament. The oldest philosophies were the Church of England-Concervative-Perenialist position and the Utilitarian position of the political economists. The last philosophic position to gain representation was the Owenite or active secular state socialization advocates. They were few in number and came to Parliament only after the reform Bill of 1832 enfranchised the new industrial towns.

The first scheme for popular education introduced by Samuel Whitbread in 1807 wanted to use the Church of England as the educator of the people. His plan was defeated because serious questions were raised about cost and the general advisability of educating the "lower sorts" above their lot in life. Little stir was caused in Parliament by either its introduction or its defeat. The Bill passed in Commons but was easily defeated in Lords. The indication is that the Church of England did not, at this time, want to enlarge its responsibility by undertaking the education of all the people. Certainly if the Church of England had wanted it passed in Lords it could have exerted some effort which it did not.[1]

The next interest shown in Parliament on popular education was the Brougham Committee's reports between 1816 and 1820. Their reports suggested the state keep from interfering with the good work beingdone by the private charitable societies. Even though they admitted popular education was not in a good state, they thought any aid from government should go to the private societies then in existence. Little controversy resulted from these reports of a basic philosophic nature.

Roebuck and Wyse, however, presented proposals that would make the state the popular educator. The

---

[1] Hansard's Debates, Vol. 9, pp. 854-59.

Government would assume responsibility for the education of all by both stature and institution. The Perennialists and Utilitarians were both in opposition to the far-reaching changes that the adoption of either's plan implied. However, the Utilitarian faction had to admit to some of their charges, and for the sake of political expediency something had better be done or the democratic election process would not work properly.

Brougham finally introduces a Utilitarian scheme for a national Board of Education in 1837. This Bill encountered opposition from the Church and conservative factions, that were rapidly becoming known as the aristocratic faction, because of their opposition to legislation aimed at protecting the common man. This debate drew the lines for the final battle of 1839.

The final debates in Parliament before the State entered popular education were between two basic philosophic positions. The Utilitarians were opposed by the Church of England. The conflict was over whom should be charged with the responsibility for educating the people. The secular state or the Church? Should the state set up machinery outside the Church to administer public education? Lord John Russell, supporting the Utilitarian concept of maximizing the efforts of private interests, proposed a neutral state agency to superintend funds alloted for public education. The Church opposed creating

such an agency as it constituted an inroad of its traditional responsibility. An argument might be made that this was a fundamental test between two philosophies on whom was to be dominant in Parliament on social questions. The reform Bill of 1832 and the New Poor Law of 1834 had established the secular Government as all powerful in these areas. The closeness of the result, a 280 to 275 victory for the Government demonstrates the division of thought on the question. The fact that the Government did not even try to get a Bill through a hostile House of Lords and instead used an executive committee to fulfill his plan illustrated the power the Church was bringing to bear in Parliament. The Utilitarian precepts brought to English popular education by Lord John Russell were the stamps of contemporary English social thought.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONCLUSION

Popular Education and English Society in Flux

To assess the origins of a philosophy of an institution, it is necessary to put that institution into a historical perspective. The changes in England that had caused reform in Parliament gradually found their way to the people through the institutional changes they caused. One of the most rapid changes that occurred was the sharp reduction of the role of the Church of England in the social and economic affairs of the Government. The traditional role of the Church as the single popular institution concerned with the welfare of the people was sharply reduced. The New Poor Law of 1834 replaced the Parish System of poor relief with a new secular institution, the Union Workhouse. The philosophy of the workhouse system was the opposite of previous systems of social welfare. Charity from the state to individuals was put on the basis of a business transaction. No longer was relief an outright grant or dole from public money; payments, in form of subsistence, were granted

to those who lived in and submitted to the workhouse regulations. The church which had previously acted as benefactor of the poor was removed from this position.

In the education of the people the role of the Church had been similar to its role in social welfare. The obligation had been historically thrust upon the Church, by civil authority, to instruct the people in moral Christian behavior as a means of maintaining social order and harmony. The rise of a secular state philosophy based on logic and legal translations of individual rights caused a direct conflict with the underlying philosophy of the Church's position as the educator of the people. Knowledge accrued by empirical science contested the Perennialist-Thomistic position of the Church in all areas, and put their proponents in conflict with secular institutions. The establishment of the University of London represented this conflict at the top of the educational heirarchy. The institutions of popular education, however, had remained in the hands of groups who espoused the traditional religious philosophies of education.

As we have seen, the educational philosophies of both Robert Owen and James Mill were in opposition to the domination of popular education or any education by irrational non-empirically derived truth systems. Owen and Mill used empirical evidence and reason as a base

for their positions; that they differed so much in the manner they viewed the roles of institutions is most significant. The contributions to the origins of a state philosophy of popular education is related partially to the difference they saw in the role of popular education institutions.

Mill's position emphasized the individual and the family as the agents responsible for education. Owen argued that the individual was helpless in the face of the institutions that were influencing his environment. Mill's position concurred with Owen's on the empirical conditions for learning, but disagreed on the means of improving the environment. Mill feared the influence of institutions in education as they had represented, in the past, islands of tradition and were anti-progress and social change. Mill's position was based on establishing the legal rights of the individual to select his own mode of education. The state should act as a neutral referee between individuals whether they were institutional or private.

Owen's position is in direct contradiction to Mill in the instance of the neutral state. He argued that institutions need not be in perpetual conflict and competition. The new industrial society did not have to be a world where individuals must battle the forces of natural law independently. Great production and

progress could be made by cooperation for mutual benefit. Employers need not be at odds with workers in areas of self-interest, for mutual benefit was the product of profit for both. Owen contended that the institutions that had been produced by new intelligence could be made to serve everyone's interest. Popular education would be accomplished by employing the fruits of industrial division of labor. Owen sought to adapt the tools of modern society to create a new community concept. The vehicle Owen wished to use was institutionalized education. He wanted to reshape society to eliminate misery and poverty by changing the entire social and economic pattern of society.

The direct appeal of Owen's thought, for change in the economic structure, and to provide integrated institutional production and socialization was in direct conflict with the Utilitarian political economists. The support Owen's philosophy gathered in English society came basically from workingmen's organizations that wanted to improve their economic position. Owen's appeal for social cooperation cannot be considered a practical appeal for direct political action. Various parts of Owen's thought were incorporated into Chartism and the Trades Union movement, but neither movement was purely Owenite in the sense that they reflected Owen's social philosophy completely. They could not, as we have seen,

because Owen's philosophy did not contain a means of popular political action. Owen's social philosophy was Paternalistic and non-democratic in the sense that he did not wish all individuals to have suffrage.

Popular education as a direct product of workingmen's organizations became more difficult after 1832. The Utilitarian middle class had triumphed in the Reform Bill. Political power was now in the hands of a social philosophy which thought the role of the state would be better with less institutional interference. Economic and Social reform was construed to mean liberating the individual from unwanted legal and institutional restraints. The creation of new institutions to serve an element of society, which was taking an increasingly hostile view of a free economic system, would only cause a threat to social order.

The workingmen's organizations realized that help in popular education as well as other forms was not going to come from Parliament of its own volition.[1] Hence, the role of workingmen's organizations becomes that of an independent political force, after 1832, agitating for political and educational reform. Education reform in terms of free popular education for all was not to come

---

[1]Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780-1810 (London: Lawrence and Vishart, 1960), pp. 225-35.

until the Education Act of 1870 which is three years after universal sufferage was granted in 1867.

While Owenite influence remained outside State philosophy, Mill's philosophy became the most dominant within State philosophy. The targets of reform for the Utilitarians were the irrational traditional practices of the past. Progress meant freeing society of the yoke of outmoded institutions and wasteful government practices. Popular education becomes part of the secular government versus the Establishment conflict. The Utilitarian position would suggest that the State should not enter education as it should be a matter of individual option. This, however, was not the issue to be decided as the State was already in popular education through its connection with the Established Church. The traditional role of the Established Church had been interlocked with civil literacy and knowledge in pre-industrial England. The teaching of the common man's children that did take place prior to the nineteenth century was usually done by religious groups using religious salvation as their rationalization. Basic skills education took on a new meaning in industrialized England. The Utilitarians thought it was now essential within the society to have a literate population. Justifications of popular education, on the floor of Parliament, show that the Utilitarians

and Established Church had some equatable social objectives; however, their means were not the same.

Utilitarian arguments, by supporters of State financial aid for popular education, imply that the ability to read, write, and do simple mathematics carried with it the virtues of middle class behavior. Roebuck, Wyse, Russell, Brougham, and numerous others who rose to speak in favor of popular education, claimed a middle class work ethic went with basic literacy. They reasoned a more productive society could be had by eliminating the source of moral decay, ignorance.

The Church desired the same virtuous social product through faith rather than logic and empirical knowledge. The Church wanted to bring the people back under the influence of scriptural religion. The clergy of all denominations saw the shift in institutional social influences that was taking place within the society. The new economic institutions of the factory system had reduced the role of religious institutions in the lives of the unskilled worker. The New Poor Law of 1834 took the Church of England still further away from the people. Before 1839, popular education in the form of charitable religious societies, was still free from secular financial influences. The religious societies had the area to themselves. However, this situation was being threatened continually during the period between the passage of the

Reform Bill in 1832 and the eventual creation of the Committee of Council on Education in 1839. Roebuck, Wyse and Brougham each introduced measures which would bring the secular state into popular education in a capacity separate from the Established Church. The Church feared that any inroad or movement of the state into popular education would be the end of their domination in this area.

A bitter fight was waged by the Church of England in the summer of 1839 on the floor of Commons to defeat the annual appropriation for popular education. The appropriations had been started in 1833, but there had been no stipulation as to the method of its expenditure specified in any of the earlier bills. The Government sought to establish a secular means to distribute the funds which would deny the Church its past privileged position. The State through the Church of England had, defacto, assumed the role of popular educator on the strength of tradition. The Government now wished to challenge this position by establishing, de jure, the neutrality of the state in popular education and permitting legal equality to exist between organizations seeking available state aid for popular education. State philosophy of popular education thus becomes part of the larger question of the role of the Established Church in society.

Mill's philosophy emerges as the State philosophy of popular education through a series of political compromises. Lord John Russell's original plan for state entrance into popular education included a state operated system of normal schools for teacher training as well as the Inspectorate. However, it became necessary to drop the normal school concept to gain adequate support for his bill in Commons. The division on the issue was so close, 280-275, that Russell needed to broaden his bill to gain all the support possible. Hence, he dropped the normal schools, the creation of a state institution, and settled for an Inspectorate with little power. What he did achieve was the establishment of secular control over public education money. The principle was established. The Established Church's position was no longer the Government's position on popular education.

Conclusions

The conclusions I would like to draw from the research presented in this work are:

James Mill

The philosophic position of James Mill dominates the origins of a State philosophy of popular education in England. The evidence shows the essential features of Mill's thought, non-coercive state authortiy, suspicion of State institutions, and the primary responsibility being with the individual and family for

education received, appearing in the Parliamentary debates and contemporary literature prior to political action. The creation of a Committee of Council on Education and the subsequent initial policies adopted, further support the case for the dominance of Mill's Utilitarian philosophy of popular education.

Robert Owen

Robert Owen's contribution to the evolution of a State philosophy of popular education was not political enactment into policy. The Committee of Council and the spirit of its initial actions were contrary to the educational philosophy of Robert Owen. His assumptions that the individual was helpless to shape his own character because the forces of the environment were too strong, and the ultimate responsibility for shaping the individual resided in the State were in direct opposition to the policies adopted by the State. However, Owen's concept of harmony, promoted through popular education for cooperation between institutions and individuals instead of competition, did give an idealogical contribution to workingmen's organizations. The greater question presented by Owen's philosophy was the role of popular education institutions in the new industrial society. Owen's advocacy of an integrated institutional relationship between the social and economic elements went unacted upon.

Philosophy and Popular Education

Establishing a Utilitarian state agency for popular education is a contradictory act. Logical consistency with Utilitarian educational philosophy would have the state remain out of education completely, as the responsibility for education resides within the family and the individual. The operation of the State in educational institutions constitutes a potential threat to individual freedom. Utilitarians argued that the power institutions hold over the minds of men might be used to promote the vested interests of the established institutions rather than the individual. If it were inconsistent for Utilitarian philosophy to establish a government agency for education, why then did the Committee of Council on Education come into being? Particularly if its operational philosophy was to be Utilitarian in nature.

The answer to this question may be found in the structure of English political and social institutions and the philosophic changes that were taking place within them. Secular government was challenging the traditional assumptions of authority and responsibility that had been held within English society. The Church of England had, in the Christian tradition, assumed the responsibility for education within the society. The Church's monopoly in higher education had been broken with the creation of the secular University of London.

The creation of the Committee of Council on Education was another instance of the secular state challenging the Church's position as the educator of the people.

The entrance of the state into popular education does not come about as a product of a philosophy which dictated the state's presence, but rather as a check against an existing practice. The entrance of the State as a Utilitarian agent in education comes from the attempt to limit an existing education force, the Church of England and to open the way for individuals to choose their own form of popular education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Introduction

This section is divided into three parts. The first deals with the primary source material; the second, the secondary sources; and the last section is a list of additional sources not specifically mentioned in the essay. The primary and secondary parts consist of three divisions; the first a general analysis of the sources dealing with popular education, the second those dealing with James Mill, and the third those dealing with Robert Owen. In each of the sections an attempt will be made to identify the most useful and available sources. In the secondary sections suggestions will also be made for future work in selected areas.

B. Primary Sources

1. General Area of Popular Education

(a) Government Documents

Government documents dealing with the general area of popular education provide useful information on the relationship between popular education and English society. The three types of documents I found most useful were the

Parliamentary Debates, Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, and various Reports published in different volumes of Parliamentary Papers.

The Parliamentary Debates covered a range from 1807 to 1840. The source, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, deserves special mention for it is not a verbatim report of the debates on the floor. While as a source Hansard's is considered a government document there is a certain amount of interpretation inherent because of the nature of the reporting. For those accustomed to a first-person style, the third-person reports given in Hansard's take some time for the adjustment to a new style. A list of the most useful debates dealing with popular education may be found in Appendix A.

The Minutes of the Committee on Education, which start in 1839, are valuable because they reveal the translation of abstract philosophy into State policy. The evidence from this source is easily obtainable and most relevant to the study of popular education in England. The two Minutes which are most relevant to this study are those for 1839 and 1846.

Parliamentary papers, in form of Reports, from various committees established to investigate education provide useful data in two ways. First they represent a great amount of opinion and trivia on existing

conditions in popular education. The second is that they expose the information gathering machinery of the English Parliamentary system. Specific Reports found to be useful are listed in Appendix B.

(b) Published Tracts

The writing of tracts dealing with popular education was not nearly as common as the appearance of articles in periodicals. The best source for reference to available published tracts is C. W. J. Higson, Sources for the History of Education, (1967), which contains not only a listing of each work, but the names of the depositories in England which have each volume. Most of the tract literature that deals with popular education does so in conjunction with schemes to improve the lot of the poor. Mill's tract "Education" which circulated in a volume with six other tracts and was widely referred to in current literature. When examining tract literature for its philosophic implications, the large majority supports the religious societies. This conclusion only reinforces that of R. K. Webb who in The British Working Class Reader--1790-1848, (1955) concludes that the middle class dominated all but the emerging radical press. Tract literature in this time period considered by this dissertation may be found in great quantity at the Goldsmith's Library located at the University of London. His collection covers the whole spectrum of

thought on social and economic issues of the day. Originals of the major works, James Mill and Robert Owen, are contained in the Goldsmith's collection.

(c) Periodicals

Periodical literature may be divided into two categories: the literary magazine and the popular press. The literary magazines usually carried articles which represented the political position of the magazine. The magazines I found to be most clearly representative of general positions were--Conservative--The Quarterly Review, Utilitarian--The Westminster Review and The Edinburgh Review. These three publications were continually involved in the political and social changes that were taking place during this period.

Popular or radical press publications divide into two distinct categories. One category is filled with publications intended for the working class by the middle and upper classes. These instances of the popular press were politically sterile and were not intended to incite social change. The publications of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge such as Penny Magazine, The Mechanic's Magazine and many others by religious societies were designed to channel the thoughts away from current events that affected the lives of the working class. These publications, though unstamped, were allowed to circulate freely by the Government.

Education was stressed for the purpose of improving economic skills not for eventual reform and political citizenship.

The other segment of the popular press was reform oriented. These publications were created by and intended for working class readers to provide a means for social and political education. These publications were unstamped and subject to great harassment by the authorities. Most representative of these papers were The Poor Man's Guardian, The Crisis, The Cooperator, Bontene's National Reformer In Government, Law, Poverty, Religion and Morals, The Birmingham Labour Exchange Gazette, and The Northern Star. Their positions on popular education varied, but they all agreed that popular education and political reform must come together.

2. James Mill

(a) Manuscript Collections

The principal unpublished sources for James Mill are found in the Place Collection in the British Museum, Manuscripts Department, and in the Brougham and Bentham Collections at University College, The University of London. These collections contain many letters by Mill which, particularly in the Brougham collection, express Mill's views on political reform. The Bentham Collection contains many of Mill's thoughts on Education particularly during the

1813-1816 period when Bentham was working his Chrestomathia. Most useful, however, of the manuscript sources is Mill's Commonplace Book in four volumes which is in the London Library. This source is a scrapbook of Mill's intellectual pursuits. Consisting of clippings and diary-like essays, it is a very valuable primary source on Mill's thought.

(b) Published Materials

(1) Periodicals

James Mill's publishing career consisted primarily of articles in periodicals. His articles appear, most of the time without being signed, in many of the reform journals of the period. He was a major contributor to The Philanthropist in which his first article in support of popular education appears in 1812. His most important series of articles were his "Seven Essays" prepared as a supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica which were published in 1828. These essays contain the Utilitarian position on jurisprudence, political reform and education. The appearance of these articles precipitated a series of articles in reply by Quarterly Review which supported the Church of England and the unreformed Parliament. To answer these attacks, Mill wrote answering articles in The Westminster Review which supported the Utilitarian position.

Reprints of Mill's two most significant articles on education appear in W. H. Burstom, James Mill on Education. Copies of his other articles may be found in the Goldsmith's Library in various bound periodicals, which unfortunately, are not well-catalogued for reference use. References in Mill's Commonplace Book give leads to many unsigned articles that he authored.

(2) Books

James Mill's hard bound publishing career was limited to three major works. The first was The History of India (1817), which took him ten years to complete, and was responsible to his ultimate appointment as an examiner in India House. The second was his Analysis of the Human Mind (1828) which was an attempt to apply empirical science to the mental process. Much of what Mill wrote earlier in his essay "Education" is elaborated upon in Analysis. The research contribution of Analysis is the explanation Mill offers for human motivation. His association principle is defined in detail.

The other major work, published near the time of Mill's death, was Fragment on Mackintosh in 1835. This 400-page work is essentially a defense of Utilitarian moral philosophy. In this work, Mill attempts to explain psychologic hedonism as a socially productive force.

3. Robert Owen

(a) Personal Papers

Robert Owen's personal papers and documents are found in his Autobiography. Written during the last years of his life, this lengthy pair of volumes provide reference to letters, documents, and his own accounts of the events of his life. During research for this work, the manuscript collections I consulted, particularly the Place Collection in the British Museum, contained various items from Owen's hand. These items, while interesting, were not the value that the printed source material was.

(b) Published Materials

The Goldsmith's Library contains a copy of virtually all the known published works of Robert Owen. Original copies of his series of essays, published in 1813, titled A New View of Society, are available. This work is Owen's primary philosophic statement. His later works, except for his last year, are restatements of the same basic philosophy. Owen's volume of tract literature was not large. Owen's basic educational philosophy is elaborated in An Address to the Inhabitants of New Lanark; on the first of January 1816, at the opening of the Institution established for the Formation of Character, which must be considered his basic educational tract. In it the basic community school concept is presented in great detail.

Other printed sources by Owen containing information of value were: Report to the County of Lanark; of a plan for relieving public distress, and removing discontent, by giving permanent productive employment to the poor and working classes etc., (1821). This work presents Owen's scheme for Utopian communities with educational institutions serving a major role as the socializing agent for the community. His testimony in Report of the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the State of the Children employed in the Manufactories of the United Kingdom (25 April-18 June, 1816, printed by the House of Commons) is quite useful. In Owen's six appearances before the Committee he emphasized the need for education for young children not the unhealthy conditions of factory labor.

(c) Periodicals

Robert Owen's use of periodical literature to publicize his social philosophy began in 1817 when he used The Times to publish the text of his City of London Tavern meetings. Segments of these early press releases are reprinted in Volume I A of Owen's Autobiography. Owen continued to use the press to spread his philosophy after his American interlude. However, the audience Owen sought to reach in his later efforts in journalism were quite different from the readership of The Times. Beginning with The Crisis in 1832, Owen embarked on a

program to reach workingmen through the popular press. The Crisis was short lived and was replaced at the end of 1834 by The New Moral World which became the principle Owenite workingmen's paper. The New Moral World lasted until 1845, but lost much of its Owenite leanings after Owen's interest in it dropped in the early forties. What distinguishes these two papers among the other workingmen's papers is the lack of political agitation in which they engaged.

The articles contained in the Owenite papers are mostly of a theoretical nature dealing with complete change of the whole social and economic system. The workingmen's papers which advocated partial reform of the political system, in particular The Poor Man's Guardian of Bonterre O'Brien, were generally hostile to Owen's paper.

For reference to individual copies of available articles which Owen authored, a Catalogue has been published by the University of London, Robert Owen 1771-1858 (1959). This catalogue is an annotated guide to the University's holdings on Owen and is quite helpful. Another useful collection of Owen's writings appear in the Everyman's edition of A New View of Society and Other Writings edited by G. D. H. Cole, 1927. Most of Owen's main works appear in this volume.

C. Secondary Sources

1. General

To study educational history and philosophy of a period, it is necessary to examine the total social and intellectual environment. Some works which put English society in perspective are: Eli Halévy, The Growth of Philosophical Radicalism (1928), Sir Leslie Stephen, The English Utilitarians (3 volumes 1900), H. L. Beals, The Industrial Revolution 1750-1850 (1958), and Phyllis Deane's The First Industrial Revolution (1965). These works along with E. Halévy, History of the English People (volumes I and II, 1924 and 1961) and R. J. White's From Waterloo to Peterloo (1957) provide an overall picture of English society and the nature of forces that were acting upon it. The most recent significant work on English workingmen's history is Edward Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class (1963).

The history of popular education in England is covered in a number of good studies. The best of the older histories are Charles Birchenough, History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day (1938) which is a good outline of early developments; Frank Smith, A History of English Elementary Education (1931), and J. W. Adamson English Education 1789-1902 (1930).

For the relationship, however general, between education and social movements see: A. E. Dobbs, Education and Social Movements 1700-1850 (1919) and Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870 (1960). The best and most recent of these studies is Harold Silver, The Concept of Popular Education: A Study of Ideas and Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century (1965). Silver's work deals mostly with the conditions of Owenite thought to popular education during this period.

Two excellent monographs dealing with the literacy level and reading habits of the English workingman in the first half of the nineteenth century are R. K. Webb, The British Working Class Reader 1790-1848 (1955) and Richard D. Altick, The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900 (1957). Webb's work is the better of the two and contains an excellent account of the Mechanic's Institutes movement and work of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

The most recent general history of nineteenth century English popular education is Mary Sturt's The Education of the People: A History of Primary Education in England and Wales in the Nineteenth Century (1967). Her work is expertly researched from government documents, but unfortunately tends to become too narrow in that she

fails to put popular education into adequate social context. Her account of the second half of the century is the best part of her book.

2. James Mill

(a) Biographies

The only real biography of James Mill is Alexander Bain's James Mill: A Biography (1882). This work is very detailed and useful to a researcher for the many valuable leads it contains. Bain consulted John Stuart Mill and many others who knew Mill during his research. The exact chronology this work gives of Mill's activities is most valuable.

(b) Reference to Mill's Activities

Sir Leslie Stephen's The English Utilitarians volume II is devoted almost entirely to Mill's role within Utilitarian circles. Graham Walla's Life of Francis Place (1898) and Bertrand Russell's Freedom and Organization (1934) contain relevant information on Mill.

(c) Mill's Educational Contributions

Two principle works exist on the contributions of James Mill to education. The older, F. A. Cavenaugh's James and John Stuart Mill on Education (1931) presents a comparison of both men's positions. Cavenaugh's assessment of the two positions is quite valuable. Most recent

is W. H. Burston, James Mill on Education (1969). Burston consists of a reprint of Mill's two most famous articles on education, "Schools for All" and "Education" plus an excellent introduction. The introduction, while short on putting Mill into social context, is an excellent source for beginning analysis of Mill's thought.

3. Robert Owen

(a) Biographies

Of the biographies that exist on Robert Owen, two deserve special mention. Frank Podmore's Robert Owen (1906) is a long well-written account of Owen's life which pays particular attention to his educational achievements. G. D. H. Cole's Robert Owen (3rd edition, 1965) is excellent because Cole attempts to put Owen in perspective with the events which surrounded his life.

Owen has had much written about him as he is credited as the first English socialist. However, an examination of the biographical literature will reveal that though much has been written, little can be added to the findings and interpretation of Podmore and Cole.

(b) References to Owen

Owen's name is mentioned in some context by virtually all authors on English Education. Hugh Pollard's Pioneers of Popular Education 1760-1850 (1956) has a good chapter

dealing with Owen's community school concept. Also A. V. Judges (ed) Pioneers of English Education (1952) contains a valuable essay on Owen by M. V. C. Jeffreys. These two sources make special reference to Owen's contributions to popular education.

(c) Owen's Educational Contributions

The principle works done on Robert Owen as an educator have been done by Harold Silver. His most recent work, Robert Owen on Education (1964), is a short collection of excerpts from some of Owen's most important essays. In his introduction, Silver goes to great lengths to convince the reader of rational eighteenth century origins of Owen's thought. He makes a good case.

D. Suggestions for Future Study

The whole area of popular education and its relationship with social philosophy has only been scratched by this study. What needs to be done is to examine the entire area of popular institutions and the social philosophy their development reflects.

In another area, politics and education, studies need to be done along the lines of the research done by Sir Lewis Namier. There is a need to establish the importance theory played in the political decisions that affected education. Was education a legitimate concern of the politicians or was it an issue that was used by factions to test their strengths?

Also as a future project, the study of the content of the textbooks that were used in English popular education for their philosophic assumptions would be valuable.

E. Selected Other Sources

(1) Primary

Althams, Henry. A Compendious Report of Proceedings and Operations in the Central School of the British and Foreign School Society, Borough Road, London. London: British and Foreign School Society, 1835.

Bell, Andrew. Instructions for Conducting a School Through the Agency of the Scholars Themselves. London: John Murray, 1813.

Combe, George. What Should Secular Education Embrace? London: Maclachlan, Stewart & Co., 1848.

Fletcher, Joseph. Education; National, Voluntary, and Free. London: Ridgway, 1851.

Kennedy, C. R. Classical Education Reformed. London: Longman, 1837.

Lovett, William and Collins, John. Chartism; A New Organization of the People. London: --, 1841.

Mill, James. Elements of Political Economy. London: Grote & Co., 1821.

_____. The Principles of Toleration. London: Grote & Co., 1836.

Place, Francis. Improvement of the Working People--Drunkenness-Education. London: Charles Fox, 1834.

Shuttleworth, Sir James Kay-. Public Education as Affected by the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council 1846-1852. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1853.

The Central Society of Education. Publications of the Central Society of London. Vol. I, London: Taylor and Walton, 1837.

Wilderspin, Samuel. Hints for the Improvement of Early Education and Nursery Discipline. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1824.

(2) Secondary

(a) Articles

Black, Archibald M. "The Owenites and the Halls of Science." The Co-operative Review, XXIX, No. 2 (1955).

Cavenagh, F. A. "Lord Brougham and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." The Journal of Adult Education, IV, No. 1 (1929), 11.

Cumming, Ian. "The Scottish Education of James Mill." History of Education Quarterly, II (Summer, 1962).

Milliband, Ralph. "The Politics of Robert Owen." Journal of the History of Ideas, XV, No. 2 (1954).

(b) Theses

Baker, G. F. "The Care and Education of Children in Union Workhouses of Somerset, 1834-1870." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of London, 1960.

Becket, Edith M. "The History of Education and Educational Institutions in Nottinghamshire . . . 1800-1930." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1936.

Benson, E. "A History of Education in York, 1780-1902." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1933.

Birtwistle, C. "A History of the Education in the Blackburn Hundred to 1870." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of London, 1952.

Burgess, H. J. "The Work of the Established Church in the Education of the People, 1833-1870." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1954.

Carr, J. R. "The Origin, Development and Organization of Certain Lancastrian Schools in London, Middlesex, and Surrey: A Comparative Study." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of London, 1963.

Clark, E. A. G. "The Ragged School Union and the Education of the London Poor in the Nineteenth Century." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of London, 1967.

Hitchcock, R. W. "A History of Charity School Education and a Statistical Survey of Educational Progress." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1938.

Kerr-Waller, M. P. G. "Scottish Influence on English Education Between 1800 and 1840." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of London, 1952.

Lesse, J. "The History and Character of Educational Inspection in England." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1934.

Pritchard, F. C. "The Methodist Contributions to 19th Century Secondary Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1947.

Rooke, P. J. "A Study of Rewards and Punishments in the Elementary Schools of England and Wales, 1800-1893." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of London, 1963.

Ross, A. M. "The Care and Education of Pauper Children in England and Wales, 1834 to 1896. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of London, 1955.

(c) Books

Armytage, W. H. G. Four Hundred Years of English Education. Cambridge: The University Press, 1964.

Briggs, Asa. Victorian People. New York: Harper Row, 1963.

Cole, G. D. H. A Short History of the British Working Class Movement 1789-1947. London: George, Allen, & Unwin, 1956.

Ervine, John. Francis Place: The Tailor of Charing Cross. London: The Fabian Society, 1912.

Hamburger, Joseph. James Mill and the Art of Revolution. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Hawes, Frances. Henry Brougham. London: Jonathan Cape, 1957.

Hodgen, Margret T. Worker's Education in England and the United States. London: Paul, 1925.

Jones, M. G. The Charity School Movement. Cambridge: The University Press, 1938.

Maltby, S. E. Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education, 1800-1870. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1918.

Smith, Frank. The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. London: John Murray, 1923.

Wallas, Graham. The Life of Francis Place 1771-1854. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MAJOR PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES ON POPULAR EDUCATION

APPENDIX A

MAJOR PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES ON POPULAR EDUCATION

1807 19, February Hansard 1, VIII p. 865.

1807 24, April Hansard 1, IX p. 531.

1807 21, July Hansard 1, IX p. 854.

1807 4, August Hansard 1, IX p. 1,049.

1807 6, August Hansard 1, IX p. 1,067.

1816 21, May Hansard 1, XXXIV p. 633.

1816 20, June Hansard 1, XXXIV p. 1,230.

1829 9, April Hansard 2, XXI p. 608.

1831 9, September Hansard 3, VI p. 1,249.

1833 30, July Hansard 3, XX p. 139.

1833 17, August Hansard 3, XX p. 732.

1835 19, May Hansard 3, XXVII p. 1,199.

1837 1, December Hansard 3, XXXIX p. 425.

1839 12, February Hansard 3, XLV p. 273.

1839 4, June Hansard 3, XLVII p. 1,377.

1839 14, June Hansard 3, XLVIII p. 227.

1839 19, June Hansard 3, XLVIII p. 529.

1839 2, July Hansard 3, XVVIII p. 1,234.

1839 11, July Hansard 3, XLIX p. 128.

APPENDIX B

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS DEALING WITH POPULAR EDUCATION

APPENDIX B

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS DEALING WITH POPULAR EDUCATION

1816 IV p. 1 Reports on the Education of the Lower Orders of the Metropolis

1818 IV p. 1 Reports on the Education of the Lower Orders of the Metropolis

1820 XII p. 341 General table showing the state of Education in England

1825 XII p. 1 Education in Ireland

1826 XVIII p. 1 Parochial Education in Scotland

1829 IV p. 443 Education in Ireland

1834 IX p. 1 Report on the state of Education

1835 VII Report on Education in England and Wales

1837 VII Report on Education of the Poorer Classes in England and Wales

1837 VII p. 437 Report on the state of Education in Scotland

1837 VIII Part I p. 1 Report on progress and operation of a plan of Education in Ireland