

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

**A Moving Staircase:
a study of the provision of education
in the County Borough of Bath 1870-1974**

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of Hull

by

Norman Paul Simpson B.A., M.Ed.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Bath: its social and political background 1870-1974	1
Chapter 2	The Bath School Board 1870-1902	12
Chapter 3	The Bath Technical Education Committee 1891-1902	36
Chapter 4	Establishing the Bath Education Authority 1901-03	56
	Appendix to Chapter 4: The Bath Passive Resistance Movement c.1902-12.	68
Chapter 5	The Bath Education Committee April 1903 to November 1904	77
Chapter 6	Elementary Education in Bath 1903-44	92
Chapter 7	Secondary Education in Bath 1903-44	125
Chapter 8	Independent Schools in Bath 1903-44	156
Chapter 9	Further Education and Technical Education in Bath 1903-44	185
Chapter 10	Bath School Health Service, School Meals Service and the effects of War 1903-44	200
Chapter 11	Post War Developments and Secondary Re-organisation	223
Chapter 12	A Consideration of the Years 1870-1974	251
Bibliography		259

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor John Lawson for his help during the preparation of this thesis. I would also like to thank the Librarians and staff of the University of Bath Library and School of Education Library, University of Bristol. Access to obscure corners of the local collection in the Bath Reference Library was facilitated by the considerable knowledge of the Reference Library staff.

I would also like to thank Robert Bryant the archivist at the Bath Guildhall, as well as the staff of the Education Department of Avon County Council for allowing me access to various files. Michael King spent considerable time with me discussing the work of his father, grandfather and great-grandfather, as well as allowing me to consult two boxes of files in his possession.

My most profound thanks however, are for my wife, who, whilst this work was in preparation, not only had the fortitude to bear with me, but also to bear our two children.

ABBREVIATIONS

B.C.	Bath Chronicle
B.J.	Bath Journal
B.H.	Bath Herald
S.B.	School Board
T.E.C.	Technical Education Committee
B.E.C.	Bath Education Committee
B.C.B.C.	Bath County Borough Council
L.E.A.	Local Education Authority
H.M.I.	Her (His) Majesty's Inspector
D.E.S.	Department of Education and Science
P.R.O.	Public Records Office
S.T.K.	Stone King and Wardle

"There were people who thought there should be a ladder reaching from the elementary schools to the universities. He quite agreed. He disagreed with those who wanted to make it a lift. They would make it a moving staircase, only there was no accommodation for sitting down."

Alderman Sir Harry Hatt
Bath Chronicle 18 November 1929.

SUMMARY

Financial frugality inhibited the development of a maintained system of education for much of the period 1870-1974. The Bath School Board of eleven always had six Anglican members, and during the Board's thirty years only four schools were built, the majority of children attended instead the many Church of England Schools. The Technical Education Committee with the Council's encouragement did much of the School Board's work and provided many classes during the last decade of the twentieth century. However the Bath Council after 1902 were suspicious of the wide brief of the Education Committee and would not allow sufficient finance to run an efficient educational system nor to establish secondary schools until the 1930s. Technical schools however were favoured by the Council because of their vocational aspect and the Education Committee promoted technical education in place of secondary schools. Also an effective school medical service was developed during the interwar years. In essence only a small number wanted education for its own sake, the majority of Councillors saw maintained schools as a charitable provision creating a literate, numerate and healthy work force. After 1945 attitudes changed in Bath and all children's potential was to be developed. Consequently a successful tripartite system was established, successful that is when judged by academic criteria. However when the comprehensive debate began and more social criteria were used to judge a school's efficacy dissension split the Council and ten years elapsed before comprehensive schools were established. The provision of education in Bath between 1870-1974 was hampered by the existence of a large independent sector. Not only did these schools have more money and better facilities than maintained schools, but they also attracted the children of the articulate middle class, thus depriving the maintained schools of vigorous advocates.

Chapter One.

Bath: its social and political background, 1870-1974.

"There is a further mystery about Bath...for I have never been able to imagine who lives in those rows and rows of houses really intended for Sheridan and Jane Austen characters. They all seem to be occupied; life is busy behind those perfect facades; but who are the people, where do they come from, what do they do?"

J.B.Priestly, English Journey.

The staple columns of many local newspapers are those headed Births, Deaths and Marriages. To these the Bath newspapers, the Chronicle and Journal, added a fourth, Arrivals. Thus the curious could discover in early 1893 that Lieutenant General Cofe V.C., Colonel Gammell and Captain Wykes were at the Grand Hotel, as was the Marquis de Ruvigny; or that his Honour Judge Paterson and Mrs Paterson were at the Francis Private Hotel. At the same time Mrs and Miss Howard had taken residence at 7 Royal Crescent, Lady Hobhouse at 36 Gay Street and Surgeon Captain and Mrs H.P.G. Elkington at 12 Lansdown Crescent.¹ This tradition continued until the Second World War but by then the visitors were more likely to be Mr and Mrs Alec Baker from Worthing or Mr and Mrs Moore from East Grinstead.²

Bath's most famous epoch was the Georgian but after the social gadflies had found another site for their frivolities and left, Bath was still a town of exquisite architectural beauty and a spa with supposedly efficacious waters, though not everyone appreciated the Bath water. A Cruickshank cartoon of 1825 shows aristocratic bathers fully dressed and up to their necks in murky steaming water, their faces flushed and grim. The legend reads 'Public bathing at Bath or Steaming Alive.'³ After a brief period of unpopularity in the mid-nineteenth century Bath was again recognised as an ideal place for retirement or an extended visit. There was a modest season when it was quite fashionable to be there. This was approximately a month to six weeks on either side of Christmas each year. As the twentieth century progressed Bath and society changed, especially during the inter-war years, casual visitors were less but the residents continued to be of comparatively high socio-economic status.

The reasons for Bath's popularity as a place of residence were varied. The tall Georgian houses were ideally suited for a family with servants. Equally the slightly impoverished spinster sisters could discreetly let rooms. There was an ample supply of female domestic labour since Bath had very little industry. The women therefore had to enter service or work in the many shops catering for the middle and upper classes.

1. B.C. 5 January 1893.

2. B.C. 22 January 1938.

3. An enlarged copy can be seen in Fortt's Restaurant, Milsom Street, Bath.

In 1871 the Census figures for the Domestic category are 16,984 out of a total female population of 31,360. Admittedly this former figure includes some wives helping husbands for there is a breakdown into two domestic categories of which the first is "Wives and women in Household duties but assisting in certain cases in the Husband's business." This has 10,489. The second group is "persons engaged in entertaining and performing personal offices for man" and this has 6,495. Even the catch-all category "Industrial Class" only has 5,313 women.¹

By 1921 domestic work was still by far the main employment for females in Bath. In a table showing the occupation of females aged twelve and upwards there are 349 domestic servants per thousand of the population. The nearest is Saleswomen and Shop Assistants with 87 per thousand of the population. Tailoresses form the third category with 54 per thousand.²

The lack of industry also meant that Bath was safe socially and politically. There was not a huge industrial proletariat toiling in factories who once enfranchised would be able to vote for Radicals and Socialists. Because of its situation in a valley there was nowhere to build vast factories, and anyway the industrialist was more likely to look to Bristol only nine miles away where there were the facilities for swift transport of raw materials or manufactured items, plus a larger labour force. These facilities meant that often a Bath man would need to go to Bristol to find work. The middle or upper class resident of Bath was not affronted by factory chimneys belching smoke across the town. The industrial area was away from the elegant Crescents, down by the river towards Bristol. Further such work that was available was mainly skilled. For example there was printing and bookbinding, and cloth weaving producing a good West of England broadcloth, as well as cabinet making to rival the smart London firms, plus carriage making (though in decline with the onslaught of the motor car); and

-
1. 1871 Census. p.264 Table 17 Occupations Males and Females aged twenty years and upwards.
 2. 1921 Census. p.xxxii Table xviii (2) Occupied Females per 1,000 aged twelve and upwards.

mechanical engineering, the firm of Stothart and Pitt supplying cranes and dockside equipment to the world, all of these were flourishing in Bath.

The 1871 Census lists 7,278 males in the Industrial Class and this is broken down into six sub-classes:

- i. persons engaged in Art and Mechanical Productions 3,001
- ii. persons working in the textile fabrics and in dress 1,450
- iii. persons working in food and drink 1,363
- iv. persons working in Animal substances 48
- v. persons working in vegetable substances 313
- vi. persons working in Minerals 1,103

There is a final category for Labourers and this shows only 1,914 from a total male population of 15,526.¹ By 1921 the picture has hardly changed. Only 63 per thousand of the male population over twelve are listed as labourers. The major trades based on the same statistical scale are metal workers 88, textile workers 25, woodworkers 56, printers 21, builders 39.² In the main then Bath workers were skilled with no threat of strikes to equal the awesomely well-organised Dockers' Strike in the 1880's or the conscience pricking Match Girls' strike. Not that Labour or labour was to be feared. In 1907 600 delegates of the Trades Union Congress spent a week in Bath with 30 Labour M.P.s.

Primarily however the residents of Bath were middle-class professionals, small traders or the retired. The gentry also lived in Bath or on the surrounding estates, but they played only a modest role in local affairs by the end of the nineteenth century. In 1938 Alderman A.W.Wills wrote a long and rambling letter to the Bath Chronicle which was published as an article. It was a memoir of his 30 years in local public life.³ He had first been elected in 1908, and he wrote "I well remember that a few years prior to my entry to the City Council and many years after a tradesman dared not express his opinion publicly...when I entered

1. 1871 Census. op.cit.
2. 1921 Census. p.xxvii Table xvii (2) Locally Important Single Occupations or related Groups of Occupations.
3. B.C. 22 January 1938.

the Council was more or less governed by members of the Bath and County Club¹ which was not nearly so democratic a club as I understand it now is. The tradesmen on the Council did not dare to advocate a policy which ran counter to its member's wishes, without being prepared to pay a big price in business for it." At best Alderman Wills was exaggerating, for by the time that he entered the Council in the early twentieth century the influence of the 'county set' was slight. Even he admits "of course the war removed 90 per cent of this tyranny." Bath tradesmen and professional men were the main power in local affairs, Jolly the draper, Withy the Nonconformist solicitor, and King the Catholic solicitor, Bush a grocer, Stothart and Pitt, both engineers, these were the men who were either elected members or co-opted to Committees. Alderman Wills was first elected in 1908 and writes in his letter of the time shortly before he was elected. The nominations for the November elections of 1903 reveal the nominees' trades as hotel proprietor, grocer, surveyor, engine driver, stone merchant, hosier, omnibus proprietor, pianoforte and music seller. Only one was able to describe himself as "gentleman and member of the Board of Guardians."² This dominance of the tradesmen continued through the twentieth century and B.S.R.Green found that in the period 1930-38 in an analysis of the occupations of Councillors the overwhelmingly largest group was the family business with 24, the nearest being professionals with seven. Again in 1946-62 they were still the largest group with twelve, the nearest was managerial executives with ten.³

The professional men were important - mainly solicitors, brokers, clergymen who like the small traders were there to service each others' needs and those of Bath's retired residents. These were army officers retired on half pay, administrators returned from India or other parts of the Empire after a lifetime abroad. Or they were members of the rising rentier class, living on their

-
1. "Bath and County Club was established in Queen Square, in constitution similar to the London Clubs. One black ball in seven excludes...Neutral in politics, exclusive in status, dull and awfully decorous in conduct." R.E.M.Peach, Bath Old and New, (1888) p.176.
 2. B.C. 31 October 1903.
 3. B.S.R.Green, 'Community Decision Making in Georgian City', University of Bath Ph.D. Thesis (1966) Table 2. p.262.

investments in joint stock companies keeping a daily, and no doubt nervous, eye on prices. There were also many clergymen in Bath. It has been argued that the coming of Wesley and the subsequent religiosity was the direct cause of Bath's unpopularity in mid-century. The city was sobered after its Georgian delights. "The retired clergyman invaded Bath at the end of the eighteenth century and the retired officer followed him in the early years of the nineteenth century."¹ Indeed the retired and elderly in general formed a considerable proportion of Bath's population. In 1871 of a total population of 52,557 the group over 60 years of age was 5,847, some 11 per cent. Whereas Derby (being the next one listed in the Census with a roughly equivalent population) has a total of 49,810 and 3,226 over 60 - only 6.4 per cent. By 1891 the figure was still 11 per cent. In 1921 the retired (excluding Naval and Military) were 46 per thousand of the male population, the second highest occupational category, and by 1951 the Census returns show total population to be 79,294 and 15,769 over 60 - 19.8 per cent. For all these reasons then - the architectural beauty, the socially safe and numerically inferior working class, and the waters of the spa - Bath had a particularly stable well-off, class-conscious society.

The original city parishes were four in number, St. James, St. Michael, St. Peter and St. Paul, and Walcot, which were all to the north of the Avon. In the 1831 Census these had a population of 38,063. The parishes to the east and south were Bathwick and Lyncombe, and Widcombe. These were associated with the city but not part of it, until 1837 after the Municipal Corporation Act of 1835. The six parishes then had a total population of approximately 50,000. In 1871 the population was 52,557 and in 1891 54,551. In 1888 Bath was given County Borough status and in 1911 a boundary revision brought the outlying western and northern parishes of Twerton and Weston plus part of Charlcombe into the city. In 1911 therefore the Census showed a population increase to 69,173. This remained fairly stable during the inter-war years - 1921 68,669, 1931 68,815 and 1939 69,040.

1. J.M.Falkner, Bath in History and Social Tradition, (1918) p.64.

In the early part of the nineteenth century it was the Corporation which had the right to return M.P.s and they always elected Tories. After 1832 the newly enfranchised electors returned two M.P.s one of whom (and occasionally both) was Whig, later Liberals, through to 1906. From 1906 to 1974 Bath elected Conservatives, with the exception of a Liberal for a few months in 1923. Often those returned in the twentieth century were titled, or army officers, in 1910 Lord A. Thynne and Sir C. Hunter, 1918 (when Bath became a single member constituency) Capt C.T.Foxcroft and in 1929 Hon. C.W.Baillie-Hamilton.

In the City Council party affiliations are much more difficult to discover. Party was never mentioned in debate - the local papers rarely if ever stated a candidate's party. In the nineteenth century there was a determination to appear to have local affairs managed by local men of good will, and not by party machines. Even the most innocuous motion caused Councillors to react if there was ever a suggestion of party. In 1889 discussing a memorial to Parliament on womens' rights, Councillor Dyer said he "strongly deprecated the Council considering anything of a political character" and the Chairman Alderman Bartrum simply declared "I decline to accept it as a political question."¹ So strong was this feeling that in 1889 Liberals and Conservatives had signed and published an Independent Manifesto. It is worth quoting at length.

"It is generally admitted that the conduct of Municipal Elections on purely party grounds prejudices the public interest in so far as it tends to subordinate it to that of a party, the object sought in these contests being mainly to secure the distribution of Civic Honours among the members of one party only. It is believed that an arrangement which should give to each an equal share would be the best practical remedy for the evil while it would widen the fields for the selection of candidates and would leave each party, in promoting to offices of Honour, free to consider those claims which arise from personal fitness and long and faithful service."²

1. B.C. 14 March 1889.

2. Independent Manifesto, (1889) (Guildhall).

The practical effect of this was that both sides agreed that the Aldermen should include seven of each party and that the office of Mayor was to be filled by a Liberal and a Conservative alternatively. In 1911 the new City Council augmented by members from the newly added parishes of Twerton and Weston met for the first time. Practically their first act was to endorse the principles of the 1889 Manifesto. "We understand that the only opponent of the principle laid down to-day was Mr. Curtis, the new Labour member for East Twerton, who however did not actually vote against the resolution."¹

In the objection of that Labour Councillor lies the fundamental difference between Conservatives and Liberals on the one side and Labour and socialist groups generally on the other. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century it would seem perfectly reasonable to a Conservative or Liberal that men of goodwill should manage local (indeed national) affairs irrespective of party. Affairs were to be managed, they believed, and the status quo was to be administered. Party labels were for foreign affairs, but in the counties and county boroughs it was hoped that matters of local importance were carried on by selfless representatives of the community. Any changes were to be slight and gradual, improvements to the existing state of things - but not radical wholesale change. The existing framework of society they felt was essentially sound, needing at most only occasional adjustment. Thus in 1890 when Alderman Clark wanted to pass a bye law under the 1889 Prevention of Cruelty and Protection of Children Act that would have restricted the hours of employment of children in streets and licensed premises, Councillor Dyer protested "against so much grandmotherly legislation and thought it would be the best plan to let matters alone."²

Against this view socialists were seen as wreckers and agitators. Essentially Conservatives wanted office, socialists wanted power. Once they had power they wanted to change society. The degree of change depended upon their precise location in the spectrum of the left. The Labour party member might accept the

1. B.C. 28 November 1911.
2. B.C. 6 February 1890.

hierarchical society but show concern for those at the bottom and work through constitutional methods to alter their lot, for the Marxist-Socialist, democracy was a sham and the social order must be destroyed and reconstructed to a precise plan.

In Bath socialists were seen as fearful creatures, rather like some form of foreign contagion. In 1895 Councillor Chivers drew attention to the resolution of the Markets Committee that the police should be instructed to warn socialist lecturers off of the Sawclose, an open area used by corn, hay and coal merchants. Councillor Ricketts whilst stating that he had no sympathy with their view said that "if any citizens wished to expound their views they should be allowed to do so in such a place as the Sawclose where they could do no harm." His attitude was not endorsed by the Council who warned instead to Councillor Phillips who "hoped the Council would endorse the action of the Markets Committee (hear hear) and complained of Socialists being imported from other places to air their forensic nonsense (hear hear)."¹ The Markets Committee report was adopted. In the general early antipathy towards the left, even to stand against Liberal or Conservative retiring candidates was construed as wicked. The first socialist candidate stood in November 1907, when of the seven Bath wards, only one - Kingsmead - was contested. The others returned Liberals and Conservatives without an election. The Bath Herald was furious, the socialist A.E.Reynolds opposed J.W.Knight, Liberal and G.Strange, Conservative in Kingsmead "and by consent it was the most unjustifiable opposition to the return of capable retiring members that has been known for many years." The report gloated that "Mr. A.E.Reynolds lives in Widcombe and once polled 134 votes in that ward as a Ratepayers Association candidate in a contest in which 2,000 votes were cast. His chances were about as healthy in Kingsmead."² In fact he polled 87 and Strange 614 and Knight 612.

Thereafter socialists stood in increasing numbers but the breakthrough was a long time coming. In 1910 Harvey, a socialist, polled 41 votes in the Lyncombe

1. B.C. 10 October 1895.
2. B.H. 1 November 1907.

and Widcombe ward, the Liberal 1,081, the Conservative 1,058. Harvey could only observe ruefully that "there is just one thing I want to say to you working men. Spend a penny on a pamphlet 'Liberal and Tory Hypocrisy', read it, digest it, and then you will think a little differently."¹ After the First World War Labour candidates were not unusual.² In 1919 eight wards were contested with success for them in four. By 1921 however five out of six Labour candidates were defeated - the sixth only won by twelve votes. The disgruntled Labour candidate in St. Michael's Ward referred to the Independents who had been successful as the "Middle Class Union".³ The pretence of being an Independent was to be used again in Bath after World War Two. The Labour Party clung together as a group and if they could be shown to be beaten by Independents then it would seem to indicate that the Bath electorate preferred the amateur, the man of goodwill rather than the party machine. But they were Independent in name only and were backed by the Conservatives and Liberal parties. Genuine Independents had little hope of winning. As early as 1906 the Chronicle observed that "a candidate found it difficult to run an election, especially in the big wards such as Walcot and Lyncombe and Widcombe without relying upon party organisation."⁴

If Labour candidates could win wards where working class representation was high, they would certainly never win the City in a General Election. The first Labour Party candidate Alfred Bethell stood in 1918, but he was no cloth cap revolutionary. Married to the Hon. Elinor Lawson, daughter of the fourteenth Viscount Mountgarnet, he had attended Sandhurst and knew Cecil Rhodes, indeed

1. B.H. 23 November 1910

2. However Labour members did not always fit in smoothly as the following exchange shows. "The Mayor was on the point of putting the Minutes when Mr. Tilley jumped up and said 'I have tried persistently to speak on the amendment. Apparently a working man's wishes are not respected. (cries of order). I don't want gentlemen to continually cry 'order' to me. I will take it from the Mayor and no one else. I know what you think of your blue blood here and what you think of Tilley. But Tilley is as good as any of you. Mr. Mayor I said I wished to speak.'
The Mayor 'Go ahead.'"

B.C. 10 March 1925.

3. B.C. 23 November 1921.

4. B.C. 2 November 1906.

the Bath Herald noted enigmatically that "for six months they occupied the same tent on the veldt."¹ In 1924 Capt. Scobell was the official Labour candidate. None succeeded - in 1922 the Conservative got 13,666, the Liberal 8,699 and the Labour 4,849.

Before 1914 the Liberals had often been returned to Westminster by the Bath electorate. The middle and upper class had seen no danger to their wealth, privilege, or power when they occasionally flirted with Radicalism. Once Labour appeared as a potent opposition group the middle class voted overwhelmingly for the safe Conservatives. Only once did a Labour candidate come within sight of success, and that was in 1945 when the Conservative polled 20,196 and the Labour candidate 18,120. The Liberals were third with 7,952. For the majority of the General Elections in the twentieth century when Labour fielded a candidate he came third behind the Liberals. In the Council individual wards returned Labour councillors but they never had overall control, that rested with the Conservatives, or more often with a loose coalition of Conservatives and Liberals.

1. B.H. 14 December 1918.

The Bath School Board 1870-1902.

A letter from Lord Templeton was read suggesting that chapters dealing with the evils following the excessive use of alcohol should be incorporated into the reading books in Board Schools...It was resolved unanimously...that the Clerk reply stating that in the Board Schools Temperance is taught as part of the reading matter and that the Board do not consider further action necessary."

School Board Minutes, 20 December 1894.

The extreme religiosity of the nineteenth century is, for a secular age, often difficult to comprehend. R.C.K. Ensor is quite blunt about it: "No one will ever understand Victorian England who does not appreciate that among highly civilised, in contradiction to more primitive, countries it was one of the most religious that the world has known...to ignore [religion's] effect on outward life would be to render much of the period's history unintelligible."¹

In Bath that religiosity was made manifest by the considerable supply of both Church of England and nonconformist schools. These schools were built and maintained by voluntary contributions and the cost was considerable. There were over a dozen National Schools teaching both infants and older boys and girls. There was also a school connected with the British and Foreign Society - the Bath and Bathforum British School - which had been established in 1810. There were also two Congregationalist schools, two Wesleyan, one Unitarian, one Baptist, one Primitive Methodist, and also one Roman Catholic. The majority were mixed but two were for girls only.² The early development of these schools has been discussed by R.B.Hope.³ This considerable provision before the 1870 Education Act⁴ made many feel that a Bath School Board would not be necessary and that if it transpired that there were not enough school places the various churches could fill their own gaps. In November 1870 a meeting was held at the Guildhall of all those people, regardless of religious affinity, who were interested in educational provision. Whilst clearly an ad hoc meeting there was some establishment interest because the chair was taken by T.W.Gibbs an ex-Mayor of Bath and many of the speakers were Bath clergy and influential laymen.

-
1. R.C.K.Ensor, England 1870-1914, (1936) p.137.
 2. Post Office Directory, (1870) p.474-5.
 3. R.B.Hope, 'Educational Development in the City of Bath 1830-1900 with special reference to its inter-relations with social and economic change,' University of Bristol Ph.D. Thesis (1970) Chapter Two.
 4. The text of the 1870 Elementary Act and a discussion on the working of the Act can be found in J.Murphy, The Education Act 1870, (1972) pp. 65-117.

The purpose of the meeting in the minds of some present was to try and obviate the need for a local School Board - "The Rev. W.C.Osborn asked whether the meeting intended to supercede the necessity of a School Board. The Chairman 'I apprehend it does' Mr. Osborn 'Then if it does I would ask further is this meeting able to discharge the duties thrown upon a School Board?' The Chairman 'I presume that the object of the meeting is to try'.¹

A small group had already visited all of the National Schools as well as those schools affiliated to the Dissenting Churches with a view to gathering statistics about pupil numbers. The Guildhall meeting was told that the National Schools under government inspection provided places for 3,778 pupils and 489 places in schools not under supervision. The Dissenting Churches provided 957 places and 1,204 places respectively. There were also 266 places in baby rooms attached to Infant Schools. This produced a total of 6,694 places for an estimated Bath population of 53,000. Since the aim was to provide places for some one sixth of the population, which on 53,000 would be 8,800, the meeting was told that some 2,000 extra places would have to be found from the various Churches' own resources if Bath was not to have a School Board.

Since the various Churches had already provided a considerable number of schools the members of the meeting were not intimidated by the need to provide 2,000 more places. J.Burne, treasurer of the Walcot Parochial Schools moved that "this meeting pledges itself to prompt measures and active co-operation to supply the need." Prebendary Scarth in seconding not only felt that "the City would never be wanting in its duty to the children of the poor" but more to the point "if they would have their schools flourish, if they were really to produce the effect desired upon the population religion must be the basis on which the schools were to be carried on."

1. B.C. 24 November 1870.

Whilst the evident fear of Godless Board Schools animated some at the meeting others looked to the practicalities of the situation. The Rev. Osborn urged that a School Board had certain legal powers, especially "for the purpose of compelling all children to attend school. Such a voluntary association as the Guildhall meeting would not have power...they ought on no account to abandon what the Act of Parliament made possible." Another questioner asked whether the ad hoc Committee would choose school sites, to be told "the Committee would not act themselves to the extent of choosing sites and building schools without getting the consent and approval of all those persons and authorities whose concurrence was not only absolutely requisite but he should say desirable."

Evidently organisation of the proposed building would have been very difficult, since the Committee would have been responsible for considerable sums, also it was drawn from Anglican and Nonconformist groups with all of the attendant possibilities for future squabbles over religious instruction. Nonetheless the meeting resolved to provide a new set of schools near the Lower Bristol Road, two free schools one in Walcot and the other in Avon Street, and to provide a new set of buildings for a school towards the Weston area. The meeting concluded with a collection which raised £150 towards these new schools.

Quite clearly there was in the city a strong opposition to the establishment of a School Board. However the sheer practicalities of the situation obliged the Council to consider the need for a Board. The Town Clerk, B.H.Watts, had taken his own census which showed that there were 6,036 children in the 46 schools which had made returns.¹ A special Council Meeting was held to consider petitions from various individuals requesting a School Board. In the debate Councillor J.S.Bartrum said that a new principle had entered civic life, seen

1. B.C. 15 December 1870.

already in the Factory Acts, the principle of compulsion. He felt that the street Arabs would never attend school unless compelled and so they would never have the knowledge to raise themselves. After a very long debate it was carried unanimously to establish a School Board.¹

The Anglican establishment of the city, unable to avoid the imposition of a School Board, pragmatically set about the domination of such a Board. At the earlier Guildhall meeting in November 1870 a Committee of fifteen had been elected. When School Board elections were announced for the 31 January 1871 that Committee quickly selected six Church of England candidates and five Nonconformists. Since the Board was to comprise eleven members the purpose of these nominations was to dissuade others from standing. This arrangement was admitted quite openly in an election address published on the 26 January 1871 in the Bath Chronicle on behalf of the Anglicans. The eleven nominations were created "with a view to acting in concert to avoid a contested election."² However other nominations had been received and so the address urged ratepayers to at least vote for the six Anglicans. In an editorial of the same date the Chronicle stated that the 6:5 ratio was not a true representation of Anglican and Nonconformist strength in the city (the Nonconformists were a small minority) but such nominations would keep out "alien" interests. Two weeks earlier the Chronicle had urged that political interests should remain aloof from the election. "The two leading political associations of the city have we are assured kept themselves entirely aloof from the matter...Religious differences it is impossible to ignore but at least we may keep political antagonism out of the case."³

However there were other nominations. The Bath Working Men's Reform Association nominated two Radical Councillors. Two women were sponsored by a local worthy who had been Mayor on several occasions, Jerome Murch. The Catholics nominated a Priest, Dr. Sweeney, and there were two other churchmen as well as the official six.

-
1. B.C. 22 December 1870
 2. B.C. 26 January 1871
 3. B.C. 12 January 1871

The Chronicle felt that the two Working Mens candidates brought politics into the election. An anonymous correspondent to the paper was angry that Murch an officially sponsored Nonconformist had nominated two females thus upsetting the 6:5 arrangement, and another correspondent calling himself Clericus M.A. fulminated against the Catholic Dr. Sweeney, "Let us remember what Popery really is politically, tyranny; theologically, heretical; ecclesiastically, schismatical; and socially, immoral."¹

Each ratepayer had eleven votes which he could use as he wished, one vote for each of eleven candidates, or eleven votes for one candidate, and so on in endless permutations.² In the event the six official Anglican candidates were elected, so were two of the Nonconformists, the two females, and the Catholic Dr. Sweeney. It was a triumph for the Anglicans and was to presage the pattern of representation on the School Board in Bath until 1902. There were always six Anglicans, four Nonconformists (the females quickly disappeared) and one Catholic. The first Chairman of the School Board, Prebendary Kemble published an open letter to the burgesses nine days after the election in which he declared that he had "no educational theories to test at the cost of others...It will be my anxious desire to exercise those powers with the highest practicable pressure upon reluctant parents and the smallest possible demand upon the rates."³

One of the Board's first tasks was to establish figures of children needing schooling, the Board's members evidently decided to ignore the two previous surveys. Thus the Board did a school by school survey and after making allowance for proposed enlargements of some schools claimed that there was adequate provision and decided to build just one school. However H.M.I. Barry suggested that 700 places were lacking in Widcombe, Lyncombe and East Walcot. In private to the

-
1. B.C. 19 January 1871
 2. Indeed so endless were these permutations that in the 1892 triennial election "one elector distributed his favours in such an extraordinary manner that he contrived to give 273 votes divided among the 13 candidates."
B.C. 28 January 1892
 3. B.C. 9 February 1871

Education Department Barry noted a deficiency of ~~444~~ places, writing that if the school proposed by the Board was built in Lyncombe for 300 boys "the deficiency will be fully supplied" and he recommended that the district deal with the matter itself and without formal notice.¹ The problem as noted by Barry was that "the distribution of the population does not conform with the distribution of the schools. On the north there is a surplus accommodation on the south surplus population."²

However the Bath School Board very quickly began to try to use the regulations to avoid their responsibilities. This was to occur every more frequently with the Bath School Board, causing the Education Department officials to resort to laconic sarcasm or simply anger. In January 1872 A. Simmons the School Board's Clerk wrote to the Department to ask whether it was obligatory to provide accommodation for children aged 3 to 5 "if not obligatory whether the power to do so is simply permissive or whether they have no such power." The reason behind the request "is that if the children between 3 to 5 are struck out of the calculations there is in the District more than sufficient accommodation." Simmons concluded that the Board was anxious to provide such accommodation but since this would necessitate building at least one more school it was felt wise to get a ruling from the Department or "the ratepayers could object to it on the ground that they have no such power to provide education for such young children."³ In view of the later Cockerton Judgement this desire to spend ratepayers' money only in strict accordance with the Regulations may be thought to be very wise. But really the Board wanted to impress ratepayers with their parsimony and when the triennial elections came the balance sheet approach was the one adopted to impress the burgesses. However on this occasion the Department sidestepped, their advice being "considering a grant can be claimed on behalf of children between 3-5...the Board should take steps for such children after making due

-
1. P.R.O. Ed.16/259 Return of 4 June 1872 with Barry's handwritten annotations.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid., Bath School Board to the Education Department 12 January 1872

allowances for such a number as will be at any time absent through illness etc."¹ Consequently the Bath School Board had to reconsider its provision, and by 1878 it had provided two schools, - Kingsmead for 150 girls and 250 infants, and Lyncombe for 258 infants. There was a third Board school, Walcot for 252 boys, but this was a former Wesleyan school which the trustees had intimated to the Board that they could not maintain any longer. Consequently the Board had felt obliged to take it over "for had they not done so there would have arisen a deficiency of accommodation in Walcot for 100 boys."²

The Kingsmead School had been built to accommodate children from the Milk Street Wesleyan mixed school and the Monmouth Place Infants (a National Society School) both of which had been carried on in hired rooms which were unsuitable. So of the Board's gap filling exercise Lyncombe was built to accommodate extra numbers, Kingsmead to replace unfit premises and Walcot taken over (and reluctantly so to judge by the comments cited above) from the Wesleyans. The Board by 1879 were satisfied that they had provided sufficient schools. "As far as the Board are able to judge it does not appear probable that after this School is erected they will have to build any more."³ Apart from the Oak Street Schools forced on them by local opinion and the Education Department in the 1890's they did not build any more. Dominated as it was by Anglicans the Board felt that the voluntary provision of schools was adequate. Yet a random review of the various schools files at the P.R.O. shows that the accommodation was totally inadequate and that H.M.I.s did as much as they could to alter matters but usually settled for improvements to existing sites - toilets here, a window there - rather than wholesale rebuilding. Often the Bath School Board or voluntary school managers stated that there were no sites available, claiming that because Bath was situated in a valley there was little land available for building. This is illustrated by the case of Christ Church Infants on whose

-
1. Ibid., Education Department to the Bath School Board 15 January 1872.
 2. Report of the Work of The Bath School Board for the Years 1877, 1878, 1879. (Guildhall).
 3. Ibid.

file an official noted "I cannot myself regard it as a satisfactory site for an infant school", followed by another handwritten note "I think the site though not good is a passable one. I am not sure but think it will be difficult to find another in the neighbourhood."¹

One of the worst - but by no means the worst - was Weymouth House School, a large National School for boys, girls and infants. It had initially been known as Abbey and St. James, and was situated in Weymouth House, Abbey Green. In 1895 the Education Department's architect visited the school and his report listed many defects, amongst them roofs of tiles with exposed laths and rough plaster, and stone walls with unplastered interiors and some of these were only six inches thick. The Architect concluded "I consider that a building with six inch walls (independent of other short comings) should be condemned in the interests of the children and the teachers." Under a heading Confidential he noted that the Headmaster had told him that sixteen years before he had been a strong man "but that he was never free from rheumatism and that he considered the Boys' school the source of his trouble. He said that he often found the temperature at 42 degrees in the morning and lighted the gas in consequence."² It must be admitted that the managers of this school tried to overcome their problems. One had remarked to the surveyor that "money would be forthcoming for a new school but that the chief difficulty would be to find a site."³ They decided to demolish the school and rebuild on the existing site. In the interim the pupils were to be accommodated in halls and houses nearby. The new school was completed in January 1899.

Some managers however took a quite different view of even the most trivial repair. The Education Department wanted a new lavatory and wash hand basin for Victoria Infants School. Ernest Shum, correspondant to the Managers and himself a solicitor, wrote to the Department that the managers wanted to avoid this

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15553 Christ Church Infants, two handwritten notes dated 18 December 1893 and 6 January 1894.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15575 Weymouth House.
 3. Ibid.

because "they feel that in a school such as this, which is attended by children of a better class than usual and who are clean and tidy, that such a lavatory is really not necessary. Moreover they feel that it will only lead to taps being left running frequently and to a great waste of water." On the minute paper of the Department was written "H.M.I. Mr. Curry. What do you say to this? Even the highest individuals want to wash their hands sometimes!" Curry wrote underneath "This request is absurd. The Managers of the School are about as stingy as they are ever made. They must be compelled to provide proper lavatory accommodation. If they are afraid of wasting water they can supply press taps."¹ It was so ordered!

Other managers adopted an equally difficult attitude towards the Department's requests. A structural report by the Department on Lyncombe St. Marks, a National School, noted that it was solidly built but that the "site is very pinched and cannot be enlarged." The report did note considerable faults with the sanitary arrangements and pressed for improvements. The managers responded by publishing an "Urgent Appeal" claiming that the Department was making "peremptory demands". The cost would be £800 whereas the total parish subscription for 1896 was only £103. They argued that if the repairs were not done then the school would be closed and the School Board obliged to open a school in its place. Consequently they felt able to appeal "in the first place to Churchmen and Friends of Voluntary Schools and in the second place to all who are interested in keeping down the rates."² Sometimes the Department's officials wondered whether to press for total demolition or basic repairs. H.M.I. Russell noted that Walcot Central School had no playground, needed the staircases making safe, needed windows and cloakrooms, and latrines sited away from the school buildings. Asked if he had anything else to add he noted "No. I have given all of the facts; and should be sorry to see such a relic destroyed."³

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15552 Victoria Infants. F. Ernest Shum to the Education Department 13 July 1897. Handwritten note dated 17 July 1897 but unsigned. Handwritten note by H.M.I. Curry 20 September 1897.
 2. P.R.O. 21/15557 Lyncombe-St. Marks.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15571 Walcot Central Handwritten note by H.M.I. Russell 31 July 1894.

So the files continue - twenty two in total, one for each of the schools in Bath. In each the H.M.I.s usually regretted the size, situation or provisions of the buildings. In none of them was there a positive commendation. Furthermore the Board's own schools were not above criticism. It was noted on the plans of the Kingsmead Board School that "there is no adequate playground for the large number of children, nor is there sufficient latrine accommodation." Another hand had noted that "it is a choice of evils. If the accommodation is required it will be better to put up with the playground."¹

The School Board was parsimonious and well knew of the poor state of many of the Voluntary Schools. However it was Anglican dominated and the National Schools were Anglican schools. Indeed by 1897 some 5,917 children attended Anglican schools, 1,200 went to Board Schools, 642 to Catholic Schools and 357 to the Nonconformist Bathforum and British Schools. The Anglican establishment in the city wanted to maintain this domination and by shouldering the financial burden for 5,917 children, thus alleviating the School Board of the need to demand extra rates the Anglican six could present themselves at the triennial elections as the best suited to guard the ratepayers interests. Indeed so successful were they that there were only elections in 1871, 1874, 1889 and 1892. On the other occasions no one contested the six Anglicans, four Nonconformists and one Catholic. Even non-elections could be turned to useful propaganda in the triennial reports, for in the report of 1877-79 it was noted that because the 1877 election was uncontested it only cost the ratepayers £6.9s.6d.² Parliament had intended School Boards to spend money in accordance with the various Education Acts, and part of the Comptroller and Auditor General's role was to prevent the Boards from "occupying the whole field of education by a process of sheer financial attrition."³ There was no risk that this would happen in Bath, for the Bath Board was slow to spend money on its legitimate functions and had no

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15554 Kingsmead Board School. Unsigned and undated note but approximately May/June 1878.
 2. Report of the Work of the Bath School Board for the Years 1877, 1878, 1879 (Guildhall).
 3. E.Eaglesham 'Controlling Educational Expenditure Eighty Years Ago' in British Journal of Education Studies, Vol,V No. 2 May 1957. p.130

intention of encroaching into other education areas.

Dominating elementary education as they did it is reasonable to ask what use the Anglicans made of their domination. In fact they thrust religion at their young charges. No matter the state of buildings, the level of salaries, the lack of books and equipment the children were drilled in religion. In the triennial reports which have survived there is a complete lack of comments on curriculum, syllabuses, school work, other than statements on religious instruction of which the following from the report for the years 1889-91 is typical. "They have been annually examined in Scripture knowledge by the Rev. W.Mitchell and Mr. R.H.Moore whose reports have invariable shown that careful and thorough instruction has been given and that the teachers have devoted much attention to this very important branch of their duties."¹

Such extreme religiosity clearly demonstrated the truth of R.C.K. Ensor's views mentioned earlier. The Anglican establishment in the city and on the School Board clearly saw working class children primarily as souls to be captured for God, whereas education for life was a secondary temporal consideration. This evangelical view is illustrated by the activities of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. It was a national society with a strong branch in Bath. Its meetings were always reported at length by the Bath Chronicle and at one such in May 1897 it was announced that national contributions of £36,400 had been raised and "nineteen had been baptised direct from Judaism." The guest speaker was the Rev. W.H.Davies Rector of Spitalfields who said that in his parish were 11,000 Jews "They were very friendly, very dirty, very courteous, very poor, extremely sober and most moral."² The last decade of the nineteenth century saw considerable Jewish immigration into Britain to get away from the pogroms in Poland and Russia and in the above comments there is the feeling of bringing the light to a sub culture, in much the same way that the School Board reported on its activities amongst working class children.

-
1. Report of the Work of the Bath School Board for the Years 1895, 1896, 1897. (Guildhall).
 2. B.C. 20 May 1897.

The Bath Chronicle was itself a supporter of Anglican High Toryism and its editorials and letter columns were filled with sarcasm and snide pokes at any attempt to introduce more than elementary education. In January 1893 they wrote in an editorial "Here are the views of a Working Women on Education communicated by a correspondent... 'Dear me what a lot of education people get nowadays. I was looking at them syllables ma'am and the number of things taught quite surprised me. I don't hold to such a lot of education. What's the use of teaching Latin to boys in our class.'"¹ Later in the same month another editorial noted that the Education Department proposed to begin a detailed examination of school accommodation in England and Wales, asking questions such as does the School provide a quarter acre playground for every 250 children; is the building well constructed, dry and of good repair; are the staircases and entrances convenient and sufficient for clearing the school quickly?² To these perfectly reasonable questions the newspaper added a few questions of its own to be asked in the same survey. "Is Pear's Soap regularly used for scrubbing the floors? Are there plenty of warm water bottles for use during winter months? What about comforters for the children's throats? Is Liebig's Extract of Meat administered freely to the children whenever they get fagged?"³

No reader could be left in doubt of the newspapers animosity by such extraordinarily unsubtle comments. In 1870 the Bath Chronicle hoped that there would not be a Board but when the Anglicans began their thirty year domination the paper made a virtue out of a necessity and supported the Anglican six in their work. Thus an editorial on the eve of the 1892 election called for electors to spread their votes over the six churchmen so that they could continue to maintain "the principles which have hitherto guided the Board but the pockets of the ratepayer will be likewise protected while at the same time all the requirements of elementary education will be fully satisfied."⁴

-
1. B.C. 5 January 1893
 2. B.C. 26 January 1893
 3. B.C. 2 February 1893
 4. B.C. 21 January 1892

During the 1870s and 1880s there had been little real opposition. The Board had initially been quite active establishing two schools and taking over a third. But the Board then felt that enough had been achieved, and it would be sufficient to administer the existing arrangements only patching up school buildings when obliged to do so by the Education Department. For example in 1891 the Board was discussing a Circular on Technical Education and the Board's Chairman T.W.Gibbs declared "They had never contemplated doing anything as a Board beyond their routine work: he did not know where they would stop if they did,"¹ Consequently the Bath School Board never established a Higher Grade School. Indeed when the Association of School Boards sent around a circular protesting against the Cockerton judgement the Bath School Board refused to sign it. T.B.Silcock a Councillor who was very interested in education and who was on management committees of ragged schools in the 1860s and who was to be a major figure in the passive resistance movement in the early twentieth century made a tentative attempt to establish a Standard Ex VI in 1892. He hoped that it might teach selected boys Maths and Elementary Science to prepare for scholarships at the Bath Technical School. He hoped to establish the Standard Ex VI at the Bathforum School which was one of the British Schools giving nondenominational religious instruction. Silcock's suggestion was approved of by the Education Department but the sub-committee of the Bathforum managers set up to consider it felt it unwise since the school was in debt. In 1894 the question was raised again and a solicitor was asked to examine the Trust Deed and he concluded that such a move could not be achieved without going to Chancery at great expense and with doubtful result.

No matter how worthy the attempt to establish a Standard Ex VI it was a Voluntary School initiative. Silcock, though a School Board member, knew that the Board would not consider it. In May 1895 a deputation including Sir Isaac Pitman presented a petition asking the School Board to establish a secondary school. The School Board argued that children in Bath were educated up to

1. B.C. 30 April 1891

Standard VI but not enough stayed in each school to make the Standard VII viable. The petition suggested that parents may well be prepared to pay a small fee and so there would be little if any charge on the rates. One of the petitioners was A. Godfrey Day, employed by the T.E.C. as Director of Studies and co-ordinator of their classes and his influence was evident in that the petitioners claimed that a Technical School could not function without a linking school to bridge the gap between elementary and technical education. So they urged the establishment of a Higher Grade School or a Secondary School. The School Board Chairman J.W. Morris said that it would be given consideration, but J.E. Sturges said "he was not convinced of the necessity of such a school [but] ...if it could be carried on without expense to the tax payer or ratepayer he should be prepared to support it."¹ In the event the Board's motion by way of reply was "that the Clerk be desired to communicate to the Memorialists that with all sympathy with their wishes the Board is not prepared to establish a Secondary School but is ready to co-operate with the Technical Education Committee to advance that object."²

The School Board was reprimanded by the Education Department for its record on school attendance. An H.M.I.'s Report on cookery arrangements was prefaced by a comment on "the laxity of the Board in dealing with attendance."³ The Board objected and asked for an explanation of this statement. The H.M.I.'s reply spoke of "not far from 40 per cent" which he felt "in a town like Bath cannot be explained except on the ground of undue laxity in enforcing attendance," he felt it compared badly with centres like Liverpool and Manchester who had vast numbers of poor children with whom they had to cope whereas "Bath abounds in charities and charitable efforts and presents no such difficulty to the Board... It is evident that in the past the action taken has been of the gentlest and slenderest character and among teachers there is well nigh universal discontent with the method of enforcing attendance."⁴

-
1. B.C. 30 May 1895
 2. S.B.Minutes 25 June 1895
 3. S.B.Minutes 28 April 1892
 4. S.B.Minutes 23 June 1893

At the next Board meeting it was resolved that a notice would be printed and copies sent to schools for the children to take home to parents to insist on regular attendance of ten times a week to help the child to progress from Standard to Standard.

Quite clearly the members of the Board felt that the H.M.I.'s comments were unreasonable. The relevant Byelaws had been passed in 1878 making every parent of a child of not less than 5 and not more than 13 ensure attendance unless there was reasonable excuse (which excuses were deemed to be sickness, an alternative source of instruction, or lack of a public elementary school within one mile from home).¹ In the Triennial Report of 1877-79 the Board noted that 6,233 children were on the books but average monthly attendance was only 4,766. They noted that they were trying to enforce the Byelaws on the parents. Again in the Report of 1889-91 the percentage attendance for boys was 83 per cent, for girls 79.6 per cent and for infants only 69.3. The Board had issued some 2,209 summonses against parents for their children's non attendance. They noted that "when the assisted Education Act came into operation the Board decided to abolish all fees in present schools...but the abolition has had hardly any perceptible effect upon attendance."² The Triennial Report for 1895-97 was equally doleful, the Chairman J.W.Morris observing that though average attendance was higher it was "most discouraging...to find how small is the effect of the fines imposed in securing an attendance."³ He noted that 1,926 summonses had been issued to 639 parents, which is an average of three each. Humphreys states that one parent had been issued with 72 summonses.⁴ The Board tried not only to threaten parents but to bribe pupils. The headteachers of the elementary schools had asked for a scheme of prizes, and the Board's response was to offer prize certificates to children who, after the Annual Inspection, passed to a higher standard. There

1. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205 Attendance Files 1871-1925. Printed note of the byelaw of the Bath School Board of 2 April 1878.

2. Report of the Work of the Bath School Board for the Years 1889, 1890, 1891. (Guildhall).

3. Report 1895, 1896, 1897 op-cit.

4. D.W.Humphreys, Education in Bath 1870. Lecture commemorating the Centenary of Forster's Education Act, Bath Guildhall 12 May 1970. (Bath Reference Library).

were also to be prizes for attendance. The first went to whoever attended ten times per week, every week. The prize was 2/6. The second prize for 1/6 for pupils not absent more than ten times, and the third prize of 1/- for each scholar who had attended at least 400 times.¹ These schemes not only show the Board doing its financial utmost to encourage attendance, but it also reveals its priorities - for promotion to a higher standard a paper certificate but for mere bodily attendance - cash!

It is difficult to see what else the Board could do in legal terms to secure attendance and so avoid the condemnation of the Education Department on this issue. In educational terms the answer was obvious. The schools of the T.E.C. were mainly voluntary but as will be seen their classes were constantly well attended. The Board Schools however, with their fierce Anglicanism, pushing the Cowper Temple clause to the limit, and the Anglican Voluntary Elementary Schools obsessed with the catechism and an arid approach to education were seen by both parents and pupils as irrelevant to their needs. T.E.C. classes were practical and vocational and attendance at them seemed worthwhile, but in the Board School piety in poor circumstances was everything. If a child could avoid school and wander the streets or, perhaps with parental encouragement, get a job then he obviously did not feel that he was missing anything of relevance at school.

After two decades of inaction the School Board discovered that a second force had entered education in Bath - the Technical Education Committee. The 1890s saw this Committee do much for Bath children and adults. A detailed discussion of the work of the T.E.C. follows in Chapter Three but suffice to say here that it seized the initiative from the School Board and either urged it to make provisions or took over the function itself. Much of this was achieved by A.J.King a Roman Catholic solicitor who was both a co-opted member of the T.E.C. and an elected member of the School Board, which he had joined in November 1890. In February 1892 he moved that a sub-committee consider whether there might be a demand in Bath for an Evening Continuation School, how it might be organised, and

1. S.B.Minutes 2 June 1891

whether it might be a burden on the rates.¹ It reported in March and King's influence as a T.E.C. member was immediately apparent for the opening sentence stated that after leaving Elementary School boys need some "further education in order to fit them to assimilate technical training or to enter advantageously upon commercial life." The Committee recommended that such a school be established and suggested courses in "mensuration adapted to the needs of Carpenters, Upholsterers, Builders and Plumbers" or drawing "which should be of a style suited to enable Builders, Masons and Carpenters to work from plans and draw to scale." With an irony which the sub-committee possibly did not realise it stated that "great efforts must be made to relieve the teaching from drudgery and monotonous routine."² Such drudgery and monotony were the sine qua non of the elementary schools. It was felt that costs (in other words costs to their electorate the ratepayer) would not be too high because of fees and grants. A meeting with the T.E.C. was suggested, which took place and in June 1892 there was a further report. This suggested that liaison with the T.E.C. was desirable to avoid waste and duplication of manpower and that "when the proper time comes the cause of higher education can be much furthered by concerted action on the part of the Board and Technical Education Committee."³ In effect the T.E.C. had only just been established and had enough of its own work to do but nonetheless it was quite apparent from the sub-committee's proposed courses that the Evening Continuation School would be little more than preparatory courses for technical education. As King noted in a Report to the Board in December 1892 the courses were "a convenient preparation for the more advanced teaching of the Technical School."⁴ In 1892 courses were established at the Kingsmead Board School and F.W.Shurlock B.A., B.Sc., was appointed as Director. So successful were these classes that people living in the Larkhall area petitioned the managers of the Evening School in 1894 to ask for such classes to be established in their area. It was felt viable to provide some tuition in St. Saviours School, Larkhall but

-
1. S.B.Minutes 25 February 1892
 2. S.B.Minutes 24 March 1893
 3. S.B.Minutes 23 June 1892
 4. S.B.Minutes 22 December 1892

it was elementary evening work only. Advanced technical and commercial work remained at one centre.

It was evident therefore that there was a desire for education in the city. By 1895 the T.E.C. was prepared to shoulder the burden of the training of pupil teachers. King - again the prime mover - introduced a motion in the School Board which acknowledged that an arrangement could be made between the Board and the T.E.C. under which pupil teacher classes could be taught through the agency of the T.E.C. "and further that such an arrangement would if adopted render it unnecessary for the Board to undertake any responsibility as to Secondary Education."¹ In the Triennial Report for 1895-97 it was noted that 96 pupil teachers attended the T.E.C. classes and that the Board paid £125 plus grants received. In May 1896 the T.E.C. opened the Bath City Secondary School for Boys and Girls which was no doubt a great relief to the Board's six reluctant churchmen.

But still the T.E.C. were prepared to take on more of the Board's work. In June 1893 the H.M.I.s had objected to the Board's arrangements for cookery classes and so the T.E.C. agreed to take them over and, inevitably, on a motion from King it was agreed that they would be run by a sub-committee on which Board members were to have three seats and the Board was to pay the T.E.C. £100 p.a. and the teacher of cookery in the Board school was offered the post of Assistant Mistress in the Technical School. The T.E.C. achieved more in a few years than the School Board was to achieve in thirty years. Even the Board's work of the 1890s owed most to the astonishing energy of A.J.King.

Though the Anglican six, and in a wider sense the Anglican establishment in the city may have felt that they have saved ratepayers money and allowed the T.E.C. to spend their whisky money instead, their inactivity was by the 1890s counting against them. In 1892 the elections were particularly vociferous if the one side expressed by the Chronicle is a guide. In 1898 there was not a contested election but three nonconformists joined the Board and they no doubt hoped to aid A.J.King. These were S.W.Bush, a wholesale grocer who was to become the chairman

1. S.B.Minutes 27 June 1895

of the Bath L.E.A. from 1903 to 1931; W.P.Workman, Headmaster of Kingswood, a Wesleyan public school foundation; and E.A.Withy, a solicitor and a Radical. These three joined the Board in 1898 but they and others had kept up an attack from without through the 1890s.

One of the nonconformists' main arguments was that the Anglicans had effectively closed down their schools, and obliged children of nonconformist parents to attend Anglican voluntary schools as the only schools available. The nonconformists had offered their schools to the Board which had refused to take them on. In 1878 the Board took over Walcot School with grave regret and built Kingsmead School to replace two small schools - one from the British Society and one from the National Society. But otherwise through the 1870s and 1880s nonconformist's schools just disappear from the lists in the Bath Directory. They were often held in hired halls and rooms and the nonconformists found that they could not afford to keep them going, the Board would not shoulder the responsibility and so they closed. They would have been content for their children to attend Board schools where the religious teaching was more or less acceptable to them. However the Board was not active and could not provide places, and the places which it did provide were for infants. In its last year the Board in its four schools had three departments for mixed infants, two for girls and one for boys. Therefore nonconformists had to send their children to Anglican Voluntary Schools and take the religious risk.

In 1892 the Oak Street Board School was opened with provision for one hundred mixed infants and one hundred girls. This was the spark which ignited nonconformist fury. In 1896 Withy and others formed the Bath Emergency Education Committee and in November held an open meeting. The Chronicle reported Withy's speech which showed real anger "the supporters of the Church Schools cared nothing for the efficiency of the education they provided, they had one end and one end only in view...they cared for nothing else than the church itself...they had suffered from an excess of that spirit in the city". During the same speech he asked "Was it not a degradation of the functions of the School Board to exist

merely for the purpose of keeping up the attendance of the Church Schools in the City?".¹

At the same meeting the Rev. J.Hirst-Hollowell² declared that he "never knew a School Board which had committed such an outrage as the one in Bath in building simply for infants in order to transfer them under clerical authority." They were angry about the Board's new school - Oak Street. It was opened in 1892 but by 1896 nearby housebuilding had increased average attendance of infants and girls to 110. Silcock and Bush recommended in Board meetings that since there was room the buildings on the site should be expanded noting the obvious "that out of over 8,000 school places in the City the Board only provides for 1,200."³ However before this could be voted upon Parham and Bagshawe of the Anglican group moved that the infants site only be enlarged to accommodate 200 to 240. This was accepted. When the Board met again in June 1896 it was told that a deputation of citizens wanted to present a resolution. No mere citizens, but important dignitaries - Alderman Jolly, Sir Isaac Pitman, M.W.Pitt, E.A.Withy and others, all members of the Bath Emergency Education Committee whose declared aim was to support the settlement of 1870. Their resolution viewed with regret the decision to enlarge the infants section only, and stated that in view of the increase in the district on the south side of the river that the school should be enlarged to serve infants, girls and boys. The Board however agreed to allow the Managers of Oak Street School to employ an architect to draw up plans for an infants only enlargement. However Silcock was able to carry a motion ordering a census of the area which the school served. It was to be restricted to houses rated under £18 - presumably the cheaper range of housing from which would come children who might want Board school places.

-
1. B.C. 19 November 1896
 2. The Rev. J.Hirst-Hollowell was a member of the Northern Counties Education League established in 1896 to challenge "every step taken by the government of the Education Department to weaken the position of the School Boards." B.Simon, Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, (1965)p.221. It is of note therefore that when Hirst-Hollowell was in Bath he was critical of the Bath School Board.
 3. S.B.Minutes 28 May 1896

In October 1896 the Board met to consider the Census results but the members of the Emergency Education Committee declared that they did not know of this until the last minute and stated that they had a petition signed by 154 heads of families in the district representing 200 boys, under school age. The Board resolved to ignore this and summed up their Census results with a resolution saying that the results did not justify erecting a school for boys nor immediately for girls but that the infants be enlarged.¹ The Emergency Committee wrote to the Education Department who in turn wrote to the Board stating that H.M.I. Curry "is in general terms in agreement with the memorial"² (of the Emergency Committee) and he proposed either a wholly new school for infants, boys and girls or enlarge the infants and build a boys and girls school nearby.

The Board replied by sending copies of their minutes and researches to the Department and forming a sub-committee to consider the issue and it reported in June 1897. The sub-committee tried to argue that accommodation in the area was sufficient since 2,052 children had to be provided for, but 784 between 3 to 5 did not attend school and so the 1,972 places provided was sufficient for 1,560 who attended. However the sub-committee noted that a new estate of houses with rateable values under £18 p.a. was being built and so more places would be needed. The sub-committee recommended that accommodation for infants and girls on the site be increased and a new site be found for a boys' school.³ It was a complete capitulation by the School Board in face of unprecedented pressure. In 1899 a new infants' school was opened on the site to replace the old one, the girls' school was enlarged and in May 1903 practically the last act of the Board was to open Oldfield Boys' School (on a miserable wedge-shaped piece of land between a main road and a railway line). The controversy over the Oak Street Schools has been discussed at length because it illustrates the undermining of the Anglican

-
1. S.B.Minutes 15 October 1896
 2. S.B.Minutes 28 January 1897
 3. Report of the Sub-Committee to look into the letter from the Education Department on School Accommodation in the Parishes of Lyncombe and Widcombe.
15 June 1897 (Guildhall).

six from both within and without. The Bath Chronicle could hint that the Emergency Committee was simply a Liberal cabal - and perhaps in reality it was, and this was bringing politics into School Board affairs. But the nonconformists for their part could argue that the Tories were behind the Anglicans. Indeed this had been the argument of Eaton Young - an unsuccessful Radical candidate in 1892.¹ Furthermore when the Liberals agreed in 1870 to remain out of explicit campaigning in the Board's affairs they had no way of knowing how the Anglicans would behave during their thirty years rule. This problem of politics and the School Boards has been discussed by David Rubenstein in the context of the London School Board. He suggests the 'economical party' allied with the church party. "These combined forces believed that Church education would encourage both working class docility and lower rates and throughout the School Board period - they attempted to foster the voluntary schools at the expense of the Board's own schools." This was certainly the view of the six Church members of the Bath Board. Equally Rubenstein's views of the London Board's Liberals could well describe the Bath Liberals of the Emergency Education Committee. "Liberals believed that a well educated working class was an aim desirable in itself. But additionally it was also an important means of securing economic advance and social stability."²

Even when it was known that a new education bill was on its way with dire consequences for School Boards the Anglicans could act in a profoundly foolish way. In 1901 during the elections for the School Board Chairman the Church six proposed the Archdeacon of Bath. The four nonconformists - Bush, Silcock, Workman and Withy proposed the previous Vice-Chairman A.J.King, the Catholic solicitor. There is little doubt that he deserved the post. His work on the T.E.C. and School Board was prodigious, as well as hours spent at speech days, open meetings on technical education and the like. It was also known to a few

1. B.C. 21 January 1892

2. D.Rubenstein, 'Socialisation and the London School Board 1870-1904: aims, methods and public opinion', in Popular Education and Socialisation in the Nineteenth Century, (1977) pp.240-2.

that his solicitor's practice in Queen Square had much declined because of his inattention to it due to his educational work.¹ The four wrote a letter outlining King's work which concluded "Why then do they refuse to give the Vice Chairman his due? For the reasons concerning one of which we need say nothing more than every public act of Mr. King has proved that however strong an objection there might have been to his name in the seventeenth century there need be none from any Protestant in the twentieth century... [if they refuse] they lay it down as an axiom for the conduct of the Board that however earnestly or self denying a man may work for it, however profound may be his knowledge of education, he is never to be allowed the fair reward of his work unless he is able to utter a particular shibboleth."² They were out-voted as they no doubt realised that they would be, and the Archdeacon became Chairman. To the four nonconformists it was another slight.

The Anglicans were unaware of the enormity of the impending changes. As practically his last duty the Chairman of the Board the Archdeacon opened the Oldfield Boys' School in May 1903. He declared that "he was heartily glad that almost all of those who belonged to the old School Board would have a larger field open to them for similar work in the authority which was to take its place."³ Even as he was speaking the Liberal caucus on the Council were in earnest correspondence with the Board of Education insisting that in the constitution of Bath's L.E.A. co-opted members be kept to a minimum, nil if possible, in order to keep out Anglican domination by nomination.⁴

-
1. In the view of A.J.King's great grandson Michael King in discussion with the writer.
 2. B.C. 5 December 1901
 3. B.C. 16 May 1903
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 139/334 Establishing the L.E.A.

Chapter Three.

The Bath Technical Education Committee 1891-1902.

The Technical School "would teach the young people science and keep them out of the streets which they were told in one of the churches on Sunday morning were a disgrace to them. If people were educated they would do something better than stroll the streets and indulge in horseplay."

Councillor Sturges, Technical Education Committee Meeting, 18 August 1892.

In 1888 the Technical Instruction Bill was introduced which permitted county, county borough and urban sanitary authorities to supply or aid the supply of technical instruction. For this purpose such authorities could raise a penny rate. With the exception of the powers of raising that rate and borrowing money each authority could delegate all its functions to a committee composed partly or entirely of its own members. However authorities were very slow to raise a rate to aid technical education. The situation was radically altered by the action of G.J.Goschen Chancellor of the Exchequer who had that rare item, a budget surplus. The licensing powers of the quarter sessions were transferred to the new county authorities. This latter also had powers to compensate publicans who had lost their licenses, and indeed there was a levy in the 1890 budget on beer and spirits as a source of that compensation. However temperance advocates, a powerful lobby in late Victorian times, objected to such compensation and so Goschen agreed to assign the money to Local Councils. Thus the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890 provided authorities with substantial sums which could be used in relief of rates or spent on technical education.

It is the view of P.R.Sharp that Goschen's Act took everyone by surprise and that he had not devised a system of distribution. Instead it was agreed to divide the money between the various areas like the probate duty under the 1888 Local Government Act - and this system relied upon the rateable value of the authority. Sharp estimates that in four County Boroughs - Bath, Croydon, Exeter and Hastings - and eleven rural counties, plus London, there was a very high rate of grant, occasionally four times the amount per thousand population. In order to attract population Bath had adopted and advertised its low rates. "To keep the rates down Bath had a policy of having relatively high rateable assessments and as a result quite fortuitously found itself receiving a comparatively high rate of grant for technical education."¹

1. P.R.Sharp, 'Whisky Money and the Development of Technical and Secondary Education in the 1890s', in Journal of Educational Administration and History, Vol. IV No. 1 December 1971 p.34.

When the 1870 Education Act made possible the establishment of School Boards the initial reaction in Bath was resistance, a desire to let voluntary effort carry the burden of elementary education. But opportunities presented by the 1889 Act and the whisky money were seized upon in Bath and a formidable and determined campaign was launched by a nucleus of Councillors and professional men to establish technical education. The Department of Science and Art notified the Bath Council in October 1890 of the uses to which the whisky money could be applied. The Mayor Alderman J.S.Bartrum declared that he had intended "to call attention to this Act in the near future, as it enabled the Corporation to make an advance from these duties towards technical education represented in Bath by the School of Art which he trusted would soon be a distinct feature in our midst."¹ By February 1891 the Council had agreed to establish a Technical Education Committee even though they did not know quite how much money would be available, and the T.E.C. first met on the 11 March 1891.² The members were all Councillors and only four could be co-opted. Councillor J.W.Morris who was to play a major part in establishing technical education in the city suggested that there should be one central institution, and it was agreed to approach the existing art and science schools and institutions within their area.³ In June they agreed that the School of Science and Art would best serve their purpose as a single school around which others could coalesce. They also agreed upon a very impudent request to Council that their Committee be given the major share of the new wing of the Guildhall for their Technical School.⁴ In 1891 such enlargements to the Municipal buildings were at the stage of discussion and pre-planning. The T.E.C. members in this move showed their confidence in the future of technical schooling, their determination to ensure first class premises and a bold and

1. B.C. 23 October 1890.

2. Although it is more usual to refer to Technical Instruction Committees in Bath it was invariably the Technical Education Committee and this name has been retained in this work.

3. T.E.C. Minutes 20 March 1891.

4. T.E.C. Minutes 8 June 1891.

quick initiative in seizing opportunities. In every respect this was an entirely different method of approach to that of the School Board.

Whilst organizing themselves in their Committee Councillors were also fending off attacks from ratepayers. It may be possible to criticise the Bath authority for not raising a penny rate earlier and indulging their enthusiasm for technical education at the ratepayers' expense. If that is so then they must be applauded for not pandering to ratepayers and using the whisky money in part or in total to alleviate rates. In Council the advocates of technical education led by Councillor Turner (of the T.E.C.) were able to fend off a demand prompted by the Vestry of Walcot and of St. Michaels that the money be used in rate relief.¹ Two months later T.E.C. member Sturges adroitly defended an attack prompted by the ratepayers of Lyncombe and Widcombe and the issue was "left on the table".²

During this time public meetings were held to expound the virtues of technical education. One such "A Lecture on Technical Education - what it is and why we need it" was given to a packed house at the Bath Theatre Royal with Mayor Jerome Murch in the chair and the speaker Councillor J.W.Morris. Murch's introduction practically summed up Morris' total speech "It was now generally acknowledged that if artisans were to have a fair chance in the race of life, if breadwinners of all kinds...were not to be beaten, if England were to retain her place in the nations of the world...we must have technical education."³ Morris tried to define his subject but like so many others before and after obscured rather than clarified. "It was the practical application of scientific knowledge to the purposes, and as such it was opposed to the rule of thumb." It had a local purpose in that instruction would be provided in "such subjects as the locality demanded" and it had a national purpose "to hold our own in the markets of the world" and it had a significance

-
1. B.C. 7 May 1891.
 2. B.C. 9 May 1891.
 3. B.C. 2 May 1891.

and purpose for the individual being educated. "The man who availed himself of technical education and took a real interest in his work would not stop there. He would turn to literature and other elevating pursuits and the whole status of the working man would be improved." Even W.Pumphrey in his concluding remarks felt able to observe "Technical Education was the carrying on to a further point that which the Elementary Education Act had given up."¹ Morris appreciated the threat of foreign competition at an industrial level and Ashworth suggests that "there were times, particularly toward 1900 when foreign competition seemed to be a brooding menace rather than a bracing challenge and the familiar label 'Made in Germany' was used as the theme of the grimmest foreboding."² It was this competition which made many professional people, such as those at the meeting which Morris addressed, realise the need for technical training. J.A.Purton claims that "If children were to be educated to meet the growing demand for a skilled working class, including technicians, then foreign competition was the incentive."³ However, as Roderick and Stephens suggest, lack of technical education, though a contemporary explanation for Britain's failure to compete with nations such as Germany, was not the only reason "Other factors advanced were high labour costs, tariff barriers, obsolescent plant and equipment, patent laws and trade union restrictions."⁴

In Bath with the exception of a few ratepayers the possibilities offered by the 1889 Act and the whisky money fired many people's imagination. Even the high Tory scribes of the Bath Chronicle, or alternatively their high Tory proprietor,

-
1. Ibid.
 2. W.Ashworth, Economic History of England 1870-1939, (1960), p.37.
 3. J.A.Purton, 'The Influence of Industry and Commerce on the Development of Education Facilities in England and Wales 1830-70', University of London M.Sc. Thesis (1958) p.164.
 4. G.W.Roderick and M.D.Stephens, Scientific and Technical Education in Nineteenth Century England, (1972) p.8.

warned to the possibilities. An editorial suggested that to use the money for the relief of rates might be of local parochial satisfaction but it would be a disaster nationally. They suspected that the flow of money might be only temporary and so "a strenuous effort should be made in every parish and city to secure such a significant application of the fund to higher educational purposes as shall justify the expectation of the Government and create a moral claim for the continuance of the grant."¹

The enthusiasm for technical education was in complete contrast to the attitude towards the School Board. By and large the latter's remit was to keep children off the streets, instil a fear of God, teach the 3Rs using the Scriptures and keep down the rates. Rarely was the work of the School Board taken seriously, as was the T.E.C. in the first half of 1891 and for the rest of the decade. It was as though the School Board supervised a week long Sunday School, whereas the T.E.C. was dealing in real education with a value to the recipient and a major value at local and national level. Because of this the size of the T.E.C. grew. It began in March 1891 with thirteen members of Council and four co-opted. In December 1891 the co-opted element grew with the addition of the headmaster of the Bathforum School, and resolutions of the T.E.C. to ask the School Board to send a female member from an elementary school, four persons from the School of Art, five from the radical Bath Trades Council and one each from Harbutt's² Art Class and Gatehouse's Science Class. By 1903 the T.E.C. was by far the largest sub-committee of the Council with 35 members. These were eight members of Council and twenty seven non-members which included W.Pitt the engineer, G.J.Long, a builder, S.Fuller, coach builder, A.J.King, as Chairman (remembering that King had never been elected chairman of the School Board because he was Roman Catholic), three clergymen and seven women. It was the large number of co-opted members which made it the biggest sub-committee. The Library and Arts Gallery Sub-Committee had the next highest number of non council members with only nine.

1. B.C. 23 April 1891.

2. It is worthy of note that Harbutt invented 'Plasticene' - indeed his company coined the word.

The T.E.C. justified its size by reference to the amount of work which it had to do, necessitating much sub-committee work.

No matter how much work there was to do there was a determination not to let technical education pass out of the control of Council. During a major debate on the issue in Council in June 1891 Mayor Jerome Murch again rehearsed the familiar arguments concerning the benefits of technical education at a local and national level and concluded "It is also believed that no organised body is better fitted to be the moving power than Town and County Councils, being in constant contact as they are with the classes who require instruction and knowing the special circumstances of the various localities."¹ This theme was echoed by other members. For example when during the same debate a motion was proposed that the site and building for technical education should be built and owned by an outside body (unspecified) Councillor Turner produced figures to show that this was not necessary. He suggested that Council could find half of the £10,000 needed and borrow the other half over thirty years. Whisky money would provide £1,300 per annum which would give £1,000 for wages and salaries and £300 for mortgage repayments. He was joined by Councillor Moore who said that this was not too expensive and that the grant would continue regardless of which party was in power nationally. But it was Councillor Sturges who voiced their real underlying fear when he declared that they must not have anything like dual control, or any committee that would over-ride the Town Council which he believed was the "head body of the city and subject to the opinion of the citizens every year."² As a result of the debate it was agreed to establish a permanent committee and to house the classes in the Municipal Buildings when they were completed.

Despite this success the fear that the whisky money would be withdrawn constantly caused worry to both Councillors and newspaper readers. Some linked this fear with an objection to the proposed use of the wing of the Guildhall for

1. B.C. 3 September 1891.

2. Ibid.

technical education. In February 1894 there was a Council debate on the matter and because of the large numbers present "including many of the artisan classes" it was decided to adjoin to a larger room.¹ There the Councillors argued their case - Councillor Phillips claimed that such an expensive site should not be devoted to school use and that there was no security for the continuation of the grant. But it was not taken up and Councillor Morris for his part wrote to the newspapers literally ticking off points on his fingers - that technical education would not be a charge on the rates, that whisky money would not be withdrawn and that the schools would not be used by the "better classes" for whom they were not intended. So far as the Council was concerned these apprehensions were effectively disposed of by the report of the first year. "We have on our books 554 students, and of these all but an insignificant proportion are either engaged in the manufactures and trades of the districts, or preparing themselves for such occupations."² This point was often raised and either ignored or answered as Morris did above. In October 1897 Alderman Commons said that "he saw children coming out of the schools whose parents he thought ought not to fall upon the city funds for the education of their children."³ It would be interesting to know how Commons distinguished between children - their speech, or their dress or their demeanour. A.J.King had already replied to this point in 1894. The policy of the T.E.C. was clearly to use the money of the better off to subsidise the less well off. "In the morning and afternoon artisans and their families could not attend, but they did attend in large numbers in the evening. Their policy had been to charge for the afternoon and morning classes fees very much in excess of those charged in the evening and by those means they considerably minimised the cost of teaching the artisans for whom the schools were more immediately arranged."⁴ Throughout the decade the proponents of technical education fought off any attacks, and allowed the T.E.C. to get on with its work.

-
1. B.C. 18 February 1894.
 2. B.C. 15 February 1894.
 3. B.C. 7 October 1897.
 4. B.C. 18 February 1894.

The Minutes of the T.E.C. showed that their meetings were always well attended, few members sending their apologies. They had immediately established their desire to have one major institution for technical education, and to site it in the Guildhall. Having established that the T.E.C. looked to other matters, specifically courses. In November 1891 they considered cooking, dressmaking, cabine making and building construction,¹ and in April 1892 they resolved to provide accommodation for carriage building, plumbing, telegraphing, book-keeping, dressmaking, cookery, laundry work, typewriting, shorthand, hygiene - and later^for French, Germany, English Language and Literature.² In July 1892 this list was extended even further when they resolved to recommend the Council to apply for a grant for trades in respect of which grants were not made by the Science and Art Department. The trades included gas manufacture, cabinet construction and design, woodcarving, leatherwork, brasswork, dairywork, photography, milling and so on and on.³ Even Council added two more, baking and confectionary.⁴

The T.E.C. were also taking steps to establish classes whilst waiting for their Guildhall accommodation. In June 1892 they resolved to take over the liabilities and assets of the School of Science and Art Committee. This ran the School of Science and Art at No. 33 The Paragon, which property was held on a corporation lease. The building was simply a converted five storey house in one of Bath's long crescents. The T.E.C. Minutes noted that the head for thirteen years was C.M.Hodges; the school had been awarded a Science and Art Department Silver Medal in 1883 and that a proportion of the advanced students went on to take Teachers Certificates entitling them to a Scholarship at South Kensington.⁵ The T.E.C. declared their intention to protect Hodges' job in any re-organisation but Hodges was to cause them endless trouble. 53

-
1. T.E.C. Minutes 20 November 1891.
 2. T.E.C. Minutes 8 April 1892.
 3. T.E.C. Minutes 23 July 1892.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 16 August 1892.
 5. T.E.C. Minutes 3 June 1892.

The T.E.C. also took over other small establishments and in September 1892 they constituted a sub-committee for the superintendance of the School of Science and Art at 33 The Paragon; City Laboratory Science School at 36 Broad Street; Branch School of Art at the Victoria Rooms in The Corridor; and the Technical School temporarily at 19 Green Park.¹

To superintend these schools and the development of classes the sub-committee advertised for a Director of Studies at £200 per annum. From 27 replies the candidate selected was A. Godfrey Day of Birmingham, who was ultimately to play a leading role in education in Bath well into the twentieth century.² As Gosden has written "Quite as important for the future...was the emergence of the occupation of educational administrator at the county level and the building up of a body of professional expertise and knowledge."³ When the Bath L.E.A. was established it was Day of the T.E.C. who played an important part in the L.E.A.'s development. The School Board Clerk simply retired from educational work.

Meanwhile the encroachment of the T.E.C. into the work of the School Board had begun. On the 19 March 1892 Councillor Sturges suggested that the T.E.C. could establish evening continuation classes, and it was resolved to confer with the Board.⁴ King had already primed the Board on the 25 February 1892 moving that a sub-committee be established to consider whether there might be a demand in Bath for an Evening Continuation School, how it might be organised and whether it might be a burden on the rates.⁵ That sub-committee reported back in March 1892 advocating such schools since boys leaving Elementary Schools need some "further education in order to fit them to assimilate technical training or to enter advantageously upon commercial life."⁶

-
1. T.E.C. Minutes 23 September 1892
 2. T.E.C. Minutes 23 July 1892
 3. P.H.J.H.Gosden, 'Technical Instruction Committees' in Studies in the Government and Control of Education since 1860, (1970) p.38. This is also discussed further in V.C.Greenhalgh, 'Local Educational Administrators 1870-1974', 'The Emergence and Growth of a Profession', University of Leeds Ph.D. Thesis (1974) Chapter Two.
 4. T.E.C. Minutes 19 March 1892
 5. S.B. Minutes 25 February 1892
 6. S.B. Minutes 24 March 1892

It was neatly done by King and Sturges, members of both School Board and T.E.C. They had persuaded the T.E.C. to shoulder the financial burden of continuation classes, persuaded the School Board to let the T.E.C. into their territory, and left the situation open for further incursions in the future. For their part the T.E.C. were happy to organise the classes since they genuinely saw it as part of their brief, and the School Board seemed amazed at their luck. For them to start evening classes would be a burden to ratepayers and give little opportunity for evangelism, whereas they looked upon the whisky money of the T.E.C. and were happy to help spend it. Indeed the School Board members also suggested that the T.E.C. might care to take over the arrangement for the training of pupil teachers, but in September 1892 the T.E.C. declined.¹ It was only temporarily shelved for on the 22 July 1895 King's resolution in the T.E.C. was accepted to the effect that they consort with the School Board to conduct pupil teacher classes, and to start a secondary school as part of the scheme for the pupil teachers.² Five days later King's motion to the School Board was accepted, to the effect that pupil teacher classes could no longer be maintained on their present basis and that an arrangement with the T.E.C. was necessary under which these classes could be taught through the agency of the T.E.C. The motion concluded "and further that such an arrangement would if adopted render it unnecessary for the Board to undertake any responsibility as to Secondary Education."³

It was this latter which was no doubt so attractive to the T.E.C. to be the sole agency for secondary education (excluding independent schools) in Bath. The T.E.C. were quick to seize the opportunity afforded by Clause VII of the Science and Art Directory. The Bryce Commission had proposed leaving the School Boards responsible for elementary education and giving the County and County Borough Councils responsibility for secondary education - as well as technical education for which they were already responsible. Gorst's ill fated Education Bill attempted

-
1. T.E.C. Minutes 10 September 1892.
 2. T.E.C. Minutes 22 July 1895.
 3. S.B. Minutes 27 June 1895.

to do this, but it failed and so he appointed a departmental committee to consider the matter. This suggested that departmental recognition be afforded to one body in each area - county and county borough - for the future promotion of secondary and technical education. Thus a new clause was inserted into the Science and Art Directory of 1898 Clause VII which stated this position.

On a motion of A.J.King's the T.E.C. very promptly notified its position to the Science and Art Department.¹ Keane notes that Bath T.E.C. was one of the first to take the opportunity to register under Clause VII and the Bath School Board did not protest, whereas some Boards felt that this was a loss of their prerogative.² Simon suggests that though the rights of the School Boards safeguarded by the terms of Clause VII "they naturally regarded this step as a major threat and protested accordingly."³ More likely the Bath School Board members sighed with relief. Certainly the T.E.C. guarded this position and when the Bath High School for Girls (a G.P.D.S.T. school) wrote to the T.E.C. asking for consent of the authority to form Science and Art Classes the T.E.C. resolved that they would not object provided that their position under Clause VII was maintained.⁴ The Board of Education advised Bath T.E.C. that the G.P.D.S.T. school was not within the organisation of Clause VII but that nonetheless their position was protected.⁵ Clearly the T.E.C. was zealous in defence of its status.

In July 1896 the T.E.C. took over yet another School Board course - the domestic work. They were to act as the Board's agents and receive £100 per annum for so doing. The cookery classes, and their teacher became part of the Technical School.

Consequently the T.E.C. took over the evening continuation classes, the domestic classes and the pupil teacher classes from the School Board, and had itself recognised as the Authority for secondary education. Equally it took over

-
1. T.E.C. Minutes 14 March 1898.
 2. P.Keane, "The Evolution of Technical Education in Nineteenth Century England", University of Bath Ph.D. Thesis (1970), p.576.
 3. B.Simon, Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, (1965) p.192.
 4. T.E.C. Minutes 16 July 1900.
 5. T.E.C. Minutes 24 September 1900.

private and charitable classes for science and art which were brought together under the T.E.C. and co-ordinated by the Director of Studies A. Godfrey Day. The T.E.C. initiated a considerable number of classes in all manner of trades and skills and though some were closed down for lack of support, the majority thrived.

The first five years of the T.E.C.'s life was in part taken up with arrangements for their accommodation in the wing of the Guildhall. The building in the Paragon was on a 75 year lease from the City Council and that was the T.E.C.'s main school - its formal title being Bath City Science Art and Technical School - Paragon Branch. By 1893 the T.E.C. had applied to the Science and Art Department for a grant of £17,025 to purchase the Guildhall extension. The building estimate was £22,425. The T.E.C. had £3,750 whisky money on hand, a miscellaneous grant of £450 from the British Association, and £400 being the value of their lease at the Paragon. Running costs were estimated to be £1,100 annually - £450 would come from fees leaving £650 to be found. In the event the T.E.C. got their money - a loan of £17,000 and a grant of £800.¹ The building was on four floors. The basement had workrooms for painting, plumbing and woodwork, as well as laboratories for electrical and mechanical engineering. The ground floor housed a 200 seat lecture theatre, a second lecture room, library and the Director of Studies' office. On the first floor were the facilities for the School of Art, and on the second floor the Cookery and Domestic Department.

In 1895 the T.E.C. considered its draft scheme for the Bath City Technical Day School. It was to be an organised Science School under the Science and Art Department and in the preamble the T.E.C. said that the proposed school was to provide further education for scholars who had passed Standard VI of the Education Code or who were about thirteen and whose parents wanted to keep them at school for a further twelve months. Generally such scholars were present in small numbers in each of the elementary schools and this new school would be a central institution for them. It would provide "a course of intellectual training and discipline, conducted with special regard to the profession or trade to be followed and with the object of discovering in what occupation they are likely to be

1. P.R.O. Ed. 29/126 Bath School of Art and Science.

profitably and advantageously employed."¹ The scheme added that the work of the school would be directed towards the completion of elementary education and a commencement of secondary education which may be afterwards continued and extended in the evening continuation classes, or the Science, Art and Technical Schools. They could attend for two years, but preferably for a third and further years to take vocational courses - engineers, architects, surveyors, builders, chemists and many others. Initial admission was to be by examination in the 3Rs plus drawing; or a note from a master affirming that the applicant had passed Standard VI.

Before this date the T.E.C. meetings had not been open to the press but after January 1896 they were invited in. When this Scheme was again discussed in February of that year one member - Edwards - asked what authority the T.E.C. had for starting the school. He declared that although it was described as an organised science school under the Science and Art Department the subjects to be taught were those which would be given in a secondary school, with the exception of two or three technical subjects. He claimed that twenty hours would go to secondary school work and only six to technical work and "contended that they were acting ultra vires in establishing such a school; they were only empowered to administer a fund for the promotion of technical education."² There was a rush to smooth over the problem. A Godfrey Day stated that many towns had started schools under the name schools of science, and that they were one of the few committees which had not taken up the work. Proser was equally to the point when he declared that only by establishing such a school could they feed the technical classes, and that they were well within their right. All were aware of his implicit criticism of the elementary schools, one of which he was the head, that boys simply could not do technical work because of the poor standard of their education. S.F. Cotgrove has stated that because there was no specific definition of technical education "the release of funds to aid technical instruction was a major stimulus

1. T.E.C. Minutes 25 November 1895.
2. B.C. 18 February 1896.

to secondary education rather than to further technical education."¹

The T.E.C. went ahead. The School was ready and as opening day loomed the Committees civic pride overtook their good sense. They asked the Duke of Devonshire to open the School, then Sir John Gorst, then A.J.Mundella and on to Sir Philip Magnus. Each tactfully declined the honour - the T.E.C. with the opening but four weeks away turned to the American Ambassador - Bayard. Ultimately, and perhaps inevitably, it was the Mayor of Bath who declared the building open, but he was accompanied by Sir William Hart Dyke - who, besides being the Vice President of the Education Department, was the M.P. who had introduced the Technical Instruction Bill to the House. He was at best a consolation prize. The speeches gave vent to sentiments about citizens becoming "combatants in the ranks of a vast industrial army, engaged in deadly conflict with a corresponding army of rival workers in foreign countries."²

With their school open the T.E.C. could feel that they had achieved a great deal. If T.H.Huxley could mutter that it "passed the wit of man" to give a legal definition of technical education³ the T.E.C. simply embraced the general idea of education with a vocational bias. Sir Bernhard Samuelson was asked by the Bryce Commission what he understood technical education to mean and he replied "I should include everything which prepares a man or a woman for the walk of life which he or she intends to pursue."⁴ This approximates closely to the view of the Bath T.E.C. They found an educational vacuum in the early 1890s and a considerable appetite for skills that practically everything that they did was well supported. In the Bath Post Office Directory of 1894 the T.E.C. advertised its schools and in the Commercial Department with bookkeeping, shorthand, commercial correspondence, and in the Technical Department with chemistry, mensuration, they were clearly within their brief. But in the Elementary Department their work was implicitly that of the elementary school - arithmetic, reading from

-
1. S.F.Cotgrove, Technical Education and Social Change, (1958) p.36.
 2. B.C. 16 April 1896.
 3. T.H.Huxley, Collected Essays, Vol III (1893) p.440.
 4. Quoted by P.W.Musgrave, "The Definition of Technical Education 1860-1910" in Sociology History and Education, (1970) p.69.

popular authors, writing and composition, musical drill and physical exercise.¹ By 1898 this was explicit. In the T.E.C. Report of 1898 mention is made of an H.M.I. inspection in July 1896 which emphasised the progress made but which had complained that when pupils entered the School they were not sufficiently advanced and preparatory classes had to be developed.² It is the view of Gosden that the T.E.C.s "could, did, and often found they had to go beyond technical instruction and act as providers or aiders of all forms of secondary and higher education. So often it proved to be impossible to give technical instruction successfully to pupils whose general level - or even complete absence of - secondary education rendered them incapable of profiting from such instruction."³ Certainly Bath T.E.C. were convinced of the correctness of this aspect of their work.

When describing the work of the Technical Day School the 1898 Report simply stated that many students were unfitted to follow the lectures in maths, geometry and elementary science, and so the T.E.C. needed to establish the school. "Any doubts which may have been entertained as to whether such a school was or was not an educational necessity of the City have been solved by the numbers of students who have entered their names."⁴ During 1897-98 some 205 pupils were on roll with a 94 per cent attendance. In that period the School Board issued 1,926 summonses to parents for the non-attendance of their children in the elementary schools.

In effect the Technical Day School was the city's secondary school, in which it was freely acknowledged that pupils bridged the gap between elementary and technical school work. As to the Science and Technical Evening Classes these were for those who "expect to obtain promotion to places of trust and responsibility by means of the thorough knowledge gained in these classes." The courses were designed to "supplement not supercede the daily routine of the workshop."⁵ There were some 443 pupils. In the Art Department there were 411 pupils both day and evening. The full time day pupils were given training in Art in preparation for

-
1. Post Office Directory, (1894).
 2. T.E.C. Report to the Council of the City of Bath Year Ending 29 September 1898.
 3. Gosden. op. cit., p.31.
 4. T.E.C. Report 1898 op.cit.
 5. Ibid.

jobs as designers, draughtsmen, architects, woodcarvers, and other trades. The evening pupils were usually already employed in such jobs and were improving their theoretical knowledge. There were in 1898 140 pupil teachers attending evening classes in the Technical School, but the unsatisfactory results came from the fact that pupils did not have sufficient time for private study and preparation. Consequently plans were under consideration to establish full day courses and for pupil teachers to have a portion of their week away from school.

In the Cookery and Domestic Science School there were 284 pupils drawn from four categories. There were those who would use their knowledge in the home, those in charge of servants, those who would be servants and those who would teach. It was noted that costs were met by the School Board since no portion of technical education funds could legally be spent on this, but the school was under the control of the T.E.C.

In total in 1898 there were 1,556 pupils, one Director of Studies, two head teachers, thirteen full time staff and twelve part time for special subjects. In 1895 there were 1,657 pupils. The members of the T.E.C. had a straightforward attitude to rewarding such success. A. Godfrey Day had commenced his duties in July 1892 at £200 per annum. He was clearly an active and able man, supervising all of the different departments and schools of the T.E.C. In March 1900 during a Council discussion on the T.E.C.'s Report a Councillor asked why Day's salary - by then £300 - had been increased to £350. The reply was that in 1896 there were 700 pupils and an income of £2,500. In 1900 there were 1,700 pupils and £5,600 income.¹ Similarly in August 1895 two Assistant Masters had been appointed for the pupil-teacher and technical classes, at £110 each per annum.² In October 1896 they both asked for salary increases but were told that the T.E.C. could not entertain such a request "until the results of the examinations are known."³

The T.E.C. were determined to make everything appear to be successful and in their early years the Press could not attend their meetings. Consequently when

-
1. B.C. 8 March 1900.
 2. T.E.C. Minutes 20 August 1895.
 3. T.E.C. Minutes 12 October 1896.

they did have a major difficulty with a senior staff member the story never came out and is found only in the T.E.C. Minutes. When they took over the Science School at 33 Paragon the Head was C.M.Hodges and it was agreed to protect his employment in the subsequent re-organisation. But Hodges constantly let them down. In October 1892 he wanted to leave his class in the care of a pupil-teacher to fulfil a private engagement in Miss Turner's school. Permission was refused.¹ He had only been in their employment five months when this occurred. Henceforward he did not bother to ask. In December 1892 he did not report the absences of the life model, sex unspecified.² In January 1894 there was no teacher at the Art School one Saturday morning.³ In February 1894 he signed the Register for three evenings although he was not present.⁴ Such poor work led to a decline in pupils' results. In October 1894 he was warned about this⁵ and again in November 1894.⁶ On 29 April 1895 he was sacked⁷ and Frank Griffin was appointed from 61 applicants. But the T.E.C. Minutes of August 1895 declared that he "was not dismissed from his post but that it was the termination of a temporary engagement."⁸ and to prove that the T.E.C. felt no ill-will they offered him two evenings a week part time teaching in the school of which he was previously Head. Hodges declined.⁹

The point is that the T.E.C. adroitly kept Hodges' scandalous behaviour out of sight until they were able to quietly remove him. They even justified the poor results of the students, caused in part by his maladministration, with a magnificent piece of effrontery, "The results are lower than previous returns had led the committee to anticipate. It is now evident that the standard of the examination has been raised."¹⁰

-
1. T.E.C. Minutes 27 October 1892.
 2. T.E.C. Minutes 19 December 1892.
 3. T.E.C. Minutes 21 January 1894.
 4. T.E.C. Minutes 27 February 1894.
 5. T.E.C. Minutes 1 October 1894.
 6. T.E.C. Minutes 26 November 1894.
 7. T.E.C. Minutes 25 April 1895.
 8. T.E.C. Minutes 20 August 1895.
 9. T.E.C. Minutes 14 October 1895.
 10. T.E.C. Report to the Council of the City of Bath Year Ending 29 September 1893.

In the T.E.C. Reports to Council much was made of the work with the School Board. Again to quote from the 1898 Report "an important feature in the working of the Schools is the co-operation of the School Board. In many towns the School Board and Technical Education Committee are working as competitors; overlapping and friction results, with a consequent waste of public money. In this matter the city is to be congratulated on the harmony of action which obtains."¹

M. Argyles notes that by 1899 some half a million students were in evening continuation schools run by both School Board and T.E.C. He comments on the situation in Leeds where both worked in harmony.² The same situation obtained in Bath but only because the Bath School Board were so supine. The T.E.C. took over the provision of secondary education, pupil teacher classes, cookery classes, evening continuation classes, and left the Board with the supervision of four public elementary schools.

By the end of the decade the T.E.C. had provided far more in ten years than the School Board in thirty years. The T.E.C. was not riddled with religious differences instead it had a unity of purpose to provide vocational education primarily for working class children, but in fact for any who would avail themselves of it since fees from the better off would aid the less able pupils' costs. The Board saw working class children as unfortunate souls to be captured for God. The T.E.C. wanted to give such unfortunates an opportunity to better themselves, to improve their station in life, to have a skill or trade. The last quarter of the twentieth century has its own dogma which is the very reverse, children should be educated for manhood and not manpower. But such sophisticated notions would not have appealed to the self made men co-opted onto the T.E.C., they wanted to give less fortunates opportunities, they wanted a skilled labour force for their own offices, shops and factories. The courses were crudely vocational, the general education was geared to the trade courses which might follow. But it was much better than anything that the School Board had provided.

1. T.E.C. Report to the Council of the City of Bath Year Ending 29 September 1898.
2. M. Argyles, South Kensington to Robbins, (1964) p.41.

Furthermore the T.E.C. was important in an administrative sense. The pattern of local government in the nineteenth century had been to create ad hoc bodies of which the School Boards were a perfect example. However the T.E.C. was a part of the growing apparatus of elected local government, in that it was a sub-committee of the Council. In this respect Gosden has written that "it is clear that the technical instruction committees were far more than shadowy forerunners of the 1902 L.E.A.s...In many counties it was a matter of a machine already there and operating smoothly extending its operation to include the oversight of the elementary field."¹

If national events had not intervened the T.E.C. may well have continued to dominate education in Bath, but as the Report for 1899 noted on School Boards and the T.E.C.'s their work "will be entrusted to a newly constituted Public Body."²

-
1. Gosden, op.cit., p.39
 2. T.E.C. Report to the Council of the City of Bath Year Ending 29 September 1899.

Chapter Four.

Establishing the Bath Education Authority 1901-03.

"The Cockerton Judgement came as a great surprise upon the Educational World."

Report of the Technical Education Committee, 29 September 1901.

In 1894 a Royal Commission on secondary education was constituted under its Chairman, Viscount Bryce. The Commission's precise brief was to consider the best methods of establishing a well organised system of secondary education, and it was hoped that the Commission would be able to suggest a rationalisation of the administrative muddle created by the overlapping of the duties of the Education Department, the Science and Art Department and the Charity Commissioners. The Bryce Commission reported in 1895 and its main recommendations were that there should be a central authority for secondary education under a Minister as well as the establishment of a Council to advise that Minister. The Commission also recommended that there should be local authorities to supply and maintain secondary schools.

The Government tried to introduce local authorities in a Bill of 1896 prepared by Sir John Gorst. However this Bill failed primarily because it would have meant an end to School Boards and their supporters put up a fierce struggle, and the Nonconformists objected to rate aid for voluntary schools. Consequently the Bill was dropped and a further Bill introduced which simply concentrated upon establishing a central authority for education. This Bill was successful and the 1899 Board of Education Act established a Board to 'superintend' education in England and Wales. The Board comprised the Lord President of the Council, the Principal Secretaries of State, the First Commissioner of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. However as Gosden has observed "This Board of eminent politicians never met as such and the President acted as a Minister."¹ The work of the Board was performed by the President, the Permanent Secretary and a staff of senior officers. The Bryce Commission had hoped that the head of a newly constituted central body would be a Secretary of State with a seat in the cabinet, head of a large Department and responsible to Parliament. However the President of the Board of Education was not a senior post, it was a junior appointment which might

1. P.H.J.H. Gosden, 'The Board of Education Act 1899', in British Journal of Educational Studies, Volume XI., No. 1, November 1962, p.49.

later lead on to a more senior post. Perhaps the Secretaries of State for Education and Science of the 1960s and 1970s were closer to the view of the Bryce Commission.

Having established one body at the centre it was necessary to rationalise the administration at local level. The main agents of educational provision were the School Boards, the T.E.C.'s and the Churches. In the long term the Conservative administration wanted to save the Voluntary Schools and give all educational powers to the County boroughs and county councils, but in the interim it was necessary to weaken and then remove the School Boards. R.L. Morant, Sir John Gorst's Private Secretary took steps to have disallowed the expenditure from the rates of the London School Board on higher elementary work. The district auditor Cockerton decided that only expenditure which was elementary was allowed.¹ Because this would have created such difficulties with the London School Board's higher work it appealed to the high court. The case dragged on for nearly two years, for when the high court upheld Cockerton's decision the London School Board appealed to the Master of the Rolls in April 1901, who also upheld the court judgement. In April 1900 the Board of Education had issued a Minute on 'Higher Elementary Schools' which was intended to curtail School Boards in their handling of any form of education beyond elementary. Consequently the Minute declared an upper age limit of fifteen and stated that only a limited number of higher grade schools would be approved by the Board. In July 1901 a further Minute handed ultimate responsibility for evening school work to the local authority and fixed the upper age limit at sixteen for evening classes run by the Boards.

In 1901 an Act was passed enabling local authorities to sanction School Board expenditure on higher grade schools for one year. The way was thus clear for a major reform of educational administration.

1. The Cockerton affair is discussed at length in E.J.R.Eaglesham, From School Board to Local Authority, (1956) pp. 113-42.

During this difficult and confused period School Boards and T.E.C.s all over the country had to continue with their work. Since long term planning was clearly difficult it was prudent to concentrate upon day to day routine administration. In Bath, because the School Board was so supine and quiescent and the T.E.C. so vigorous the confusion at the centre did not create too many problems. Indeed some members of the T.E.C. saw the Cockerton Judgement as an opportunity to extend their dominion still further. In September 1901 the Evening Classes Sub-Committee of the T.E.C. resolved that it was ready to take on the education of pupils over fifteen where the School Board could not do the work legally and if necessary take over the evening schools themselves.¹

In October 1901 the T.E.C. did take over St. Paul's Evening School in Avon Street and the School Board were to pay the costs for pupils under fifteen.² This was a new evening school which had been opened in September 1901. The Council had used its powers under the 1901 Act to allow the School Board to run some evening classes for one year from 31 July 1901 to 1 August 1902. Canon Quirk, Chairman of the School Board, had written to the Council in July 1901 stating that they ran evening schools at the Technical School and two branch evening schools at Walcot and Kingsmead Board Schools. In his letter he noted that in the classes at the Technical Schools adults were taught "and the curriculum is beyond that to which the Cockerton Judgement confines the action of the School Boards." However at the two branch schools Quirk felt that the curriculum was within the powers of the School Board and the bulk of the students were below the age of fifteen "but a few may require instruction in elementary subjects who may exceed that or such age as may be decided to be the maximum age of scholars taught by the School Board." He remarked ruefully that at the direct instance of the H.M.I. the School Board had arranged to open evening departments in six schools, of which it appeared that only St. Pauls was

1. T.E.C. Minutes 30 September 01.

2. T.E.C. Minutes 11 October 01.

taken over by the T.E.C. It would appear from his letter that Canon Quirk did not grasp the impending fate of School Boards for he concluded by writing that when an Education Act had been passed the Board would be happy to arrange with the Town Council the "continuation and furtherance of secondary education."¹ With the simple adoption of the Mayor's motion and the granting to the Board of a sum not exceeding £674.12s.6d. it would appear that the problem of evening classes in Bath was solved, and indeed it was, but there had been considerable difficulty beforehand at the Board of Education when the Bath School Board had tried to organise matters themselves, without the aid of the Town Council.

On 6 March 1901 the School Board Clerk Simmons had written to the Board of Education for guidance. He noted the district auditors claim in the case of Regina v Cockerton to surcharge School Boards for any expenditure in evening schools on students over sixteen. Simmons continued to the effect that his Board were planning for classes in the new school year after August and pending appeal would the Board please advise him whether his Board could admit anyone over sixteen to evening schools. "Hitherto they have admitted persons without any limit as to age over sixteen."² The minute paper which accompanied his letter to various In-trays around the Board was quickly filled with annotations, all showing that neither Morant nor Gorst had advised their H.M.I.s or civil servants as to Departmental policy during the period of appeal. Thus one wrote "This is the first case of the kind and when decided will become a precedent." This evident truism was followed by another to the effect that the Bath letter "raised the question of age simply." Another hand noted "So did the Cockerton case." Ultimately someone asked "Have you no case where the School Board has asked what is to be the interim practice until the Regina v Cockerton case has been finally decided."

This was dated 2 April 01 and it returned to the same desk, question

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 9 July 01
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 16/259 H. Simmons to Board of Education 6 March 01.

unanswered on 9 April. The same hand wrote "I think a question was asked in the House...please let me see a copy." No doubt the official expected a departmental junior to copy from Hansard. Instead he received a note from the Privy Council Office four days later. The note is quoted in full. "The Hansard of V.P.s replies is not yet in: but The Times report herewith is, I believe, accurate. The V.P.s answers on April 2nd is the important one for your purpose. The V.P. by it expressly declined to decide or let the Board of Education decide what a Schl.Bd. may or may not do out of the rates. R.L.Morant."¹ The resulting letter to the Bath School Board is best summarised in the notes passed to the Board's scribe "State that the B. of E. cannot advise your Bd in the matter. Expenditure by the S.B. out of the rates is under the supervision of the D. Auditor and the local Bd." The initials are indecipherable but it was dated two days after Morant's note 15 April. It is not the purpose of this work to discuss central government but this brief incident well illustrates that during l'affaire Cockerton, Morant and Gorst were not advising their permanent officials, or alternatively they were meeting events as they occurred and so had no interim policy beyond destroying the School Boards. Whatever the case the Bath Board certainly had no conception of the flurry that their innocent letter caused. As has been shown since the Board of Education refused to give them advice on pupils over sixteen, they came to their own arrangements with the Town Council and the T.E.C. and did not go ahead with five other proposed evening classes.

That was the only inconvenience caused in Bath. The major problem elsewhere was usually the higher grade schools, but the Bath School Board did not maintain such a school. They had never wanted to support any form of higher tops or secondary education and so the T.E.C. had taken over that task and its Technical Day School was in effect the town's Higher Grade School. No one disguised the fact that the first two years of the course were designed to bridge the gap between elementary and technical work, and, in view of the poor standard in both Bath Board and Voluntary Elementary Schools, to do some remedial work with pupils.

1. Ibid. Note from R.L.Morant, 13 April 01.

In its Report for 1901 the T.E.C. observed that "the practical effect in Bath [of the Cockerton Judgement] was to render it necessary for the School Board to give up the education in Evening Continuation Classes of boys and girls above the age of fifteen."¹ As the letter of Canon Quirk to the Town Council two months earlier had looked to the Education Bill, so did the conclusion of the T.E.C. Report. "The trouble and confusion occasioned by the Cockerton Judgement will prove a great national blessing if as a result there should be passed a well thought out measure for defining and co-ordinating Primary and Secondary Education."² However in 1902 the actual co-ordination of primary and secondary education was not under consideration, indeed the opposite, for they did not co-ordinate. The T.E.C. concluded its report with the merest genuflection toward the School Board "your Committee will not fail to co-operate with the School Board in giving full effect to any Education Act which may be passed."

By the time that the T.E.C. Report for 1901 was published there had already been considerable discussion of the Education Bill, and in June 1901 a major debate in the Council Chamber. It is possible to see in this debate and in subsequent events a determination by many Councillors to ensure that the body ultimately to be in charge of education should be directly controlled by the Town Council. They had learnt from the experience of the School Board, and the T.E.C. In the case of the former it was entirely outside of their control and was susceptible to control by a caucus. Indeed that had happened during the three decades of the Board's existence. The Anglicans with their six out of eleven members could control elementary education in Bath. Consequently the Councillors determined not to have an outside body in charge of education again. The decade of the T.E.C. had been far more successful in that it was a sub-committee of Council and so directly controlled by it, but the very large numbers of co-opted members obviously worried some councillors. If there was an imbalance between elected and co-opted members then again a caucus could gain control of the

1. Report of the Technical Education Committee for the year ended 29 September 01.
2. Ibid.

sub-committee. Perhaps they would not always get the education sub-committees recommendations through Council, but it was reasonable to suppose that overworked Councillors and Aldermen would be prepared to take very seriously a sub-committees recommendations. There is also a party point here. The nonconformist Liberal group would not want an education sub-committee with a balance of Liberals and Anglican Tory Councillors but a majority of Anglican Tory co-opted members. It is very difficult to discuss with accuracy party politics in relation to Bath Council for even in the first years of the new century they still deprecated division or discussion on party lines. Thus in the debate on education in June 1901 Councillor T.W.Plowman could say Councillors should beware "when they got into the region of politics in the Council (hear hear). Their councils should be like Caesar's wife above suspicion."¹ As has been suggested earlier division on party lines did not occur until the Labour Party became a force in Bath local politics immediately after the end of the war in 1918. However in view of the national move towards the Liberals in 1905 it would not be unreasonable to expect a similar move in Bath in the annual November elections. Regrettably neither the Bath Conservative nor Liberal parties have retained records of the period, and the newspapers prior to 1914 were very loathe to mention party and so party loyalties remain conjecture. What is clear however is the determination of a vocal group of Bath Councillors to keep education under the control of Council. It is interesting to compare the attitude of the Bath Council with that of the West Riding where Gosden and Sharp found that "the implementation of the Balfour Act, therefore, required no more than the adaptation and further development of an existing committee structure [the Technical Instruction Committee]". Indeed that Committee was given the task, by the County Council, of working out how the Balfour Act was to be implemented.²

The debate of June 1901 addressed itself to the issue of control and Councillor W. Knight's motion read "that this Council is of the opinion that any

1. B.H. 19 June 02.

2. P.H.J.H.Gosden and P.R.Sharp, The Development of an Education Service: The West Riding 1889-1974, (1978) p.14.

expenditure which is to become chargeable upon the rates of this City should be controlled by the elected representatives of the ratepayers and that no Committee or Board should be entrusted with powers which would involve the levying of a rate in the City unless such Board or Committee be elected annually by the Town Council, or Committees consist of Members of the Town Council."¹ The motion continued that they should petition Parliament to this effect and added for good measure that the majority of the managers of all publicly supported schools should be elected annually. Also watchful of ratepayers interests a further motion urged that the five shillings which under the Bill would be paid to Voluntary Schools should be paid for all schools.

The proposer Knight was a Churchman and it is quite possible that they felt the T.E.C. had been dominated by Liberal Nonconformists who had used that Committee to do what they could not get the Church dominated Board to do. In explaining and discussing his motion Knight stated that the Council "could not fail to see the advantage of compelling the Education Committee to publicly present its reports to Council. They remembered in their own experience how constant had been the complaints of the impotency of the minority on the Technical Schools Committee. Abuses of all sorts would occur if Committees sitting in private were to have the power that would be conferred upon them by the Bill to incur any expenditure they might choose." Clearly then both Anglicans and Nonconformists felt aggrieved, and determined for their own reasons to control education. But Knight also said that Parliament should not legislate "in the interests of political parties or religious sects" in this matter but attempt to make English people better educated. In the event the whole motion was passed by 19 votes to 16. The Bath Chronicle chose to see the event as a Liberal proposal favouring Nonconformists, despite Knight's statement during the debate which began "Speaking as a Churchman..." The valid point which the paper made was to state the absurdity of discussing the Bill in Council at all, and then sending

1. Ibid.

a petition to Parliament.¹ However in November 1902 Councillor Silcock (a Liberal Nonconformist) introduced a proposal into Council which was to be sent to A.J.Balfour at the House. It was passed by 21 votes to 19 and urged Balfour to withdraw that portion of the Bill dealing with elementary education. On this occasion it did not need the newspaper to point out that this was farcical, for one of their number, Councillor Plowman said that "it was hardly likely that Mr. Balfour after withstanding the whole force of the Opposition in the House of Commons would throw up his hands and the sponge because Bath Town Council passed this resolution."² Thereafter the opposition to the Bill in Council was left to a tiny group led by Silcock who in turn were ultimately connected with the passive resistance movement in Bath. It is intended to discuss that movement in an appendix to this chapter, and discuss here the main thrust of the arguments around the Bill, and the establishment of an Education Committee.

Realising that the passage of the Bill was inevitable the Council wasted no further time in petitioning Parliament and in February 1903 established a sub-committee to submit to council a scheme for an L.E.C. Even that sub-committee was cautiously selected comprising the General Purposes Sub-Committee, and those members of Council who were also members of the School Board (thus excluding School Board priests) or members of the T.E.C. The sub-committee could consult with various people and bodies in Bath "and any others actively engaged in the work of education."³ This reported in March and proposed an Education Committee of twenty seven, being the Mayor ex officio, seventeen members of council and nine others, who had experience of education or who were acquainted with the needs of the various schools. However the vital phrase in the report referring to the nine to be co-opted was "all of whom shall be appointed by the Council without reference to the nomination or recommendation of any outside body."⁴ On this fundamental point - the Council's determination to nominate its own co-opted

-
1. B.C. 19 June 02.
 2. B.C. 13 October 02.
 3. B.H. 7 February 03.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 19 March 03.

members - was to follow a long protracted correspondence with the Board of Education. On the T.E.C. the 26 co-opted members could be nominated by the following bodies - School Board and Managers (five), Grammar Schools and other educational institutions (two), representatives of trade and industry (eight), representatives of the teaching profession (five), various others (six). It was this absolute right to nomination that the Bath Councillors wished to avoid. They accepted the sub-committee's suggested Constitution for the L.E.C. and notified the Board in March 1903. The Board felt that the nine co-opted members should be explicitly stated as representing University, secondary, technical, elementary and voluntary education, rather than simply nine people interested in education.¹ Indeed the Board even suggested such as the Bristol Venturers Technical College and others should have a right to nomination. Bath objected especially to the Bristol College "the Board entirely lost sight of the very excellent work which has been carried on in the City by the Technical Education Committee since the year 1890".² The Board for their part would not consider a scheme which they felt made it impossible for Bath to consider outside nominations in future. Bath replied immediately that "as drafted it does not render impossible that they could consider such nominations." At the side a Board official simply wrote "It does".³ The Board suggested that Bath may well find that outside advice might be of use. But Bath was tenacious and whilst conceding that the Constitution would use the Board's wording in respect of the nine co-opted members representing various aspects of education, they kept their wording, cited above, which guaranteed to Bath Councillors the right to nominate without reference to a specific body. This was no trivial matter and Bath Councillors were determined to succeed. The correspondence showed how deeply they must have resented the inactivity of the School Board years, and their inability to do anything about it. The answer seemed to be to keep a tight control of the L.E.C. ensuring that there were always more Councillors than co-opted members and that

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 139/334 Constitution of Bath L.E.C.
 2. Ibid. Letter to the Board 2 April 03.
 3. Ibid. Letter to the Board 7 April 03, see also B.C.B.C. Minutes for 7 April 03.

no group had a right of nomination.

Consequently the L.E.C. met for the first time on 3 April 1903 with some eighteen months before it was necessary to elect another.

The Bath Passive Resistance Movement c.1902-12.

"Originally, perhaps, members of some primitive sect, they were now in the natural course of things members of the Church of England."

John Galsworthy, The Man of Property.

It is to be regretted that there is not a study of dissent and nonconformity in Bath to compliment J.A.William's two volume work on Catholicism in Bath from 1559 to the mid-twentieth century.¹ Such a study might consider the strength of nonconformity, its social origins and to whom it addressed itself, as well as its influence on the political life of the town. In the absence of such a work it is only intended here to sketch the course of passive resistance and nonconformist opposition to the 1902 Education Act.

Passive resistance was the name given to the movement which opposed the 1902 Act and whose opposition was made manifest by withholding a certain proportion from the rates which were paid twice yearly. The portion withheld was deemed to be that amount which the local authority would spend on supporting voluntary schools - a sum almost impossible to estimate with precision. Having withheld money the local authority had then to summon the individual before the magistrates, if he still refused then a warrant was issued to seize goods to the value of the money withheld. These were then sold at auction to raise those sums. If the ratepayer refused admittance then a jail sentence could be imposed. Eaglesham suggests that the movement "presented the administration with no insoluble problem apart from the unpleasantness of imprisoning large numbers of respectable citizens."²

The passive resistance movement created considerable public nuisance for very small sums of money (often a few shillings) but the nonconformists who were basically Baptists, Wesleyans, Methodists and Congregationalists, felt that the principles at issue were of great importance. They objected to rate aid going to voluntary religious schools which did not have a popular majority on the management committee. "For thirty years it had been conceded that voluntary subscriptions were the indispensable condition of denominational privileges and that rate aid necessarily involved popular control."³ This was

-
1. J.A.Williams, Bath and Rome: The Living Link, (1963).
 2. E.Eaglesham, "Implementing the Education Act of 1902", in British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. X. No. 2, 1962 p.162.
 3. Manifesto of the Passive Resistance League of Bath and District, (Bath Reference Library) p.4.

a political objection. They were concerned that in one school area nonconformists might be obliged to send their children to Anglican schools since it was the only one available. Equally voluntary schools could still require their teachers to be of the faith of the school, so a religious test could be imposed. Since there were many more Anglican than nonconformist schools in Bath (and also very probably in the country as a whole) it was possible that nonconformist teachers would have many schools closed to them despite having paid rates themselves to support them "the law confirms the provisions of trust deeds which disqualify Nonconformists for sixteen thousand headships, and they may be legally excluded on religious grounds from thirty two thousand subordinate posts."¹ These were religious objections.

But the nonconformists did not seem to formulate explicit educational objections to the 1902 Act. The passive resistance movement in Bath seemed to be a political and religious movement. The dissenters appeared to be determined to preserve their identity as dissenters, and education would appear to have been a handy peg on which to hang political, religious and even social complaints. Nowhere is there a demand for better buildings, salaries, equipment, curriculum, or secondary school opportunities.

In Chapter Two above the Bath Emergency Education Committee was discussed.² This committee wanted the School Board to build more Board Schools, specifically they were concerned with the Oak Street group of schools. The Emergency Committee was led by declared Nonconformists E.A. Withy, the solicitor, Alderman Jolly, store proprietor, M.W. Pitt, engineer and their aim was to support the 1870 settlement. In 1902 this was also the aim of passive resisters. "We renew our resolve to yield no form of consent to the deplorable legislation which now disturbs the peace and wounds the consciences of so many of His Majesty's subjects."³ To nonconformists the 1870 Act was the basis of a

-
1. Ibid. p.7.
 2. See pp. 30 ff.
 3. Manifesto, p.8

of a nonsectarian national system of education. The Cowper-Temple clause suited them, and in Bath they knew that if there were no Board Schools there would only be Anglican schools for children regardless of the religion of their parents. Consequently in looking to an extension of the 1870 system they probably felt that they were defending the status quo which could become a national school system and that they were not making a sectarian objection.

In this support of the Board Schools the nonconformists were more honest than Anglicans in that this latter would not send their children to Board Schools whereas nonconformists certainly would, indeed part of their objection to the Anglican dominated Bath Board was that it would not take over nonconformist's schools and they had to close, obliging nonconformist children to go to Anglican schools. In this factor may lie the explanation for some of the stridency of the movement in Bath.

Various questions can be asked, for example why were the nonconformists unable to support their schools, was it because they were numerically smaller or because they were of a lower social class than Anglicans and thus poorer? If this latter was the case did the nonconformists determine to show in the passive resistance movement that in defence of their principles a small poor group of dissenters could be as resolute as the Anglican establishment in the town. Possibly, as their Manifesto would seem to suggest, they were determined to protect their beliefs as they saw the subversion of the Church of England from within. "We should ignore a vital fact of the situation if we did not note that this bid for statutory supremacy in elementary education follows upon a significant change in the prevalent temper of the Anglican bishops and clergy. For many years ritualistic practices sacerdotal teaching and the spirit of prerogative have been in the ascendant; whilst a powerful party has been engaged in a conscious and sustained effort to command the Church of England."¹

1. Manifesto, p.3.

Without a study in detail it is not possible to answer these questions. However it must be noted that the passive resistance movement in Bath was not a matter for the Council Chamber, nor for all nonconformists. Thus in the 'Local Notes' column of the Bath Journal Councillor Workman's words were reported, "Speaking as a convinced nonconformist he hoped they would take up the work without suspicion of the Church party. He did not believe that the Church party were intending to work this Act for their own ends, but with the desire to have a thorough system of municipal education."¹

The movement conducted itself by public meetings and through the columns of newspapers. J.E.E.Munson² has discovered the minutes of the Bristol and District Free Church Federation but the minutes of the Bath and District Passive Resistance League do not seem to be extant, if indeed any minutes were taken when the League met. In the absence of minutes it is necessary to rely upon the reports of the Bath Chronicle and Bath Journal. Public meetings were organised even whilst the Bill was going through its Parliamentary stages. The meetings were of varying quality. Thus the meeting of the ad hoc Western Counties Education League against the Bill at the Guildhall did not make many sensible points and the Chronicle passed sentence - "The hall was not by any means full."³ But in November five months later another meeting at the Guildhall had to have an overflow meeting at the Old Sessions Court and those in attendance included the Earl of Cork, Earl Carrington, Sir Arthur Hayter and other titled members of the public.⁴ The Anglicans for their part held meetings and the Archdeacon of Bath at a conference of the Bath Deanery saw the Bill as a great help to Church Voluntary Schools since it offered them a chance of financial survival.⁵ This

-
1. B.J. 20 May 03.
 2. J.E.E.Munson, "A Study of Nonconformity in Edwardian England as revealed by the Passive Resistance Movement against the 1902 Education Act," University of Oxford D.Phil. Thesis (1973).
 3. B.C. 17 July 02.
 4. B.C. 6 November 02.
 5. B.C. 8 May 02.

was precisely the nonconformists point and fundamental objection, and there were a number of sermons from dissenting Chapels to this effect. In turn a correspondent to the Chronicle calling himself "Fairplay" argued that the nonconformists had been happy to transfer their schools to the School Board after 1870 and if they were unhappy in 1902 then they should build and finance their own schools. "Methinks that would be an excellent test of their sincerity and show that there is something more in their opposition than their traditional hatred of the Church."¹ This monetary argument was often referred to. A year later in May 1903 at a meeting of the Diocesan Societies at the Assembly Rooms the Bishop of Bath said that churchmen had raised over £30,000 on building and maintaining schools and this had not been done to see them taken out of church hands after 1902. "Was it to be wondered at that they were to be allowed to carry on their schools? It would have been wondered at had they not been allowed to do so."² He felt that the Church had been eminently reasonable in allowing one third of managers to be nominated by a power other than themselves. On a specific point Reverent Tugwell in a sermon at St. Marys Church declared that nonconformists had withheld 1s.11d. and 11²d. from rates, but the Act required schools to be handed on in good repair and his Bathwick School would need £100 for debts and repairs plus a further £400 on top of the £300 already collected for the erection of two classrooms which the Board of Education required. "Church people have a much more substantial reason for not being content with the Act's provisions."³ The alternative was to lose the school and see it close. This they would not do, and this was the most telling argument which the Church had against the nonconformists. The former had raised £30,000 and had kept their schools going, the latter had allowed theirs to close. The nonconformist demand for rate aid for all schools with popular control thus appeared as a way around their poverty and inability to finance schools and a device to increase rates.⁴

There was also the not unembarrassing fact that there were not enough

-
1. B.C. 16 May 02.
 2. B.J. 16 May 03.
 3. B.J. 5 July 03.
 4. B.C. 24 July 02.

nonconformists available, or prepared, to serve as managers on non-provided schools. The Education Committee found that if they went outside their ranks, nonconformists would refuse to help, and if they stayed inside there were only ten nonconformist committee members. Thus every one was on at least two school managers bodies.¹ The following month still not having sufficient the Committee decided that the agreed one third of managers (in effect two out of six and often called Council Watchdogs) should simply be of a different denomination to the school foundation.

All of this militated against the passive resisters. They refused all opportunities to help and all olive branches held out by others. Thus in February 1903 T.B.Silcock refused to serve on the steering sub-committee to establish the Education Committee or on this latter itself. The Journal wrote "to compare great things with small he retires like Achilles in dudgeon to his tent."² Councillor Tonkin tried to persuade Silcock to join the sub-committee saying that "he did not think they would find so many points of difference as some anticipated and...Mr. Silcock without sacrificing any of the opinions he held could join the Committee."³ The Mayor also tried but Silcock was adamant declaring that "he had such a distaste for the Act on account of the gross injustice which it inflicts on large numbers of people that he could not bring himself to take any share in its administration. He would rather give any time he could spare to working for an alteration of the Act."⁴

Silcock was of major importance since his connection with education in Bath went back to the 1860s when he was on the Management Committees of Industrial Schools, and his opinion on education was respected. However sometime in 1903 or 1904 he left his position on the Council, firstly to be the President of the passive resistance movement in Bath and then to fight for and win a Parliamentary seat as a Liberal Candidate in the Somerset constituency of Wells. In June 1903 the Bath Passive Resistance League held a meeting at Manvers Street Baptist Chapel

-
1. B.J. 30 June 03.
 2. B.J. 11 July 03.
 3. B.J. 7 February 03.
 4. Ibid.

Schoolroom and the newspaper report of that meeting clearly shows that those present were concerned not with school provision and organisation, but with theological bickering. Silcock claimed that religious tests would be reimposed, and the Chairman G.J.Long claimed that 'ritualists' had captured the Church of England and such priests "would like the children trained to go to Confession and bow down before the Virgin Mary."¹

The theological dispute continued in the newspaper columns. The Rev. Thomas Houghton quoted Romans XIII Verse I "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers" and suggested that this made plain the Christian's duty to pay his rates whilst nonconformists cited Acts 23 Verse I "he had lived in all good conscience before God" which they took to mean that they must do as their conscience dictated.² But the real focus of attention was on the possibility of a rate strike. By late 1902 this was the main issue. The Chronicle editorial noted "surely the old weapons of argument of constitutional agitation locally and nationally have not become so rusted in their armoury as to have become wholly useless."³ The Journal's editorial continued the theme saying that it was an evil day for English Nonconformity when they decided not to pay their rates even to the point of distraint and jail. "A foreigner coming among us and hearing this talk which goes on about the revival of the inquisition could find it hard to believe that the new law not only does not compel any Dissenters child to learn Church doctrine but that not one single scintilla of special privilege is focused upon a church school."⁴ Nonetheless the rate strike went ahead. Tiny sums were withheld, and in July 1903 over seventy passive resisters appeared before the bench, including nine nonconformist ministers. They tried to argue a defence on the grounds that it was a conscience matter - this was promptly overruled - the bench declaring it to be a fiscal matter. Each was ordered to pay his rates with costs.⁵ The magistrates for Weston issued an order to pay, and a distress

-
1. B.C. 11 June 03.
 2. B.J. 6 June 03 and 13 June 03.
 3. B.C. 9 October 02.
 4. B.J. 25 July 03.
 5. B.J. 25 July 03.

warrant against T.B.Silcock for 8s. 9¼d. On the 1 September 1903 a silver cream jug was seized from him.¹ Four days later another forty or so were fined and by the time that the movement ended Bath magistrates had fined some 274 resisters. Possibly some small few were imprisoned, but the newspapers lost interest and notices of trials became inside page column fillers. Though passive resistance was a national movement ultimately the threat of prison was a deterrent for all but the most committed individuals, and as Murphy suggests it was difficult for individuals to resist an Act of Parliament for very long.²

Consequently the passive resistance movement petered out and Cruickshank claims that "Nonconformity never recovered its old political influence and the growing secularisation of English life continued to sap its strength until public opinion became deaf to the old war cries."³

-
1. B.J. 1 September 03.
 2. J. Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain 1800-1970, (1971) p.94.
 3. M. Cruickshank, Church and State in English Education, (1963) p.89.

Chapter Five.

The Bath Education Committee April 1903 to November 1904.

Resolved that Friday the 17th Instant being the day appointed for the visit to Bath of Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show, be observed as a whole holiday at all the Public Elementary Schools in the City."

Bath Education Committee Minutes, 13 July 1903.

At the turn of the century T.B.Silcock was an authoritative man in the Bath establishment on the subject of education. Beginning forty years earlier his experience included work on the School Board, the T.E.C. and he would certainly have had a position on the Education Committee had he wanted it. He was a major figure in the passive resistance movement and was ultimately to be M.P. for Wells. In November 1900 he was made Mayor of Bath, and at the Mayor-making ceremony he made the traditional lengthy speech, part of which declared "it was the province of the Council to see to the proper housing of the people to close unhealthy dwellings, to provide pure water, to arrange for the disposal of all refuse, to see that the streets were well lighted and paved, to provide open spaces, to protect the life and property and so the work of the Council touched the life of every citizen from the highest to the lowest."¹ If any other Mayor had omitted education from such a comprehensive list it could have been regarded as a mere slip, but for Silcock to omit it suggests that education was still not seen as a civic duty. He mentioned lighting, paving, cleaning, housing, protesting, but not educating. A year earlier Councillor J.W.Morris when presenting the T.E.C. Report for the year had declared to Council that "he was anxious...that the Corporation should realise that the Technical Schools were part of their own work."² However his was a voice alone, and education on the rates was to be regarded as a charitable provision, a fact well illustrated by the Education Committee's first eighteen months. The Bath Council had established the Committee in April 1903 to run until November 1904. The Committee made its priorities clear in that time and laid down policies which were to be effective for twenty years or more.

One matter of major importance was the attempt to appoint a Director of Education. In July 1903 a schedule of the job of Director was drawn up and proposed to the Education Committee. The successful applicant was to combine the functions of an H.M.I. and a Clerk to a School Board and he was to work under

1. B.C. 6 November 1900.
2. B.C. 9 February 1899.

the direction of the Committee and the Town Clerk. As well as making himself familiar with the schools and visiting them, he would have to advise the Committee "as to the extension and co-ordination of the various departments and in every way possible to interest himself in the educational development of the city." The job description concluded that since the "work is still new to the Council and to a large extent unorganised it is impossible to make any more definite statement than the above."¹ The Bath Committee were not unique in their uncertainty. Greenhalgh suggests that after the 1902 Act there was no clear job definition nor title since the various county boroughs adopted numerous titles for their education officers - Secretary, Director, Clerk to the Education Committee, Clerk and Organising Secretary. Equally there was no clear pattern of recruitment in the social, educational and occupational backgrounds of the men who were appointed.²

The Bath post had already been advertised and from the 149 replies a short list of ten was drawn up of whom five were selected to be interviewed by the full Committee. The Minutes stated quite clearly - "Resolved with one dissentient that it be recommended to the Council to appoint Mr. F. Roscoe as Director of Education at a salary of £400 p.a. subject to the terms of an agreement to be prepared and sealed by the Town Clerk."³ The Council did not accept the recommendation on 21 July⁴ referring it back to the Education Committee. Roscoe was not appointed and Bath did not have a Director of Education until 1926. What had happened between Roscoe's appointment by the Education Committee and the Council's failure to ratify this six days later was the receipt of an extraordinary letter from a local H.M.I., R.F.Curry. He had been asked to give his

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 1 July 03.
 2. V.C.Greenhalgh, op.cit., Chapter Three.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 15 July 03. Roscoe had had a varied career. He had been an Inspector to the Royal Merchant Seaman's Orphanage for eight years, and for five years he had had duties at the Post Office Homes. He had also been involved with teacher training having been secretary to the Birmingham Teachers' Association as well as giving lectures to Birmingham teachers on teaching methods. Though not a graduate he had attended courses in teacher training at Leipsig and Jena.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 21 July 03.

views to a small group of Education Committee members, on the idea of the Bath L.E.A. appointing a Director of Education. His reply, in letter form, stated "I am against the appointment of a Director of Education because I think it may possibly be harmful to the schools, and also because I think it is unnecessary." He did not say in his letter why such an appointment would be harmful, nor unnecessary. He continued "I have no axe to grind. If the appointment is made it will make no difference to me, except that it may possibly save me a little work." He was rather disingenuous when he stated that he had no axe to grind, because the basis of Curry's letter was to offer to do the job himself. He suggested that it would be "a pity to saddle the rates with such a large annual payment [i.e. the proposed annual salary of £400 p.a.] if it can be avoided and the work required done as well." Curry stated that he had just been made responsible for all of the elementary schools in Wiltshire and "I should be prepared to provide at my own expense an office in the town where I could arrange to be at certain stated times, and where anyone who wished could come at those times and consult me."¹

His letter was discussed at an Education Committee meeting which Curry attended and he was asked to amplify his views. His only reason for trying to dissuade the Council from appointing a Director "was the fact that when Schools were repeatedly visited by different officials each of them having peculiar or particular views then the teachers tried to fall in with them and the Schools did not appear as well as they would do if they had a freer hand."² It was a specious argument and not adequate to explain his reasons for trying to obviate the necessity of the appointment. To suggest that he would have an office in Bath and be available occasionally for consultation was an absurd replacement for a Director of Education. The Committee members divided into two groups. There were those who could not understand what was involved and who could only see a saving to the ratepayers of £400. Possibly they felt that since Curry was employed by the Board the Bath Committee may well be made privy to inside information.

1. B.C. 18 July 03.
2. Ibid.

There were other Committee members however who knew that a Director was necessary. Councillor Workman asked an obvious question of Curry when he wanted to know how many schools the H.M.I. was already responsible for in Wiltshire. The answer was 400. Further comment on this point seemed unnecessary. E.A. Withy said that the Council had already agreed to appoint a Director and should not now alter their views. Plowman suggested that Curry would be in a very anomalous position. Bagshawe continued this and made the very prescient point that "to adopt the idea would be to continue the hopeless divorce between secondary and elementary education," (in that Curry was H.M.I. for elementary schools only). But it was Workman who made the most telling point in that a "Director could not be harmful to the good schools and the sooner he was harmful to the bad schools the better. He would not only be a School Board Clerk but a man who would be able to raise the education of the city to a far higher level than it had reached before and a level which was not attainable on the old lines." By eight to four the Education Committee voted against Curry's offer, and went ahead to interview and appoint Roscoe. But the Council on the 21 July reversed their decisions. Councillor Phillips in the Education Committee had already opposed the appointment of a Director saying he "wished for information on the point of what the duties of the Director would be. He had the schedule but could not make head or tail of it." In the Council meeting he made the same point. "What he asked would the Director have to do? He had come to the conclusion that to find something to do he would have to interfere with the managers probably and with the teachers certainly."¹ Councillor Thomas made the inevitable plea to save the ratepayers £400. Councillor Chivers gave notice that he intended to introduce a motion to retain A. Godfrey Day of the T.E.C. and to have him assisted by the Town Clerk. The Chairman of the Education Committee, Bush, said that Curry's offer whilst kind was "an offer which laid him open to the charge of intruding upon affairs which did not belong to his province." In the event the voting was 26 to 5 in favour of referring back to the Education Committee their decision to appoint Roscoe.

1. B.C. 25 July 03.

The Committee were bitter. Even a Churchman from the School Board the Rev. W. La Porte Payne moved that Curry's offer "would not ultimately result in any financial gain to the City...the offer does not embrace the work of Higher Education carried on in the City."¹ But before there was a vote A. J. King moved that they accept the inevitable and agree to work without a Director for six months and with the Town Clerk. It was carried eight votes to seven. At the Education Committee meeting the Town Clerk had voiced his feelings vociferously. "Mr. Kersley: What the Council wants to know is the Town Clerk prepared to act as a director of studies? The Town Clerk: Oh no! I have never said so. What I am prepared to do is to continue acting as a secretary to this committee provided I have an understudy upon whom I can practically throw the bulk of the work."²

On the 22 July a bewildered Roscoe wrote to the Education Committee saying that the Press had published details of his supposed appointment and he felt honour bound to resign from his post at Birmingham University in order that they could replace him. "Your Committee evidently wished me to begin work almost immediately... but I am faced with the prospect of finding myself adrift in September and of having to explain why the Council of Bath refused to confirm my appointment."³ When it became apparent that this had had no effect in aiding his plight, he wrote a withering letter to the Mayor and Corporation which, though it did his cause little good, no doubt made him feel much better. He said that in applying for any other post he would be involved in lengthy explanations as to why Council did not approve one of its Committee's nominations. "The simple truth that the Bath Council did not know its own mind is so extraordinary that it will require much amplification and might arouse suspicion." He noted that after the successful interview the Town Clerk said he would be required in Bath as soon possible, and later sent him property lists. Roscoe suggested that a good Director could save his salary by careful supervision, as well as promoting

-
1. B.J. 24 July 03.
 2. B.C. 25 July 03.
 3. Ibid.

efficiency and helping to get larger grants. His concluding sentence was a magnificent parting shot "It is only fair in advertising for [another Director that] you should give an account of your latest performance so that he may realise that he runs the risk of some humiliating experiences."¹

On 4 August Council discussed the issue for the final time. Economy, the interests of ratepayers, Curry's offer, all were foremost in the discussion. Ultimately it was agreed that the Education Committee should try to work for six months without a Director. For the unfortunate Roscoe some Councillors had suggested a solatium of fifty pounds, but even that was abruptly rejected. Alderman Moger said "It was a great pity he had let go of one rope before he got firmly hold of the other...If those gentlemen who felt so deeply on the matter would start a subscription list he would be prepared to subscribe but he objected to the Council doing it."²

This matter has been dealt with at considerable length because its repercussions were to have a fundamental effect on the Education Committee in both its relations with Council and in its own conception of its role for many years hence.

It was evident that Roscoe was appallingly badly treated, but so was the embarrassment of the Education Committee members. That Committee included twelve of the thirteen members of the final School Board, a reactionary body as Chapter Two above has shown. However even they were eager to have a Director and were quick to defend the appointment. The job specification printed on 1 July was forward looking mentioning the extension and co-ordination of education and acknowledged that the Committee could not be more specific since they themselves were not entirely sure what was involved. In the last Council debate of 4 August Councillor Hatt, who was not on the Committee stated that "the future of education in Bath depended upon its being started on the right lines, and he did not believe the right lines were those which did not provide for the appointment of a director in order to start it."³ Councillor Plowman of the Education Committee

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 4 September 03.
 2. B.H. 4 August 03.
 3. Ibid.

in the same debate "objected to the ship of education being allowed to drift about for six months without anyone at the helm." Clearly whatever their previous experience be it School Board or T.E.C. the members of the new Committee had been determined to make a vigorous start, appoint a Director and begin to forge a new system of education. They had the wisdom to admit in print that they were slightly unsure what the future lines of progress were, but thus their desire for a forceful Director.

Council members however simply felt the existing system of Board Schools and Technical Schools could be welded together and administered. The administration could be carried on by the Town Clerk with a bit of secretarial help, plus A. Godfrey Day, who with the Town Clerk was already on the City pay roll, and H.M.I. Curry who had offered to do the work for nothing anyway. The Council showed a complete lack of vision and evidently did not feel that the public provision of education needed further extension. The Education Committee, however, having admitted that they needed guidance were not to get it. The Town Clerk was too busy, whilst A. Godfrey Day was an administrator for the T.E.C. not a Director; and the greatest difficulty was with H.M.I. Curry. The Committee must have asked themselves whether Curry could serve two masters, since it would be embarrassing for them to try to formulate policy, which may have been in conflict with the Board, when Curry was paid by the Board but worked for them for nothing. There was an even greater embarrassment for the Committee in that they realised they could not guarantee to get their recommendations through the Council. This is really the most fundamental point, which arises from the Roscoe affair. Henceforth the Education Committee initiated little, content only to administer. The Committee's expertise came from co-opted members and Councillors with long years of experience in education, but both groups also had other interests and their own careers and businesses. Consequently for over two decades there was no one who was paid to lay down long term goals, to consider current educational ideas and methods, to act as a catalyst for educational advance. In view of their lack of a Director it is better not to ask why the Bath L.E.A. did so little, but to marvel that anything at all was done. Gosden and Sharp found a not entirely

dissimilar situation in the West Riding. There the Education Committee did get a Director, but he resigned after a year and another was not appointed until 1929.¹

The only mystery is why Curry made the offer. If he already had 400 elementary schools in Wiltshire to superintend, it is evident that he would have little time for Bath's 23 schools. Alderman Moore seemed to feel that H.M.I.s generally were encouraged to take such initiatives when he declared in the Education Committee that "it seemed that the Education Department favoured their inspectors helping the various education authorities to carry out the Act to the best possible end."² This may well be the case but surely that did not mean taking on the role of quasi Directors as well as their official duties. The files at the Public Records Office have no mention of Curry's action and it may well be that he was simply empire building for himself. However his initial letter advising Bath against appointing a Director and offering his own part time services was ill advised and did a grave disservice to education in Bath. During the time that he was available for consultation the Committee referred only trivia to him. "Resolved that the opinion of Mr. Curry be obtained as to the examination of children for the Labour examination at other times than those at present fixed." and again on the same day "Resolved that Mr. Curry be asked to suggest a suitable date for the commencement of the School Year for all the Primary Schools of the City."³ On 16 October 1903 he was asked to examine a pupil in the work of Standard VI and after a local surveyor's report to visit various schools to suggest alterations and improvements.⁴ Nothing in the Minutes suggest that Curry was asked to help with anything other than routine administration.

Consequently the Education Committee had to face the future without a Director, unsure as to the best policy to follow, and uncertain whether Council would accept their recommendations. Not surprisingly the eighteen months to November 1904 saw them cautious and unimaginative.

-
1. Gosden and Sharp. op.cit., p.21.
 2. B.C. 18 July 03.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 18 September 03.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 16 October 03.

In June 1903 the Committee established a list of sub-committees. They were to be Finance, Staffing, Attendance, Building, Stores and Technical. This was to be essentially the sub-committee structure until the 1940s.¹ They also appointed managers for all of the schools with the proviso that powers exercisable by the L.E.A. be exercisable by the individual members who may thus have access to all schools maintained by the Council. Similar routine administration involved having 'B.E.A.' stencilled on all items in schools, and fixing the caretakers' pay. In December 1903 Prosser, a co-opted member and head of the Bathforum School, moved that a sub-committee be appointed to consider and prepare a scale of salaries for teachers in the Technical Schools, but it was defeated.² He did this because the Education Committee had agreed a scale for elementary heads and teachers and Prosser wanted some attention paid to Technical work - which he called Higher Education. The pay scale which was established was a low one. For heads of boys' schools the scale was £150 p.a. by £5 p.a. to £200 and then £10 for each five years service, whilst for female heads the scale was £100 by £5 to £120 then £5 for each five years service. Trained and certificated teachers got £85 by £5 to £150 (males) and £70 by £3 to £100 (females). There were other grades of staff, uncertificated, ex-pupil teachers, article 68 (i.e. females over 30 unmarried and vaccinated) and pupil teachers. These latter were given a derisory £16 in their first year, £20 in their second and £24 in their third. For females the figures was £13, £16 and £20 respectively.³ There was an attempt to raise these salaries by a few pounds per annum but the Council created difficulties. Councillor Knight asked what the total increases would amount to and Councillor Bush, Chairman of the Education Committee, said no more than £200 from December 1903 to March 1904 and from then till March 1905 a further £650.⁴ Between February and May 1904 the matter went back and forth between Council and Committee the latter trying to establish a marginally higher scale than the former.

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 17 June 03.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 18 December 03.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 16 October 03.
 4. B.J. 4 February 04.

Ultimately a compromise was reached, but again the Education Committee had been thwarted by the Council in trying to make modest improvements in the service which they administered.

The Education Committee did organise a scheme of studies for pupil teachers. There was to be a three year course, with a maximum of 25 pupil teachers in each year. (H.M.I. Curry had agreed the curriculum). Maths had six hours per week, English five and the other subjects - Botany or Physics, Chemistry or Hygiene, History, Geography, French, Drawing, Physical Exercise and Manual Instruction each had between one and two hours. Homework was also set. There was to be no Latin since "Mr. Curry strongly advocates only one foreign language and says this would be French".¹ There were to be 30 scholarships for two years for boys and girls aged fourteen, and 30 for three years for boys and girls aged thirteen. Ever mindful of the ratepayers purse it was stated that any pupil teacher who failed to pass or complete the three or two year course would have to get their parents to reimburse the Authority for any money expended. The provision of some 60 scholarships may appear to be a generous endowment by such a financially cautious County Borough, but pupil teachers were simply a way of getting teachers very cheaply. As Councillor Bush admitted to Council of the scheme outlined above, if the Council "did not adopt the Scheme the effect would be that the Council would have to employ more qualified assistants with the result that the cost would be more than the proposed scheme."²

Without a Director the Committee were left to make their own arrangements with the Board of Education, but for their part the Board were not eager to establish precedents the long term effects of which were uncertain. The Education Committee wrote to the Board to ask whether passages, cloakrooms and inside latrines came within the definition of a room for the purposes of assessing fair wear and tear.³ The Board's officials searched for a precedent and on finding none one official wrote "I should give a very guarded reply." Thus in

1. B.E.C. Minutes 19 February 04.

2. B.J. 1 March 04.

3. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15563 Bath L.E.A. to Board of Education, 3 December 04.

their reply the Board stated that they had no power to give an authoritative interpretation of the Education Act, but generally the Board "are disposed to consider that the liability for fair wear and tear under Section 7(1)(d) of (1902) Act extends to the use of any room whether schoolroom, classroom, cloakroom or lavatory inside the building and does not extend to rooms outside the building, such as for instance a lavatory built on the playground."¹ The need for excessive caution is difficult to comprehend on such a straightforward matter. However this was not a unique occasion, for Prebendary Tugwell of Bathwick had asked a similar question concerning fair wear and tear and again the Board's notes show that they were only prepared to give the most vague advice and "it must be understood that answers given to questions which are general in their nature must not be applied to particular cases without extreme caution."² In this instance though the Board were actually chasing Managers and L.E.A. for repairs to floors, improved ventilation, cloakrooms for girls, two extra classrooms and other items. The plans were sent to the Board on 29 February 1904 and approved on 9 March 1904 with the comment that "the Managers have made the best of a difficult case."³ Throughout the first eighteen months the Education Committee had modest dealings with the Board over repairs to buildings and this will be considered in a later chapter on elementary education.

The Committee settled into a system of administrative routine, only organising salary scales, or pupil teachers courses which were absolutely necessary, otherwise they were blind to the needs of their area. In November 1903 "the Town Clerk read a circular letter from the Board of Education with reference to supplying or aiding the supply of Education other than Elementary under Part II of the Education Act 1902 but no present action was considered necessary."⁴ The Education Committee simply ignored the possibilities of developing secondary education by this action. In part the huge independent sector in Bath probably obviated the need in their view for state provided secondary schools. Equally there

-
1. Ibid. Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 20 December 04.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15551 Bathwick School.
 3. Ibid.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 20 November 03.

was the Technical Day School, renamed the City Secondary School, which they felt fulfilled the needs of children in Bath requiring post elementary schooling.

In November 1904 that school was inspected by four H.M.I.s and their Report was a devastating indictment of the School. Consequently the first eighteen months of the Committee's life which opened with the Roscoe fiasco was to conclude with a Report the twenty pages of which demonstrated the vital need for a Director of Education.

The four H.M.I.s were dissatisfied with every single aspect of the School. The accommodation "is insufficient for the needs of the School" (the School was housed in a wing of the Guildhall opened some eight years earlier to great acclaim) "Some of the rooms are distinctly unsatisfactory and poor." The staff were equally criticised. The Headmaster (A. Godfrey Day) "is a man of good secretarial and organising ability...[but] it does not appear that the work of the Assistant Staff is effectively supervised or controlled." A. Godfrey Day was one of those along with the Town Clerk and H.M.I. Curry (not present at this Inspection) who formed the Directorial Triumvirate. Consequently "it is obvious indeed no school can become fully efficient where the Headmaster's interests and energies are so diffused." As to individual staff the language Mistress's pronunciation of French and German was, though fair, capable of improvement. One assistant master of French was "conspicuously lacking in method and discipline." Two pupil teachers teaching some maths and English were not adequately supervised. A class of 26 girls and 18 boys was taught by a young teacher and lacked "method, interest and effectiveness", and the class was "too large for even an experienced teacher to take properly." A maths teacher was "monotonous and lifeless [because] he was teaching subjects in which he takes very little interest himself."

The H.M.I.s were clear in their analysis of the cause of poor teaching, "the salaries are too low to attract and retain masters and mistresses possessed of such qualifications...better initial salaries should be offered and a salary scale should be instituted."

The curriculum was barely satisfactory and they disliked the way that History, Geography and Latin could easily be dropped in the first years to do such subjects

as Bookkeeping and Shorthand. This was "rather indicative of the importance attached to subjects which if properly taught have considerable value from an educational point of view, though less value from a narrowly utilitarian standpoint." Textbooks generally "are unsuitable, as they are published entirely with a view to passing the Local Examinations." They noted "little sympathy and co-operation in the matter [of discipline] between teacher and scholar" and the H.M.I.s detection of cheating "did not seem to surprise or perturb the teacher in charge." The School did not seem to have a clear policy of progress for the future and there was "an aggregation of scientific and technical classes rather than a complete and graded course of secondary education."

The H.M.I.s were very unhappy about the low level of fee income from the School. The fees were from £3.9s.0d. to £6 per annum. These were payable in four installments but general practice was to waive the fourth installment from those scholars whose attendance was satisfactory. Consequently Bath children often only paid between £1.17s.6d and £2.11s.0d. The H.M.I.s felt that such a low fee was dangerous in that it would persuade scholars in elementary schools to take places when they would not really benefit, and low fees "must involve, if and when the School becomes thoroughly efficient, unfair competition with other Secondary Schools in the area."¹

If the Education Committee were to blame for much in the Report their low fees policy was really laudable, for it would be difficult for H.M.I.s to gauge whether a child would or would not benefit by further education. Equally they well knew that there were no other municipal secondary schools in the area and so they were evidently concerned to protect the independent schools against competition from low fees.

Finally the H.M.I.s noted that there was no continuity of management since the seven managers were elected annually. The Inspectors suggested that one third should change each year, and that there should be female managers since there were female scholars.

1. All quotations from Report on First Inspection City Secondary School Bath 8 and 9 November 1904.

The Committee members felt that the school was the jewel in their crown, and the school's speech days could always draw an important platform party. Equally the description of the school in the annual Bath Post Office Directory was always fulsome. However the H.M.I.s' Report illustrated the faults in every sphere, management, staff, head, buildings, curriculum and fees structure. During the years which followed matters only worsened through the whole educational structure.

The Committee concerned itself with day to day administration, whilst A. Godfrey Day, Curry and the Town Clerk were too busy to adopt the role of Director. The elementary schools continued in poor buildings, secondary provision was not expanded and the independent sector flourished, patronised quite naturally by the Education Committee member's own children.

Chapter Six.

Elementary Education in Bath 1903-44.

"Reported that their Majesties the King and Queen had consented to address messages to the children in the elementary schools by gramophone record; an appeal was made for the provision of records privately so that the children in the Bath Schools able to borrow gramophones might hear the royal messages without cost to the Authority."

Bath Education Committee Minutes 20 April 1923.

A study of educational provision in Bath between the two Education Acts 1902 to 1944 is in effect a study in educational parsimony.

Bath Councillors simply could not accept that a provided secondary education was a public responsibility. They grudgingly realised that the 1902 Act required local authorities to provide and maintain elementary schools but determined to be as frugal as possible in their administration. Councillor Bush was Chairman of the Education Committee from its inception to 1935. This long tenure of office was not unusual, for as Lester-Smith has observed in the early years after the 1902 Act a chairman was selected who was thought to be suitable "to act as leader and spokesman in the local administration of education, and having appointed him to regard the decision as a life sentence."¹ Before that Bush had been a member of both the School Board and the T.E.C. He was an ardent educationalist who had to contend with personal abuse and sarcasm in the Council Chamber when promoting his Committee's cause. Bristol University awarded him an honorary M.A. in 1928 for his work in education and in 1925-26 and 1926-27 he was the President of the Association of Education Committees.² He was unstinting in his support for educational advance in Bath and yet in an early debate on providing school meals Bush said that "personally he had a great antipathy to providing either free education or meals. But many of the children born into this world in England were born into a state of slavery as bad as any in America owing to the indifference of their parents to their moral physical or spiritual welfare and it was for the State to consider what its interests were. Should these children be uncared for to grow up a terror to the nation? While they were discussing these problems children were growing up more as heathens than Christians."³

In this speech Bush showed his paternalism and fear of the mass. Education was to be free only because working class parents would otherwise not pay and their children would run wild. Bush was not alone in thinking that what was

-
1. W.O.Lester-Smith, Government of Education, (1965) p.149.
 2. A brief biography, rather disingenuous and laudatory, can be found in Education, The Journal of the Association of Education Committees, 22 March 1935, p.344.
 3. B.C. 17 May 1907.

offered freely was not valued, and though he worked for education until his seventy ninth year he always felt that he was helping the less well-off - that he was organising something of a charity. Small wonder that others less committed to the cause of education could be brutal in public discussion. "Nationally in 1936 the cost per head was £14.7s.3d. and in Bath £12.8s.3d... It really meant that during the nine years the child was in the elementary school he or she cost the city £112. Not the price of a cheap motor car. (laughter). They could congratulate themselves that their costs in Bath were so far below the average for the country for educating in an elementary school a boy or girl."¹ This was said by the Mayor, Leonard Adams, in the Education Committee in 1937, and is indicative of the attitude of many councillors more than thirty years after the 1902 Act. The previous Chapter illustrated the difficulties which the Education Committee faced in its first two years. Even though Committee members were not radical in their approach to educational provision they did try during the years 1903-44 to make improvements, but inevitably reactionary Councillors created difficulties in the Council Chamber. Evidently Bath was not unique in this for Bolton King, Director of Education for Warwickshire in the 1920s, had similar problems. "If the Education Committees had a free hand, most of them would do the work more wisely and generously but the Councils are very sensitive to the cry of the ratepayer and are ready to sacrifice the children to him. Often their personnel is not of the type which makes for progress...Out of date prejudices, petty carpings, sheer indifference take the place of a far seeing and generous policy."²

Nowhere was this lack of foresight more apparent than in the policy of the Bath Councillors towards teachers' salaries. Before the Burnham Scale was introduced in 1919 Bath had a robust laissez faire attitude, paying whatever the market would accept. They paid slightly more to certificated than uncertificated teachers, but in 1906 the cost conscious Managers found that some teachers employed

1. B.C. 17 November 1937.

2. B.King, Schools of To-day: Present Problems in English Education, (1929) p.42.

as uncertificated had studied in their own time to pass the acting teachers' examinations to qualify as certificated teachers. In September three teachers in three different schools applied for the increase in salary. Their School Managers told them that they would be retained for six months and then they would have to find other employment. "Mr. Bagshaw said it was the general rule with school managers to encourage their uncertificated teachers to obtain certificates but there was such a thing as having a limit to expense for if every assistant was certificated the cost would be enormous."¹ The Finance Committee of the Council resolved that uncertified teachers who became certified should have their salary raised to the certified teacher but they should not receive any increments until "the staffing arrangements of the schools in which they are employed shall justify such increase."² These Bath teachers were not unique in being discriminated against. Tropp notes that uncertificated teachers who qualified in their own time by private study were called "non collegiate certificated teachers" and they had formed their own "Independently Trained Association" as early as 1890.³

Because Bath paid low salaries it tended to be unable to attract staff. In 1913 Bush reported that a post for a teacher had been advertised for ten weeks in the Schoolmaster without a reply.⁴ Eventually Bath was approached by a deputation from the National Union of Teachers who asked for higher salary scales. The deputation included Bath teachers and was led by F.W.Goldstone M.P.⁵ The matter was passed to the Finance and General Purposes and Staffing Sub-Committee who reported in May 1917 in favour of a limited increase in salaries.⁶ Even so it was ungenerous. "Uncertificated Teachers who gain their 'Certificates' shall receive an immediate additional increment of £10 and there after increments as provided

-
1. B.C. September 1906.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 19 October 1906.
 3. A. Tropp, The School Teachers (1957) p.157.
 4. B.C. 3 February 1913.
 5. B.C.B.C. Minutes 16 February 1917. A former pupil teacher at Borough Road, Goldstone was Labour M.P. for Sunderland 1910-18, and in 1924 he was to become General Secretary of the N.U.T. which post he held until 1931.
 6. Report of the Finance and General Purposes and Staffing Sub-Committee, Report on Salaries B.C.B.C. Minutes 1 May 1917.

under the Scale for Uncertified Teachers up to £10 above the maximum of that scale."¹ Having studied to become a Certified teacher they were still to receive payment on the Uncertified teacher's scale. In moving acceptance of the Report to the Education Committee A.P. Workman claimed that though the N.U.T. tables showed Bath to be near the bottom in pay rates "those tables were not worth much... In Bath there were a large number of small schools and they had a large number of teachers for whom they had no room as certified teachers and they were receiving the minimum scale."²

However after the First World War it became apparent that Bath's salary scale was so low as to be detrimental. In January 1921 Bush told the Council "There was no borough in England and Wales paying on a lower scale of salaries to teachers than Bath. Some L.E.A.s had gone onto III or IV or even higher...with the inevitable result that [Bath] could not get teachers to fill vacancies."³ Consequently the Staffing Sub-Committee of the Education Committee was asked to consider the matter and it reported in October 1921.⁴ This Report noted that in 1920 the Burnham Committee had issued its Report suggesting Scales I, II, III and IV and that L.E.A.s and Teachers representatives should confer to agree upon the appropriate scale for individual areas. The teachers wanted Scale III but the L.E.A. were prepared to offer only Scale II and the Report noted that the Board of Education accepted Scale II as appropriate.

In December 1921 however a deputation of ratepayers attended the Council meeting to protest against the proposed increases, and also a letter was read from the Bath Guild of Ratepayers. A move in the Council meeting to delay the increase in salaries until 1923 was sidestepped when it was agreed to postpone discussion until 13 January 1922 but this motion only passed by 25 votes to 23.⁵ At the January 1922 meeting it was agreed to pay on Burnham Scale II from the 1 October

-
1. Ibid.
 2. B.C. 21 April 1917.
 3. B.C. 4 January 1921.
 4. Report of Salaries of Teachers in Bath Elementary Schools B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 October 1921.
 5. B.C.B.C. Minutes 6 December 1921.

1921 (instead of the 1 April 1921 thus saving six months in increases) but subsequent increments were to be made each April.¹

These scales applied to the elementary school teachers, but Bush had also persuaded the Education Committee in January 1921 to adopt the Burnham Scale for secondary school teachers and to apply it from 1 October 1919. This generosity was not welcomed by the Board because Bath had omitted to advise the Board of its intentions. The Board had only discovered the fact by chance when considering Form G91F which was a routine administrative return. Kesteven County Council had proposed to do as Bath had done but had formally asked for their early payment to be recognised for grant expenditure and they had been refused. In the file notes the Board's officials remarked that Bath's teaching scales were low, and that Bath had already begun the payment. "In these cases and in view of the fact that the L.E.A. decision was adopted before 12 January 1921 I do not think that we could refuse to recognise for grant the expenditure involved" and the unsigned note was dated 21 February 1922.²

It was to be a very long time before Bath agreed to consider an increase from Scale II to Scale III, and in 1936 when the increase was discussed it was resolved to take no action.³ However even the hard won Scale II was susceptible to cuts. Lloyd George's coalition realised that post war inflation was getting out of hand and so in B.W.E.Alford's phrase the Cabinet decided "to apply the brakes"⁴. This was to be done by the creation of an ad hoc Committee under Sir Eric Geddes, a business man as were the members of his committee. Their brief was to examine the various estimates for 1922-23 for the armed forces and social services and advise on economies. Education came into this second category and so severe were the Geddes Committee's proposed cuts that they were regarded as falling under the 'Geddes' Axe' and items to be chopped were teachers' salaries and pensions and the age of starting school was to be raised to six.

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 13 January 1922.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 53/286 Bath L.E.A. Major File 1907-21.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 15 July 1936.
 4. B.W.E. Alford, Depression or Recovery? British Economic Growth 1918-1939, (1972) p.31. This work is an interesting discussion of the main economic problems of the interwar years.

In January 1923 the Education Committee accepted the recommendation to cut the Burnham Scale by five per cent. To the Committee's credit they rejected the request of the Lowestoft L.E.A. for support for their suggestion that the cut be ten per cent.¹ The Committee drew up a list of all teachers to show how their salary would be affected. The five per cent abatement was applied to all full time and part time teachers, but not monitresses, student-teachers and special teachers.²

The Geddes' Committee had also recommended that teachers' superannuation which had been established in 1918 as a non-contributory scheme, should after 1923 become a contributory scheme. Teachers were to contribute five per cent to their salaries towards superannuation, consequently teachers suffered a ten per cent salary cut. When discussing the education costs for the year 1922-23 in the Education Committee Alderman Spear (whom the Bath Chronicle called the 'Chancellor' and spoke of his 'local budgets') noted that teachers fell behind in salaries between 1914-19. Furthermore the five per cent salary cut plus five per cent superannuation contribution would push them further back. Even so Spear obviously felt that the Burnham Scale was an expensive item in local costs for he said that "the colleges are turning out crowds of young teachers, many of whom find it difficult or impossible to get work, which means that older teachers who happen to get out will find it next to impossible to get in, the preference being given to younger and cheaper teachers."³

Brian Simon has discussed the fierce reaction and antipathy to these cuts, mentioning the new breed of education officials - Spurley Hay, James Graham and Percival Sharp and notes Sharp's comment "I cannot believe that any body of responsible men with any degree of vision can contemplate what amounts to a wreckage of the educational system."⁴ In Bath however the Council accepted the five per cent salary cut "in a spirit of cordial goodwill of the voluntary offer made by the Teachers' representatives on that Committee to make a substantial

1. B.C. 19 January 1923.

2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 16 February 1923.

3. B.C. 16 February 1923.

4. Education, 13 January 1922, quoted by B.Simon, The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-1940, (1974) p.41. See also pp.304-7.

contribution to the financial necessities of the nation."¹ In Maurice Kogan's laconic phrase - "Present day radicals do not know what a real reactionary is like."² But as so often in Bath it was the Council who were reactionary, the Education Committee on the other hand tried to avoid the worst of Geddes.

Alderman Spear presented details of spending to the Committee in February 1922 and whilst glorying in the reduced costs saying that "on these estimates there would be a total saving of £2,898 or nearly the equivalent of a twopenny rate...the cost of education in Bath had not increased pro rata with the whole of the country by a very great deal" he was also unhappy about the Geddes proposals" he pointed out that in many households raising the age of entry to six would entail great hardship upon the parents. He thought it would be quite possible "to place children of the age of three to five as well as from five to seven under the care of untrained teachers...He hoped the Committee would set their faces against the suggestion to introduce larger classes."³ Spear's suggestion of using cheap unqualified teachers to look after the under-sevens was far from radical, but at the very least he could see the lack of wisdom in the Geddes' Report, which he had urged Committee members to read for themselves.

At that same meeting in February 1922 a co-opted member Mrs. Cordiner gave notice of a motion that she would move at the next Education Committee meeting which was "that the Bath Education Authority protests against the proposed economy with regard to education and respectfully asks the Ministry to reconsider their decision in the matter."⁴ The motion was discussed the next month March 1922 and Bush summed up the Committee's views. "Personally he doubted that Mr. Fisher was going to obtain his contemplated saving of six millions. He presumed that two millions of that sum would be obtained from the proposed five per cent from teachers' salaries. How the other four millions was to be saved was quite another point."⁵ The motion was accepted with nineteen for, one against and eight

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 19 January 1923.
 2. M. Kogan, The Politics of Educational Change, (1978) p.24.
 3. B.C. 17 February 1922.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 17 February 1922.
 5. B.C. 17 March 1922 see also B.C.B.C. Minutes 17 March 1922.

abstentions. On 4 April this modest declaration of the Committee was referred back by the Council "on account of its indefinite nature."¹ and the Committee decided to rethink the motion at a later date.² The motion was thus shelved, the Committee failing to move the Council to its view.

When the next round of salary cuts came in 1931 there was no resistance in the Education Committee or Council since they resolved "that pursuant to the National Economy (Education) Order 1931 all teachers in Bath maintained schools were to have their salaries cut by ten per cent from 1 October 1931."³ In February 1932 the savings were estimated to be about £5,000 in 1931-32 and about £7,000 in 1932-33. Total educational spending for this latter year was to be £120,157.⁴ In June 1935 it was simply minuted that teachers' salaries would no longer be subject to cuts.⁵

Possibly the weak defence of their service displayed by the Committee members came from a real weariness. Every year throughout the 1920s and 1930s Bush had to defend the education budget, every month he had to move the education minutes, and to get even tiny items of expenditure agreed was a very difficult task. The following comments are taken from a routine debate in October 1920 when little expenditure was involved and Bush was moving the Committee's Minutes in Council. "He expected some of them were sick of education (hear hear) when they [the Council] were in their worst moods blaming the Education Committee for all they were worth for expenditure, let them remember they [the costs] were exceedingly low and that they [the Committee] were doing their best not to arouse the tempers of the Bath ratepayers."⁶ If Bush and his colleagues came under such fire so frequently it would have seemed to them pointless to object too strongly to salary cuts which anyway were being imposed from the centre by Government. When the Committee had to face the necessity of staff cuts because of the Geddes demands Alderman Spear said that he had been told by H.M.I. Grindod "that if the Council

-
1. B.C. 4 April 1922.
 2. B.C. 21 April 1922.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 21 October 1931.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 12 February 1932.
 5. B.C.B.C. Minutes 19 June 1935.
 6. B.C. 26 October 1920.

did not do it themselves the Government would do it."¹ The Committee bowed to the inevitable and accepted reductions in salaries and staffing and saved their energies for improving education in those areas which were within local initiative. But all too often the Education Committee was faced with almost insuperable obstacles and vested interests. The Council refused to spend ratepayers' money and the non-provided school managers refused to spend the Church's money. There were no new buildings until well into the 1930s and so those same wretched elementary school buildings which had upset the Inspectors during the School Board days continued in use.

In 1911 for example the Town Clerk F.D.Wardle (using Bath L.E.A. headed notepaper and thus writing in his capacity as one of the Directorial Triumvirate) wrote to the Board of Education primarily to send plans for a twenty gallon flush tank for Victoria Infant School. The Board replied accepting the plans but desiring "that the Boys' urinal which is at present contiguous to one of the classroom walls be moved further away." Wardle replied that the position of the urinal "is most convenient and to place it in some other portion of the playground would simply involve further expense." The Board acquiesced but said that it must eventually be moved. In February 1913 H.M.I. Fisher noted under the heading 'Observations not for Managers' - "the urinal to which we objected has been closed up but now there is no urinal for boys at all - they must use the WC." This was too much for the Board who wrote asking for a plan showing where the new urinal was to be sited and by December 1913 the work was completed.² This relatively simple exercise had taken two and a half years to complete. However the correspondent to the managers was F. Ernest Shum who had already angered the Inspectorate in the late 1890s when he tried to avoid the expense of the installation of a wash hand basin and taps.³ Occasionally the Board forced managers to make improvements, for example in June 1909 the Inspectors decided

1. B.C. 9 January 1923.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15552 Victoria Infants School. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 3 July 1911. Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 14 July 1911. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 22 July 1911. Inspection Notes February 1913 Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 25 February 1913. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 28 April 1913. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 9 December 1913.

3. see above p.21.

that a large room at St. Paul's Church of England School needed partitioning into two halves, as well as improved lavatory accommodation and also the surface of the playground needed repair. In November the managers rejected the request to partition on the grounds that it would sacrifice twenty places, and they suggested instead the use of curtains. In an internal Board note H.M.I. Tillard wrote "this is a very unsatisfactory end to have reached after six months correspondence. I think we shall have to press for partitions under pain of a reduction in accommodation which would by itself dispose of one of the managers' arguments and for the other improvements under pain of withdrawing recognition say at the end of the school year...It is of course undesirable to use the threat...Are you prepared to go as far as that?" The Board's officials were prepared and in December 1911 they requested a room partition or they threatened to reconsider the school numbers, and secondly demanded improvements to toilets, urinals, ventilation and lighting "or the Board will proceed to fix an early date for terminating their recognition of the School."¹ Consequently all of the required work was completed by February 1911.

Neither the managers nor the L.E.A. seemed prepared to remedy deficiencies without pressure and threats from the Board. This in turn led the Board's officials to append sardonic notes to the various Bath school files when dealing with problems. For example the Bathforum school was condemned by H.M.I. Fisher as a "basement school" in 1908 and an enormous list of repairs was required. The Board threatened to cease to recognise the School after February 1910. Fisher's colleague Russell wrote "I suggest an early date to ensure that the local authority really stir themselves in the matter of Bathforum. Bath being what it is any means of applying pressure is useful."² The inevitable pleading letter was sent to the Board stating that in 1890 £1,300 had been spent on the building at the insistence of the Education Department and a further £500 between 1890 and 1903.

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15563 St. Paul's Church of England School. H.M.I. Report 1 June 1909. Managers to Board of Education 23 November 1909. H.M.I. Tillard Memorandum 23 November 1909. Board of Education to Managers 1 December 1909.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 16/259 General file on Bath Elementary Schools. Random Note by H.M.I. Russell 15 August 1909.

The Board had suggested that the building was so bad as to be a health hazard - but the managers claimed that attendance was good and that the headmaster had only had three days absence in eighteen years. They asked that the School be not condemned. The Board insisted on certain repairs and the managers agreed. The school was reprieved in 1910 which was, by coincidence, its centenary. Despite shoddy buildings and the general reluctance of Anglican Managers to spend money they showed an astonishing lack of perspective by inviting Runciman, the President of the Board of Education to be present at the Centenary celebrations. The correspondent to the Managers and a Committee member Titley sent the invitation. H.M.I. Tillard had to explain to the President that the school had been condemned as from 1910 but that this had been lifted after building work had been agreed upon "it is probably to celebrate this great deliverance as well as the centenary that this function is being organised." Runciman was terse in his reply "Extremely sorry, cannot. W.R."¹

Provided Schools were also found to be in a poor state and the L.E.A. were as difficult to deal with as the non-provided school managers and the Board frequently had to resort to coercion. In December 1909 H.M.I. Russell wrote of the Walcot Council School "The premises have not been improved. The case is a very bad one and it is desirable that something should be done soon." Three days later H.M.I. Tillard noted his agreement and added "I think we should stir the L.E.A. up". Thus an official letter was sent to the Bath L.E.A. saying that the Board had received no reply to their earlier letter of June 1909 which summarised the H.M.I.'s recommendations and unless they received a reply within two months "it will be necessary to fix a date for the termination of the recognition of the School." Bath replied within a month agreeing to the repairs.² Facilities were also lacking. For example when H.M.I. Russell inspected the Walcot Council School he not only noted the physical defects mentioned above but also reported "the

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15550, Bathforum School. H.M.I. Fisher's Notes 9 October 1908. Managers to Board of Education 18 November 1908. H.M.I. Fisher's Notes 15 May 1909. T.I.Titley to W.R.Runciman President of the Board of Education 8 March 1910. Unsigned and undated internal memorandum to W.R.Runciman, approximately March/April 1910.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15572 Walcot Council School. H.M.I.Russell's Notes 15 December 1909. H.M.I.Tillard's Notes 18 December 1909. Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 24 January 1910.

school is without any supply of dictionaries, atlases, or continuous readers. A piano is much needed for the School.¹ In April 1910 Lyncombe Council School was inspected and the Report concluded that "the use of slates should be discontinued." The managers' minutes noted "the discontinuance of slates will involve expenditure which cannot be covered by the allowance of 1s.0d. per head." H.M.I. Fisher was undaunted "I hope the Board will take a very strong line on this matter," and a colleague agreed "The reason given by the L.E.A. for refusing to give up slates is a most absurd one." Yet another official, no doubt tired of Bath and its Councillors wrote "I suppose slates are generally employed in Bath Schools. Does the continuancy arise from a slate manufacturer?" But H.M.I. Fisher replied that he had discouraged the use of slates. "The continuancy does not come from a slate manufacturer, but I imagine from Mr. Prosser, formerly Head of Bathforum School who has been appointed as an official by the L.E.A. to cut down expenditure in stationary and equipment." Consequently the Board wrote in stern terms to Bath "The Board consider the use of slates in Schools is open to the gravest objection both on educational and on hygenic grounds and they hope that the L.E.A. will take the earliest opportunity of reconsidering their decision to retain them in the Schools."²

It is difficult not to sympathise with Bush who faced parsimonious managers, reactionary Councillors and a suspicious Board. However Bush had realised that in the area of elementary schools Bath had too many small schools. If he could persuade the managers to agree to amalgamate departments and even schools then he could effect economies of scale. He could have larger schools, less administrative and maintenance staff within schools, fewer heads, and possibly better buildings. Bush tried to effect this before the First World War, but was unable to do so alone, and it was not until Bath had a Director of Education that the amalgamations of the elementary schools were carried through.

-
1. Ibid. H.M.I. Report 12 May 1909.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15555 Lyncombe Council School. H.M.I. Report 26 April 1910. Minutes of the Managers of Lyncombe Council School 25 May 1910. Random notes by H.M.I. Fisher 1 July 1910 and 14 July 1910. Two unsigned notes 7 July 1910 and 13 July 1910. Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 11 August 1910.

In May 1907 Council debated the cost of the Bath education service and Councillor Colmer said that the Education Committee had "about 6,300 scholars on the books and...they had a staff sufficient to teach 9,500 and still satisfy the requirements of the Board of Education." Colmer noted the costs per unit of average attendance for books and stationary and found it varied at Bathwick 3s.4d. and at Widcombe 1s.8d. Councillor Tonkin in reply stated the basic problem was "the small schools which there was no power to amalgamate. There would be no hardship if the children of St. Michaels had to go to Walcot Central Schools and the whole staff at St. Michaels could be spared. The same thing could be done in other schools of the city if there was power to amalgamate schools." Bush, to illustrate the Committee's impotence in this mentioned the request to St. Michael's managers to amalgamate the infants and mixed departments but they had refused "and the Education Committee had no power to insist upon it."¹

Ever eager to save costs the Councillors at their next meeting in June 1907 moved that at the next meeting of the Association of Education Committees Bush should try to put on the agenda a motion that L.E.A.s be given powers "to amalgamate schools of similar character, provided or non-provided and any cases in which the Authority consider such a course expedient, provided that such powers shall not extend to enable Authorities to amalgamate schools of different denominations."² Two weeks later the Committee sent an urgent recommendation to the managers of St. Marys and St. Johns - both Roman Catholic Schools - suggesting that those Schools should amalgamate.³ The reply was received in September 1907 the managers of the two schools saying "in view of certain reconsideration by the Government of the whole question of Education it would be unadvisable to consider the proposed amalgamation scheme."⁴

The Education Committee, themselves masters of procrastination when it suited them, were to find that school managers could also procrastinate. In fact the

-
1. B.C. 7 May 1907.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 June 1907.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 21 June 1907.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 20 September 1907.

Committee could do little to force amalgamation by re-organising the provided schools. There were only four provided schools comprising seven departments when the Education Committee began in 1903. These four were larger than the non-provided schools comprising thirty-five departments. Departments and occasionally whole schools had only a hundred children, which because of the large classes would mean only two teachers. However Bush in part for financial and in part for educational motives kept up the pressure for amalgamation and the Council were with him, though in their case entirely for financial reasons.

In March 1911 the Finance and General Purposes Sub-Committee had tried to find economies and they had instructed that a statement of staff numbers on roll at each school be compiled with a view to showing what economies could be effected by amalgamations. The Staffing Sub-Committee, as well as conferring with managers of non-provided schools on this topic were to consider staffing and the salary scales, with a view to effecting economies.¹ Consequently a new salary scale was proposed in which head teachers were not to have a scale, but be paid in relation to the size of the school. The maximum salary for a certified teacher was to be £140 and £150 for a graduate, instead of £150 and £160 respectively. Pupil teachers' salaries were to be cut from £25 p.a. for males and £20 p.a. for females to £15 p.a. for both.² When moving the adoption of the Minutes to Council nine days later Bush urged that they be adopted with the exception of the salary reduction recommendations, and Council followed his advice.³

It is difficult to decide precisely what lay behind these moves. Perhaps Bush was protecting education from wounding attacks by these salary cuts, since he knew already that Bath's salary levels were low. Or was he, with the connivance of the Education Committee and Council trying to intimidate teachers? These latter were caught between Scylla and Charibidis, either some would be made redundant if schools amalgamated, or, if they were not, all teachers were

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 17 March 1911.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 13 July 1911.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 22 June 1911.

threatened with salary cuts. Possibly the hope was that teachers would bring pressure to bear on the managers. Whatever the case in July 1911 the Staffing Sub-Committee re-affirmed to the Education Committee that the only way to save money if salaries were not to be cut was to amalgamate schools, and suggested schemes had been sent to managers.¹ But again this failed for as Alderman Spear explained to Council "a scheme of classification of scholars and schools was prepared showing substantial savings but it met with no approval [from managers]. He said emphatically that this could only be done by consent and unless that consent were forthcoming they would have to be prepared to go on as they were."²

The war of attrition dragged on. The Committee again requested the managers of the Catholic Schools of St. Marys' and St. Johns' to amalgamate. But the managers replied that if St. Marys' closed the Catholic children who could easily get to there would not be able to cross the City to get to St. Johns'.³ Eventually the 1914-18 war provided the Education Committee with its opportunity. In October 1915 the Board of Education asked all L.E.A.s to facilitate recruiting and the Bath Committee resolved that this could best be achieved by adjusting staffs in schools, reducing the staffing scale and not replacing recruited men by others of recruiting age. In December church school managers were asked which departments could be amalgamated; and head teachers were to arrange staff transfers between schools where one had too many and one too few.⁴ Keeping up this initiative the next month the Staffing Sub-Committee presented a lengthy report on the proposed amalgamation of schools in general and Lyncombe St. Marks and Trinity in particular.⁵ The Report was a very detailed piece of work, itemising staff, pupils, average attendances, costs and the residences of children. In essence the plan was to retain the infants in their departments but send the boys and girls at those two schools above the age of seven to nearby schools. Some of the redundant staff could be employed in the enlarged schools, but they still

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 17 July 1911.
 2. B.C. 2 April 1912.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 21 February 1913.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 17 December 1915.
 5. B.C.B.C. Minutes 21 January 1916.

estimated that some four uncertificated, one certificated and three head teachers would not be needed. Beyond saying that "it is assumed that no teacher would suffer financial loss if the scheme were adopted" the Report did not indicate what would happen to them. In fact little was done, but the Committee's unerring determination to persuade or coerce managers finally succeeded. The 1918 Education Act presented an opportunity for the Education Committee to consider a complete re-organisation of schools in Bath. In the long run Bath adopted a scheme based on Infant, Junior and Central Schools and H.W.Brand in his monograph Unwillingly to School wrote that "long before the Report of the Hadon Committee led to the re-organisation of the nation's schools...the Education Committee resolved...to re-organise the City's elementary schools into Infants 5 to 7 and Juniors 7 to 11 or combined Infants and Juniors Departments 5 to 11."¹ However Brand's brief work is an apologia for the L.E.A. and it should not be assumed that in response to the 1918 Act the Bath Education Committee had devised this re-organisation. In fact the Anglican School Managers, desperately trying to avoid the decimation of their schools devised the scheme themselves. The three H.M.I.s for the area - Battiscombe, Coulson and Grindod - submitted a joint Report on the Bath scheme under the 1918 Act in February 1921. In passing they stated that the Diocesan Inspector, Prebendary Frith, had suggested to certain Church School Managers that they should amalgamate because the Board of Education could require them to do so under Section 31 of the Act. The Church Union Managers wrote to the Education Committee with the suggestion that some of their schools could become central schools and provide advanced instruction, and some could be junior schools. The three Inspectors stated that some Councillors realised that no scheme was being devised for provided schools and so the Education Committee decided that provided and non-provided schools should be re-organised on a central junior school basis.²

In fact the Church Union Managers wrote to the Committee with their suggestion

-
1. H.W.Brand, Unwillingly to School (1974) p.21. This monograph was published by the Bath L.E.A. and was written by a former Director of Education for Bath. Brand's own work as Director will be discussed in Chapter Eleven below.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 120/144 Schemes under the 1918 Act. Report by three local H.M.I.s.

which was referred to the Staffing Sub-Committee and Bush hoped that it "would not only consider the latter but consider the question as related to the whole of the schools of the city. Then they would have a complete scheme."¹

But after the end of the First World War another problem was occupying most of Bush's time - secondary education. As the next Chapter will show the Council refused to countenance an expanded maintained secondary sector. The Board of Education threatened to close the only secondary school because it was so bad. Bush quickly saw in the central school idea an answer to his problems. If he could extend the leaving age by one year on whatever pretext to fifteen then he might be able to argue that the central schools were secondary schools - indeed they were even to be called senior schools. Nowhere is this explicit and only once do the Board's officials hint at what they fear may have been Bush's intention, but it is a reasonable assumption. Thus from 1918 to 1926 when a Director was finally appointed Bush tried to steer through Council and the Board an elementary school re-organisation which had to be all things to all people. For the Board it had to be educationally sound and answer the 1918 Act, for the managers it had to preserve their schools, for the Council it had to be economic, for the parents it had to be geographically convenient, and as a bonus he hoped it would satisfy them all on the question of secondary provision.

The Bath Church School Managers had proposed in their letter of January 1919 that Weymouth House School which had both boys' and girls' departments should become a school for pupils in Standard VI and VII and that these should receive pupils from all of the other Church Schools in the City. The remaining Church Schools should become a junior school receiving and retaining pupils up to and including Standard V.² The matter was passed to the Staffing Sub-Committee and when they reported in February 1920 they showed considerable enthusiasm for the whole project - even hoping that the central schools might open that summer.³ A

-
1. B.C. 17 January 1919.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 17 January 1919.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 20 February 1920.

complete draft scheme was drawn up and Bush explained it to the Education Committee.¹ There were to be four central schools - Oldfield Council boys and girls, West Twerton boys and girls, Walcot Parochial boys and girls and Weymouth House Church of England boys and girls. These were to take Standard V and above. Standards I to IV were to be in the junior schools. No new buildings were envisaged, only adaptations of existing schools. Bush added that "those who had followed the subject had known that with larger schools where the standards were large the cost to the rates had always been lower than where the schools had been small and conditions had made it necessary to have more teachers than should have been engaged." He also noted "with regard to the secondary school they hoped some day to have a sufficient school to accommodate all the pupils seeking admission...It might be that in the near future the city authorities would decide to keep children up to the age of fifteen."² In January 1921 the Education Committee resolved to advise the Board that they were making arrangements to re-organise along junior and central school lines hopefully from April 1921 and they asked the Board's views on the Scheme. A District Committee of the Board discussed Bath's proposals and the local H.M.I.s were asked for their views. The District Committee felt that the plan "seemed calculated to effect a notable improvement in the co-ordination of Elementary Education and will make it possible for the provision of Advanced Instruction". The three H.M.I.s reported in February 1921 "except for Central Schools - for Bath a very bold venture - all the other proposals have been discussed for years and some of them might very properly have been pressed for long before the war." (by which they meant the provision of secondary education.) The Report of the Bath L.E.A. did not dwell on that subject and the H.M.I.s were apprehensive, as was the District Committee. "The District Committee do not consider the Authority should be allowed to escape the necessity of making adequate provision for secondary education by an expedient which is not intended for a backward or unprogressive Authority."³ However in

1. Draft Scheme Under the Education Act 1918 (1920) (Copy in Bath Reference Library)
2. B.C. 15 October 1920.
3. P.R.O. Ed. 120/144 Schemes under the 1918 Act. Comments by the District Committee and the Report of three local H.M.I.s.

August 1921 the Board wrote to Bath L.E.A. to say that they could not recognise the scheme for the purpose of expenditure because Circular 1190 had been issued which required cut backs in expenditure but the Board's letter did advise that such parts of the scheme that were vital to local circumstances could be considered.¹ Bath acknowledged the Board's letter saying that because of the Circular 1190 only limited action could be taken under the 1918 Act. The Board felt that local circumstances required improved secondary provision, Bath suggested that free places in secondary schools "will be taken into consideration when it is possible to make larger general provision for secondary education in the city."²

For the Education Committee and Council what was vital to local circumstances was elementary school re-organisation and they pressed on with this. In March 1921 a petition was received by the Committee signed by twentyfour parents objecting to central schools on the grounds that these schools would not be convenient to the petitioners' homes, or that the petitioners did not like the head, or the staff of the school to which their child was to be sent. Bush quickly disposed of these objections noting that of twentyfour signatures there was only one address, and ten of the surnames did not appear among those of the children proposed to be transferred. He said that parents had been given the opportunity of selecting the school to which they wished their children to attend and to suggest an alternative in case of difficulties. At the same meeting it was agreed that the central schools be called senior schools³ and re-organisation was to be implemented from mid 1921.

The Education Committee could be very dilatory when it suited them and also extremely prompt - indeed prompt to the embarrassment of others. Wardle the Town

-
1. Circular 1190 was dated 11 January 1921 and was one of four sent to L.E.A.s by the Board which indicated the initial cuts in projected expenditure which the Exchequer required. The other three Circulars were 1185 of 17 December 1920, 1225 of 18 August 1921 and 1228 of 23 August 1921. These circulars and their effects upon the provisions of the 1918 Act are discussed in L.Andrews, The Education Act, 1918, (1976) pp.69-72.
 2. Ibid. Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 5 August 1921. Bath L.E.A. to Board of Education 5 November 1921.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 18 March 1921 see also B.C. 18 March 1921.

Clerk had advised the Board that some Managers were not happy about the re-organisation. The Board asked individual Managers for their views and a minute states that of the various Managers "ten replied, seven agreed and three disagreed." Bath had put the Board in an awkward position because "it is difficult to know whether we can now write and approve the re-organisation not being satisfied that the Managers all agree, and yet it is difficult not to approve as the re-organisation took place two months ago." The Board took what they hoped would be the line of least resistance and wrote a soothing letter to two of the unhappy groups of Managers saying that "the Board understand that the arrangements are being found to work smoothly...and further experience will show that the re-organisation is likely to result in considerable educational benefits" and the Board concluded by hoping that Managers would not press the objection. F. Ernest Shum of Bathwick Schools replied "I do not think it must be assumed that the Managers...do not wish to press their objection" and L.Vibert of St. Stephen's School wrote in similar vein. The Board's officials were optimistic and one noted "this is not so bad and we can even interpret it as ascent till they make use of the right they reserve to themselves." and a second noted "I have heard nothing and am asking no questions."¹ However if the Board's officials were congratulating themselves on having avoided the difficulties created by Bath, then they would not avoid the next issue which Bath raised. For in October 1922 the Education Committee thought that they should initiate a local byelaw to raise the school leaving age to fifteen. This was to involve the President of the Board of Education, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Prime Minister and the Association of Education Committees and to make Bush, in educational circles, a national figure.

In October 1922 Councillor S.D.Kennard urged that should Bath keep its school children until they were fifteen instead of them leaving school at the end of the term in which they were fourteen. He felt that "this amendment should apply unless

1. P.R.O. Ed. 16/259 General File on Elementary Schools. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 24 February 1921. Undated Minutes but approximately June/July 1921. Board of Education to F.Ernest Shum and L.Vibert 11 July 1921. F.Ernest Shum to Board of Education 19 July 1921. L.Vibert to Board of Education 7 November 1921. Two unsigned Minutes 14 November 1921.

the parents of the children could show that these scholars had some profitable employment waiting them. Mr. Kennard explained that the Education Committee were very anxious indeed to do something to relieve the problem of junior unemployment." Councillor Ford said that the position for childrens' employment would be no better when they were fifteen. Bush said that 150 were on the register of the Labour Exchange and a further 380 children were due to leave school by the end of the year, meaning over 500 children unemployed. "Canon Girdlestone remarked that the adoption of the proposed amended byelaw would increase the size of the senior classes considerably. Was the accommodation sufficient to meet the new demand? The Chairman gave a satisfactory assurance on this point and Mr. Kennard's resolution was adopted."¹

These exchanges have been quoted at length to illustrate the ease with which the motion to raise the leaving age was adopted, for the 1918 Act had only just raised the leaving age to fourteen without exception. Bath was a very cost conscious County Borough, and whilst it is entirely possible that the desire to protect children from the dole queue was the main motive behind the resolution, it is also possible that Bush hoped that if children could be obliged to remain at school until they were fifteen they might be persuaded to stay to sixteen and thus the central schools (henceforth called senior schools) could become secondary schools by default.

Wardle wrote to the Board outlining the proposal and noting that because children could leave when they became fourteen the schools were full at the start of the year and less so at the end and Bath's proposal would allow for more economic use of staff.² A Board official observed that "it is obvious that to provide educational facilities for such a number of children must entail expenditure or else that the present conditions as to staffing are extremely uneconomical." and he suggested that the proposal be refused on grounds of expense.³ The Board wrote to Bath saying that they could not accept this proposal for the reasons

-
1. B.C. 20 October 1922.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205 Attendance Files 1871-1925. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 23 October 1922.
 3. Ibid. Unsigned Minutes 4 November 1922.

indicated in paragraph 4 of Circular 1262 which had been issued in May 1922. This Circular named the appointed day for the 1918 Education Act with the exception of Section 8(2) and Section 10, the former providing for attendance at elementary schools and the latter attendance at continuation schools.¹ The Board claimed that the intention to raise the age to fifteen should not be used "to meet a temporary emergency caused by unemployment."² However in a Minute discussing the letter, the writer noted "but I imagine the real reason why we could not approve such a byelaw is our understanding with the Treasury that in the present financial circumstances no such byelaw will in any circumstances be approved."³

Bush tried again six months later when he and the new Town Clerk Basil Ogden visited the Board. The Board's notes of the meeting were barbed. "At present the Authority were hardly in a position to do justice to children up to fourteen and certainly would not be able to do so up to fifteen."⁴ Bath replied by letter that if Authorities were given power to create byelaws then presumably Parliament intended the power to be used.⁵ Bush next took his case to the Association of Education Committees and a resolution was passed against the Board and its refusal to allow an L.E.A. to raise the leaving age. A Board Official noted "that Bath has constituted itself the champion of all areas who are seeking for an extension of the school age." One official suggested a public inquiry in Bath, the publicity he hoped "may well have the effect of eliciting a good deal of objection to making attendance at school up to the age of fifteen compulsory." But another noted that although this might work in Bath, other Authorities might have inquiries with the opposite effect. Anyway, if as Bath claimed there was support for the increase in leaving age all the more reason for Bath to proceed by persuasion.⁶ In fact the Board's officials were caught between Bath's demands and the Treasury's

-
1. Details of the Appointed Days under the 1918 Act are given in L.Andrews op.cit., pp.90-96.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205 op.cit., Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 22 November 1922.
 3. Ibid. unsigned Minutes dated 16 November 1922.
 4. Ibid. Notes of meeting 11 July 1923.
 5. Ibid. B.Ogden to Board of Education 27 July 1923.
 6. Ibid. Undated Minutes.

financial policy. As another official noted "I think you are aware that in connection with the Carlisle case the President wrote unofficially to the Treasury to ask that he might be released from the definite promise which Mr. Fisher gave...not to approve byelaws raising the age to fifteen. The Secretary's file herewith shows that the reply was unfavourable so that further written application to the Treasury would be needed if he were going to give way." A second official noted "if it were not for our pledge to the Treasury not to approve byelaws raising the School age to fifteen I should be very much disposed to hold a public inquiry at Bath."¹

Eventually in August 1923 the President of the Board, Edward Wood, went outside of his Department for advice and wrote to the Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin. "I confess that I feel great difficulty in maintaining a blank refusal... May I let Bath publish their byelaw and hold a public inquiry?". Baldwin's reply is not on file.² In the absence of any advice Wood wrote "Very well - I will write to the Chancellor. Socially I have no doubt there is a good deal to be said for what these people want to do and as a matter of general policy I am very doubtful about the wisdom or possibility of sitting tight and doing nothing." Wood wrote to the Chancellor Neville Chamberlain in effect asking if Bath could publish their byelaw and hold an inquiry.³ Chamberlain replied at length, sympathising that "the stringency of the times compels to secure retrenchment when his [the Minister's] natural inclination must be to encourage educational development. Your difficulties I realise are enhanced by the passing into law of the 1918 Act which whatever its merits exhibited little regard for financial considerations and the economic position of the country after the war." Chamberlain discussed the continual increase in expenditure and the worry of how he could balance the Budget for 1924-25 "all I know is that it will be an extremely

-
1. Ibid. Two unsigned Minutes 7 August 1923 and 9 August 1923.
 2. Possibly Baldwin did not reply for he was holding the post of both Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time. He relinquished this latter in August and in December faced a General Election which he lost to MacDonald. Certainly no public inquiry was held in Bath on this issue.
 3. Ibid. Minute 23 August 1923 Edward Wood to Neville Chamberlain 31 August 1923.

arduous task and that it will be a question of drastic reductions in the present level of Departmental expenditure and no question of any increases." Consequently to allow Bath's request was out of the question because it would encourage pupils to stay on and if that failed "all I think you can do is to state frankly that the condition of the National Exchequer is such that you cannot persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consent to a proposal which it would be impossible to confine to Bath." Chamberlain concluded with an encouraging little homily "I am sure that the main body of public opinion would support you in such an attitude; educational zealots you can never convince; for them financial considerations have no relevance."¹

Wood wrote to the Bath L.E.A. regretting that he could not consent to the byelaw, acknowledging the public spirited feelings which had prompted their request and suggested that they use persuasion to persuade children to stay at school.² No doubt hoping that that was the end of the matter the Board's officials must have lamented when they heard that Bath was prepared to use persuasion - in the form of a five shilling a week maintenance grant to parents if their children stayed at school.

Wood's letter was not well received by the L.E.A. Bush was angry because the Board had suggested that the raising of the school leaving age would not advance education. "His answer...was that if their proposal was uneducational why did he (Wood) communicate with the Chancellor of the Exchequer respecting the possible expense? And why did he suggest that voluntary effort should be made to keep the children in school? He believed that it was the fact that possibly more expense might be incurred and they did not want to spend one single penny more upon education than they were spending at present."³

At the next Education Committee meeting Councillor Sam Cook, a Labour member, introduced a motion that five shillings be paid to parents of all children aged over fourteen who stayed at school. (Cook himself had left school at twelve and

-
1. Ibid. Neville Chamberlain to Edward Wood 26 September 1923.
 2. Ibid. Edward Wood to B. Ogden 13 October 1923.
 3. B.C. 19 October 1923.

been a half timer for two years). Alderman Spear asked if they could spend such money. Bush said that they would need the Board's approval and estimated that about £11,000 would be necessary each year - half of which might be paid by the Board.¹ At the next meeting Cook presented a new, more precise motion. The money was to be paid to "necessitous parents as part maintenance during such continuance of a child at school, the subsidy to commence immediately compulsory attendance ceases." Cook felt that there were 200 cases in Bath and the cost would be a ½d. rate, half paid by the Board. The motion passed the Education Committee by 15 to 1 and the Council by 41 to 5.² At the Council meeting fairly obvious points were made. Alderman Hatt for example noted that the motion did nothing to alleviate unemployment, the move was only a palliative. However the motion was accepted and a copy sent to the every County Borough and County Council, to the heads of political parties and the M.P. for Bath, Captain C.T.Foxcroft.

It was a move of considerable audacity on the part of Bush, the Committee and the Council. Bush knew that the proposed byelaw to raise the leaving age had been refused because of the implicit costs involved. This new move was an explicitly financial venture. They were challenging the Board quite openly. This time no anonymous officials penned minutes to each other. L.A.Selby Bigge³ wrote directly to Edward Wood only days after the Bath Committee had passed their resolution. "The Scheme of the Bath L.E.A. is apparently one for bribing poor parents to let their children stay at school and it is hardly distinguishable from a scheme of poor relief or unemployment benefit coupled with an obligation to attend school such as is attached to the unemployment benefit for juveniles between the ages of sixteen to seventeen." He argued that the Bath plan was not in the spirit of Schedule VII of the Code which countenanced attendance allowances only for children on advanced instruction. "This I think is just the kind of

-
1. B.C. 16 November 1923. Barker mentions the fact that Philip Snowden in June 1918 had unsuccessfully tried to secure maintenance allowances for all children whose school career would be extended by the 1918 Education Act. R.Barker, Education and Politics 1900-1951, (1972) p.31.
 2. B.C. 19 December 1923.
 3. Lewis Amherst Selby Bigge Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education 1911-25.

scheme to which you do not desire to lend any countenance. It might be favoured by a Labour Government but you would I imagine wish to retain full and unprejudiced liberty to oppose it."¹ Selby-Bigge knew that Wood as a Conservative was about to leave office because MacDonald was forming his first administration. The incoming President of the Board of Education was C.P.Trevelyan. As always, however, a change of government did not mean a change in the prevailing economic circumstances, and Trevelyan, whatever his own feelings, had to continue the Board's policy on this issue.

In February 1924 Bush met Trevelyan and Selby-Bigge at the Board and he made his own position quite clear. He preferred to raise the leaving age to fifteen rather than introduce a subsidy and if the former were allowed he would make sure that the latter proposal was dropped. Bush in a spirit of reconciliation had said that if the Board would allow an increase to fifteen, he would accept that children could stay for a full school year or leave as soon as they got a job. The Board was completely against this saying it would revive the old custom of children leaving as soon as they had a job. Ultimately the matter was left with Bush.² At the Board Sir Edmund Phipps, one of the permanent officials who had attended the meeting, wrote a summary for the local H.M.I. Grindod. It appears from his notes that the Board were going to capitulate on raising the leaving age. "What do you say?...For it is extremely important that if this is to be done it should be done well: it will be a precedent for all England! And I am afraid that Bath has not got enough experience of good work for the elder children and good buildings etc. to undertake such a very difficult experiment." But H.M.I. Grindod knew his area well. The maintenance allowance "was not well thought out, were all the children to get it? About all this part of the business I feel there is a good deal of bluffing!" He mentioned the lack of a Director of Education and suggested that possibly the Bath Education Committee did not realise just what was involved administratively in letting children leave if they

1. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205 op.cit., L.A.Selby-Bigge to Edward Wood 31 December 1923.
2. Ibid., Minutes of meeting 27 February 1924.

found work, whilst keeping other children at school. But even so Grindod added "Is it beyond the wit of man to give Mr. Bush's plan - properly thought out, properly set out in black and white - temporary recognition? I know that a lawyer will think that a silly question. But the fact is that men like Bush who know the poor from the inside and who know business affairs and city life from the inside feel that they can tackle this transitional crisis in a fashion which is at the lowest better than doing nothing. If I were a free man and not a Board of Education official and not thinking about a national scheme and all that aspect of the business I could handle this business on Bush's lines and feel it would be better to do so than to drift."¹ Grindod's views were influential and Bush again went to the Board in April 1924. It is evident from the Minutes that the Board were prepared to accept the raising of the leaving age if it could be shown that there was no extra cost involved. Chief H.M.I. Richards took Minutes of Bush's visit and said that Bush was a genuine enthusiast who wanted Bath to be the first L.E.A. with a leaving age of fifteen. Bush had produced figures to show that by readjusting accommodation and employing two or three extra teachers it could be done. Richards argued that there was already an excess of children over accommodation in all of the senior schools in Bath which had classes with between 44 and 61 children in them.²

Bath wrote to the Board suggesting that only Oldfield Boys' and Girls' needed extra staff and that the three other central schools could be adjusted by use of partitions. Again H.M.I. Grindod defended Bath's plans "as regards the quantity of accommodation this is just sufficient (barely sufficient) for the experiment... as regards staffing the authority will provide what is necessary, as regards organisation there will be difficulties...Clearly there are risks - my own opinion is that the L.E.A. should be allowed to take them for the sake of the possible gains." But Chief H.M.I. Richards was more sanguine "I don't think so. For what are the possible gains? - apparently some provision for 25 per cent of leavers. It appears to me the Bath L.E.A. are in a dilemma because if some 75 per cent of

-
1. Ibid., Sir Edmund Phipps to H.M.I. Grindod 26 February 1924. H.M.I. Grindod to Sir Edmund Phipps 27 February 1924.
 2. Ibid., Minutes of meeting 12 April 1924.

leavers are going to stable and permanent employment the whole argument of wholesale demoralisation falls to the ground."¹ In the event it was Richard's view which prevailed and the Board wrote to Bath saying that if the byelaw was to be allowed it must be the L.E.A.'s intention to enforce the leaving age to fifteen as a regular thing and not to allow casual leaving to take a job. Further the Board insisted that it could not be carried through without considerable extensions to schools or else building a new school.²

Bush chose to interpret this in the Education Committee as some inexpensive huts and two or three teachers in the senior schools. He assured the Committee that if they did this they would get their byelaw.³ Thereafter various letters were exchanged between L.E.A. and Board. A year later the Board were still insisting that the initiative lay with the L.E.A. to provide precise proposals, plans, and estimates.⁴ However Bush's plans for extensions to the Girls' Secondary School had run into considerable opposition in Bath because of costs - some £12,000 was needed. The Board's officials jubilantly extrapolated from this the fact that if Bush could not get approval to borrow to expand the Girls' Secondary School he would not get it to expand the senior schools, and it was on that expansion that the Board's approval for the raising of the leaving age rested. Beside a cutting from the Bath Chronicle for 12 May 1925 about the argument over borrowing £12,000 an official noted "the Bath Authority are up in arms against Alderman Bush's education policy...It seems likely that the reply from Bath to our official letter of last August is indefinitely postponed."⁵ Bush had one last try in September 1925 when he wrote to the new President of the Board of Education Lord Eustace Percy ostensibly asking about children of twelve being medically examined but also asking about Bath's proposals to increase the leaving age.⁶ The letter did not reach Percy, one official called Bush 'tiresome' and

-
1. Ibid., Bath L.E.A. to Board of Education 29 May 1924. Notes by H.M.I. Grindod 11 June 1924 and Chief H.M.I. Richards on the same date.
 2. Ibid., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 17 June 1924.
 3. B.C. 23 June 1924.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205 op.cit., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 4 March 1925 and earlier letter 16 August 1924.
 5. Ibid., Minute dated 19 May 1925.
 6. Ibid., S.W. Bush to Lord Eustace Percy 14 September 1925. Board of Education to S.W. Bush 22 September 1925.

said that he could have found a better excuse for writing to the President. A reply was sent to Bush saying that the Board would give their views on Bath's proposals when they had received a reply to their August 1924 letter asking for precise details of building plans to accommodate the extra children. Knowing that Bush could not get this through the Education Committee and Council, no more was heard from him.

This whole issue of raising the leaving age to fifteen and a five shilling subsidy is interesting in that it shows on the one hand the determination of Bush (who by 1925 was 70) and on the other the equal determination of the Board and the Exchequer to block the proposal. In part the Board was dominated by the Treasury, but they could also see that by itself keeping children at school until they were fifteen, or until they had a job, was not very sound educationally and was only a brief palliative since it did nothing against unemployment. Bush of course hoped to make the senior schools into quasi secondary schools in the absence of real secondary schools in Bath. In turn the Board's officials were continually lamenting this lack and felt that Bush and the Committee should have concentrated on rectifying that. If Bath had money to spend, it should be spent on secondary provision they felt, and not on ill advised schemes which created difficulties and bad publicity for Governments at a particularly difficult time nationally.¹

The Board's officials frequently noted how urgently Bath needed a Director of Education, and in fact once H.W.Hoyle was appointed Director of Education in

1. C.P.Trevelyan was President of the Board for only eleven months (January to November 1924) during the years 1922-25 in which Bush pressed for the raising of the leaving age in Bath. Trevelyan not only advocated this policy but was to try to introduce Bills on three occasions between June 1929 to August 1931 when he was again President of the Board in MacDonal's Second Labour Government. MacDonal did not favour this increase in the leaving age and twice Trevelyan was unable to get his bill into the Parliamentary timetable and when he did it was to be defeated in the Lords. Whilst Trevelyan was happy to use the policy of later school leaving as a convenient method of relieving juvenile unemployment he would perhaps have been unhappy with Bush's motives which were to extend the time spent in the central school in the hope that a legal obligation to remain until fifteen could become a voluntary desire to remain until sixteen. More likely Trevelyan would have wanted the Bath L.E.A. to provide schools which were really secondary schools and not an emanation from the elementary schools. Trevelyan's period in office is discussed by R.Barker, *op.cit.*, pp.41-64. See also B.Simon, The Politics of Education Reform 1920-1940, (1974) pp.78-84, pp.151-167.

1926 he began to do a considerable amount of work.¹ The raising of the leaving age was temporarily shelved as Hoyle looked to a further amalgamation and re-organisation of the elementary schools. He had commenced working for the L.E.A. in April 1926 and presented his first Report in October. This plan noted that the first re-organisation of 1921 was very successful but that further moves were now possible. Bath had more than the average number of teachers, and above the average intake of head teachers, uncertified assistants and supplementary teachers. The proportion of certified assistants was substantially below the average for other county boroughs. Hoyle proposed to reduce head teachers by 30 per cent, increase certified assistants by 50 per cent, reduce uncertified assistants by 30 per cent and reduce the total number of teachers by 17 per cent.² The Committee planned to make the first moves and amalgamate six schools from January 1927. Some Anglican Councillors were angry. Bagshaw said that "This is a distinct threat to people who within the last few years have spent £30,000 on fabrics and who have spent equal if not larger sums before and on people who have paid their rates and taxes in addition to all their voluntary expenditure up to 1903 for a very vast amount of the working expenditure of the schools." He was concerned not only with the financial but also the religious aspect. "There would not be the high tone in the Biblical instruction in the Council Schools in this city if there were no church schools and no Roman Catholic Schools to make teachers of the Council Schools feel on their mettle."³ But other Churchmen adopted a realistic attitude. Prebendary Windsor acknowledged Bath's debt to those who had built schools long ago. "Those people had been pioneers of education and very largely out of their own resources carried it on. That accounted for having little schools planted all over the city." He only wanted assurances that no teacher displaced would lose salary, though he accepted that they might lose status.⁴

Thereafter Bath was able to re-organise and amalgamate schools with little

-
1. Bush had seized the opportunity to have a Director appointed in 1926. For the circumstances surrounding the creation of the post and Hoyle's appointment see below pp. 145-148.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 13 October 1926 also B.C. 20 October 1926.
 3. B.C. 17 February 1926.
 4. B.C. 20 October 1926.

if any protest from church school managers. Indeed so successful was Hoyle's work as a cost saving exercise that in July 1928 Council voted him a salary increase. Between 1921 and 1926 there had been but one amalgamation, but in two years between 1926 and 1928 Hoyle had effected six. Thereafter the 1930s saw few further changes in elementary school provision. That period in Bath was totally preoccupied with the secondary schools.

By 1930 Bath had a three tier arrangement of junior schools to eleven, senior schools eleven to fifteen, and secondary schools eleven to sixteen. At eleven there was an examination. Pupils who secured 50 per cent could transfer to senior schools. Those who secured 65 per cent were eligible for entry to a second examination for a free place in the City Secondary School. There was a fourth element the West Central School. This school will be discussed in greater detail in the following Chapter, but it was situated in Twerton which became part of Bath County Borough in 1911. It had been a Higher Elementary School, and for various reasons it was not easy to make into either a senior school or a secondary school, and so it became a central school. The H.M.I.s noted that "this is a good type of selective Central School. It takes those not accepted by the secondary schools who get 65 per cent of marks in the general exam for Schools at eleven years of age."¹ Parents had to sign an undertaking that their children could remain at the school until they were sixteen.

As for the other four senior schools they were officially elementary schools, and not secondary, no matter how much Bush might try to make the central/senior schools appear otherwise. Another enthusiast for central schools observed "while the Board enhance the dignity of the Central School they find it convenient to forget how sorely it is depressed by the inferior status to which they have relegated it."² Olive Banks suggests that the selective central schools (and indeed the junior technical schools which Bath also maintained) "both sprang, like their predecessors the higher grade schools from the elementary rather than the

1. P.R.O. Ed. 97/592 Hadow Re-organisation.

2. B.King, op.cit., p.30.

secondary tradition."¹ The comment of the H.M.I. about Walcot Parochial Senior School illustrates this in that the work schemes "are carefully designed with the idea of preparing boys for industrial life. With this end in view Science and Art take a prominent place." and for the girls "a three year course with a commercial and industrial outlook is planned."² But as the H.M.I.'s noted of all the senior schools, pupils often left after two years at age fourteen. (Frequently they transferred to one of the Bath L.E.A. schools which accepted pupils at fourteen, for example the Junior Technical School or the Junior Art School.) All of the senior schools were inspected in 1928. In 1933 they were again inspected and a single report on them all was issued. The Inspectors lamented the lack of space, facilities and adequate building. They noted that "the Junior Schools are not grouped in any definite way with Senior Schools and as parents are asked to exercise a choice, a Senior School may draw from several Junior Schools."³ The Inspectors felt that something had been done about curriculum but the impression is that they felt that the re-organisations and amalgamations were only administrative, and that the L.E.A. had not made the most of the opportunities to co-ordinate the work of the whole system of elementary schools. However the precise content of the curriculum was never of concern to the L.E.A. and was left to individual head teachers. Even Hoyle after 1926 had too much to contend with administratively to spend time with head teachers and teachers on this topic, because the real issue in Bath in the years between the two great twentieth century Education Acts was the provision of secondary school places.

-
1. O.Banks, Party and Prestige in English Secondary Education, (1955) p.97.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/39108. Walcot Parochial C of E Senior School 1922-33 Report by H.M.I. 1928.
 3. H.M.I. Report on Bath Senior Schools 1933 (Guildhall)

Secondary Education in Bath 1903-44.

"The working man had not to complain of want of education from want of opportunity but rather from want of perserverance in taking advantage of the opportunities that presented themselves."

Alderman Sir Harry Hatt Bath Chronicle 18 November 1929.

The 1902 Education Act required L.E.A.s to provide and maintain elementary schools and the Act also gave L.E.A.s powers to provide schools other than elementary. The Board of Education could only advance its views by advice and persuasion, its ultimate sanction was to curtail or discontinue the Government grant. These powers were sufficient for the Board to ensure that an L.E.A. fulfilled its legal obligations and provided elementary schools. However the 1902 Act was permissive with regard to secondary schools and the Board did not have the right or the powers to insist that an L.E.A. provide sufficient secondary schools, nor if there were already secondary schools that they be maintained to a very high standing.

The Board faced a dilemma in that a good L.E.A. would not need to be threatened and would try to make adequate secondary school provision whereas a lax authority would seize the opportunity provided by the curtailment of the grant to cease providing secondary schools. The Board had considerable difficulty with the Bath L.E.A. between the wars because one or two Councillors were eager to see a good system of maintained secondary schools but the majority were not. In 1902 the County Borough of Bath had one secondary school with fewer than three hundred pupils. By 1944 it had only two secondary schools, one for each sex. The four decades between the two great Education Acts did not see in Bath the implementation of a grand design for secondary education. On the contrary the stage was dominated by various Tory Councillors unable to understand why bright working class children should need more than a good elementary education, and by the Board of Education's officials and inspectors, alternately threatening and cajoling but ultimately impotent to force the Council to provide adequate secondary schools. Periodically the Bath Trades Council or the Workers Education Association entered stage left to demand more secondary provision, or from stage right the Ratepayers Associations and ad hoc bodies of householders and citizens entered to protest about costs or complain about the effects on property prices if a school was sited in their road. Centre stage Alderman Bush, Chairman of the Education

Committee and A.M.King¹ Chairman of the Secondary Schools Sub-Committee faced considerable difficulties as they both tried to establish sufficient secondary places. The four decades between 1903-44 saw the struggle between an L.E.A. determined by whatever means not to do what a Central Government Department wanted it to do, and that Department, the Board of Education, completely lacking the power to enforce their will.

The period between 1902-14 saw the Board at its most determined. However the Education Committee and the Council simply could not understand what was wrong with the secondary school which was housed in one wing of the Guildhall. As Chapter Three above has shown the school had cost nearly £20,000 to establish in 1895 and covered three floors. By 1902 the School was in buildings only seven years old. The H.M.I.'s report of 1904 had said of the building "the accommodation is insufficient for the needs of the School...The amount of free space available for extension is very small and it is doubtful whether it would be sufficient to provide for the needs of the institution."² It was this demand for new buildings which caused Councillors to regard the Board's general comments about secondary provision as unacceptable. The Council felt that school buildings no more than ten years old simply could not be inadequate. When the Committee discussed the 1904 Report Councillor T.F.Plowman observed that even if the Committee devised a new scheme "it would probably result in a rebuff from the authority of the Council as he did not think they would agree to any scheme being submitted which would result in any expenditure and if they did he felt sure the ratepayers would not."³ Councils have limited budgets and large projects involving considerable sums are carefully planned and implemented, but are then assumed to have a useful life. Obviously no Councillor, having been sufficiently enthused to agree to expenditure of £20,000 only ten years previously would expect that that project could be

-
1. A.M.King was the son of Austin King the Catholic solicitor who had been a member of the School Board and Chairman of the T.E.C. A.M.King was a co-opted member of the Education Committee and Chairman of the Secondary Schools Sub-Committee from 1905 until 1941.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5051 Report of the Inspection of Bath City Secondary School, 1904. A discussion of this Report concluded Chapter Five pp.89ff.
 3. B.C. 16 November 1906.

regarded as unsatisfactory and that further huge capital sums should again be necessary. The fault lay in the original siting of the school in the Guildhall, which did not allow for future expansion, made no provision for playgrounds or playing fields. However for the T.E.C. in 1895 to secure the wing of the Guildhall for educational use was a considerable coup, especially in view of the fact that it was very valuable space in the town centre accessible to all and they had persuaded Councillors and citizens of the real claims of a school on that space. The Board for their part simply said that the site was not adequate and that Bath must make alternative arrangements.

The first reaction of the L.E.A. was to try to show that the school was adequate, and by a system of scholarships to the independent sector to draw off any possible excess. A sub-committee was established to consider the provision of secondary education in the city. It reported in December 1907¹ and immediately said that since there was only one provided secondary school in the City co-ordination was not possible since the L.E.A. could not control the other schools. The sub-committee asked the head teachers of the elementary schools how many children would take advantage of secondary education and then concluded "we are of the opinion that even if Secondary Education were provided absolutely free not more than four per cent of the numbers on the books of boys and girls school in any particular year would be able to take advantage of it." From this remarkable conclusion they extrapolated their figures - in 1906 there were 4,700 children on the books and four per cent was 188 children, and these figures were based on entirely free education. "This is not of course the case and there is no indication that such will be the policy of the City Council for many years to come. Nor, indeed, can we urge (Mr. Prosser dissenting) that it should be, for what costs nothing is usually valued at little." Thus they felt that they could reduce the figure of 188 to 90. Since there was a three-year course they multiplied 90 by three and so suggested that the school should have accommodation for 270. However the School only had room for 190. So the sub-committee continued with

1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 January 1908.

their statistical Procustian bed by noting early leaving and suggesting that pupils did not stay for three years but two and a half years. Consequently 2.5 gave them 225 places still a deficiency of 35 places. "We are of opinion that this additional accommodation...should be provided at once [by adaptations within the existing buildings] in which case we consider that the accommodation would approach 270 and would be adequate for many years to come." They felt that for the brilliant child there should be the possibility to work through the secondary school to University. "The education given at the City Secondary School is not adapted to this end, nor in the interests of the majority of pupils is it, perhaps, desirable that it should be." Consequently they proposed that three scholarships should be offered each year, one each at Bath College, King Edwards School and Bath High School for Girls.¹

When the Report was discussed by the Education Committee Councillor John "Thought the report offered no answer to the question whether the provision for secondary education in the city was adequate. The Report was vitiated by taking for granted that the Committee had no responsibility whatever except to those children in the elementary schools and by paying too much attention to the genius." A.E.Withy, a co-opted member, said "All the Committee did in the way of co-ordination was six paltry scholarships. A mountain of labour produced a ridiculous mouse."² But Bush, knowing that he could only persuade the Council to accept modest advances, successfully discussed the Report in Council. He urged that expansion of the Guildhall site to accommodate 270 or 300 would mean that secondary education would be amply supplied in the Bath area and that three scholarships a year to children who displayed exceptional ability might be of value to the country. He concluded by saying that the H.M.I.'s adverse comments and the Board's threats to withdraw grant could be halted if the Council would adopt the Report "if carried the resolution would mean that they affirmed the principle that extension was necessary."³

-
1. The independent sector is discussed in Chapter Eight.
 2. B.C. 20 December 1907.
 3. B.C. 7 January 1908.

The Council accepted the Report, and resolved that on the question of more space the Education Committee should consult with the Corporate Property, Library and Art Gallery and Market Committees. Not only was the Guildhall the town's administrative centre and home of the secondary school but it also housed the town's enclosed market and was to house a Library and Art Gallery. The Committee did as requested, but realised that the Guildhall really was not adequate¹ and they proposed to ask the Council for the authority to discuss alternatives.² The Council deferred a decision on this until the Committee had had a conference with the local H.M.I.s.³

The local H.M.I. was E.Battiscombe and he had already made his feelings clear to the Board in 1906 when he added a confidential note to the Inspection Report of the secondary school in that year. He wrote that Bush "himself is very interested in the school and genuinely interested to do anything that he can to strengthen it; it is clear that he has considerable opposition to meet on the part of an influential section of the Committee who are not at all disposed to listen with any favour to anything that would involve additional expenditure on the school. Some of them would even appear inclined to regard the school as unnecessary."⁴ In March 1908 five H.M.I.s met the Education Committee and in essence they told them that to ensure payment of grant in future considerable repairs and improvements were needed to the Guildhall site and then "the Board might be satisfied with such an arrangement for temporary purposes provided the Board were assured that the Council would within two years commence the building of a new Secondary School on another site."⁵ The Committee resolved to do the repairs and to assure the Board of Education of making alternative arrangements within two years. In April the Council decided that the provision of additional accommodation (and not building a school on a new site) be deferred and that the

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 January 1908.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 21 February 1908.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 10 March 1908.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 Footnote by H.M.I.Battiscombe 20 August 1906 to Report of the Inspection of Bath City Secondary School, 1906.
 5. B.E.C. Minutes 20 March 1908.

Board were to be informed "that the provision of satisfactory accommodation for Secondary Education will be considered in conjunction with the proposal to enlarge the boundaries of the City."¹

The proposal to re-organise the boundaries, which eventually came to fruition in 1911, presented an opportunity which Bath Council were not slow to grasp. In Twerton, a small artisan suburb, adjacent to Bath, there were plans to build a higher elementary school. In fact as Olive Banks has pointed out very few L.E.A.s had instituted higher elementary schools, since the L.E.A.s had preferred to concentrate upon making the higher grade schools into secondary schools, whereas the higher elementary schools were a half way stage between elementary and secondary. The 1905 Code had introduced new regulations for higher elementary schools but by 1917 there were only thirty-one such schools in England.² The Council representatives met with representatives of Somerset County Council to discuss the proposed school, and the Bath Council Minutes noted that the Councillors also wanted to see how far the school "would provide for the requirements of this City and how far the position in regard to the City Secondary School would be modified by the erection of such a school."³ Nothing was resolved at the meeting but the Bath Councillors were optimistic that when Twerton became part of Bath, a higher elementary school could perhaps become a secondary school and so obviate the need to build. This was the basis of their reply to the Board on 16 April 1908 and again on 12 November 1909. On this second occasion they asked the Board for permission to defer a decision on secondary education until the Local Government Board had reported on boundary extensions.

In the interim the Education Committee had had plans drawn of possible alterations to the Guildhall. The proposals were dammed in Council by the colourful phrase of Councillor Powell who suggested that extensions in such a congested area "would be like putting a bird cage into the bottom of a slate cistern."⁴

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 15 April 1908.
 2. Olive Banks, *op.cit.*, pp.51-60.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 27 April 1908.
 4. B.C. 27 October 1908.

In March 1909 the Committee heard that the Board of Education accepted the need for a higher elementary school at Twerton which the Somerset L.E.A. were proposing. With considerable aplomb the Bath Education Committee wrote to ask the Managers of the Twerton Schools if they would consider an alternative site for their higher elementary school so that it would be more readily accessible by Bath children.¹ The Twerton Managers refused even to meet the Bath Councillors.²

Unknown to Bath officials, the Somerset officials had already approached the Board. Indeed the Somerset M.P. H. Barlow had written to the President of the Board of Education, Runciman, "could you let me know if the Bath Education Authority approached you with a view of blocking the project of a Higher Elementary School in Twerton. I am informed that the Chairman of the Bath Education Committee has made a threat that he will...I may tell you at once that the Twerton people are very much enraged at the idea of being deprived of the School, and it would be a very serious thing for them because Mr. Bush, the Bath Chairman's policy is one of secondary schools, not Higher Elementary Schools and of course a Secondary School is a much more expensive affair."³ Barlow wrote again in August 1908 to say that Bush had finally conceded that Twerton needed a higher elementary school "but he wants it put across the river in Bath." The Chairman of the Somerset County Council - Hobhouse - had found a site and Barlow wanted the Board to accept it.⁴

The local Inspectorate had summed up the Twerton area. "The population... consists almost entirely of the working classes, and their sons become artisans while their daughters enter domestic service, factories or shops. They cannot as a rule remain at school beyond the age of fifteen nor will they remain beyond thirteen unless provided with a type of education that will fit them for industrial pursuits."⁵ It was for this reason that a higher elementary rather

1. B.E.C. Minutes 19 March 1909.

2. B.E.C. Minutes 23 April 1909.

3. P.R.O. Ed. 20/121 Twerton Higher Elementary School File 1907-20.
H. Barlow to W. Runciman 30 July 1908.

4. Ibid., H. Barlow to W. Runciman 15 August 1908.

5. Ibid., Form G.H.E. Preliminary Statement by the Board of Education for a Higher Elementary School, 15 October 1908.

than a secondary school was felt best for the people of Twerton. Certainly they were interested in education for their children, and the Twerton School Board had provided and maintained four Board Schools all to a reasonable standard.¹ Bath's officials tried to persuade the Board to shelve a decision on siting until after the Local Government Board had decided. However a local philanthropist Jonathan Carr gave £1,500 to help to establish a free higher elementary school. In view of this the Board decided that a large central school for Bath and Twerton might help Bath but was not what Twerton needed. Furthermore Bath's previous delays were weighed in the balance against them. "It is also clear that the Bath Authority are in no way committed to provide any Higher Elementary Schools at all,"² wrote one Board official. In other words even if the Board did wait until after the boundary revision there was no guarantee that Bath would build the school. Better a higher elementary school built by Somerset, than a secondary school not built by Bath the Board reasoned, and so in May 1910 they approved the plans and the school was finished in October 1911. By that date Twerton was within the Bath County Borough borders and the higher elementary school was creating dissension with Council. Inevitably Bush was having to explain why such a school was expensive, the need for more substantial buildings and better qualified staff, and Bush had expressed his view that it would have been better for the City if it could have been a secondary school. A.E. Withy retorted "We don't want to have artisans' children taught French and Latin." Not that Withy did not value the school for he "gloried in the fact that there was in the city free to the child of any ratepayer a school where he could get specialised technical training, free and general instruction which went beyond the standard of the elementary school."³ This equivocal attitude towards schools and their role aptly illustrates the views of many Councillors during these years.

However even after the boundary changes Bath Councillors still found that the

-
1. The four P.R.O. files dealing with these Schools are Ed. 21/15567-15570. It should be noted that the Board's typists frequently typed Tiverton in error for Twerton. This is especially the case with Ed. 21/121 on the Higher Elementary School.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 20/121 op.cit. Minute unsigned and undated but about March 1909.
 3. B.C. 11 June 1912.

secondary school question would not go away. In February 1911 the Board had written to ask for specific details of the new site,¹ and in April 1911 the Board extended the recognition of the secondary school to 31 July 1911 but declared that it could not pay grant beyond that date until it was satisfied about the provision of proper accommodation.² However the Board did nothing about this threat until March 1912, long after their deadline had passed, asking the L.E.A. what was happening.³ A sub-committee was asked to report and it did so in June 1912 noting that no scheme involving expenditure on new buildings would be likely to find acceptance by the Council. If that assumption proved correct and the Board failed to pay any grant "the whole cost of maintaining the School will fall upon the Authority as from September 1911. This would involve an extra expenditure of over £1,000 per annum, representing the Grant which would otherwise have been earned by the School during the current year." The sub-committee's recommendation was that a deputation should visit the Board to ask for a stay of execution in view of the money already spent and a promise to try and do something in the future.⁴ The Town Clerk's letter to the Board was suitably dramatic, asking for an appointment and stating that "drastic action at the present moment by the Board may have serious and far reaching consequences on higher education in this city."⁵ A minute summarising the position for the President of the Board by A.R.Guest (a Board official) noted H.M.I. Battiscombe's shrewd view that Bath "would postpone consideration of the matter until their hands were forced by the Board." Guest noted the fact that eight years had passed since the School's premises were found to be unsuitable "and that the object of the L.E.A. seems to be to put off taking the matter in hand for some years longer."⁶

The deputation consisting of Bush, A.M.King and the Mayor T. Plowman, visited the Board on 18 June 1912. Plowman pleaded poverty, mentioning the huge drainage

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 17 February 1911.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 20 April 1911.
 3. The major correspondence between the Board and the L.E.A. during the years 1909-1912 on this topic is reproduced in a Report by a Council Sub-Committee B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 June 1912.
 4. Ibid.
 5. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 11 May 1912.
 6. Ibid. Notes by A.R.Guest 12 May 1912.

and sewer scheme which the borough had just undertaken at a cost of £250,000: furthermore he claimed that the rates in Bath had risen by 37 per cent since 1902 and the education rate by 241 per cent. Bush argued that the school was in buildings only twenty years old, and A.M.King even tried to suggest that in fact the buildings were not really that bad. In reply Runciman was brief. He said that the Board had to spend public money on efficient education and in those buildings the school was not efficient. Further a school for only 160 pupils (Bath had cut back on admissions slightly to please the Board) could not be regarded as a heavy burden on the rates. H.M.I. Bruce argued that Bath "had a very low rate of expenditure which was much less than the average for other schools of the same sort under the Board's jurisdiction." If a further time limit were imposed it would be final. H.M.I. Clay agreed to visit the school himself.¹ He did so in July 1912 and reported that the arrangements were thoroughly unsatisfactory.² Still Bath clutched at straws and the Board's architect was invited to visit - which he did on 10 July. But the Board wrote to Bath to say that to extend the school over the Market site in the Guildhall was unsatisfactory and that they would thus suspend payment of grant until realistic plans were submitted for a new school.³

Bush discussed the matter in the Education Committee. He said that the Board had "intimated, at least he accepted it as such, that if the Council would send forward a definite promise to build within a reasonable period the threat would be withdrawn." Bush looked at the Council's prevarication when the Committee had wanted to build and Council had wanted to wait until the boundaries were altered to take in Twerton "which was a polite way of getting out of spending money." Bush felt that "everything had been done in the way of securing the building that the Board of Education demanded, everything really had been definitely blocked when they had reached the Council Chamber."⁴ But another voice was raised in the

-
1. Ibid., Minutes of the Meeting 18 June 1912.
 2. Ibid., Report by H.M.I. Clay on the Bath City Secondary School.
 3. Ibid., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 29 July 1912.
 4. B.C. 20 September 1912.

Education Committee which was not so despondent as Bush's. Alderman Spear said that the Board "were making threat after threat and they were quite safe in disregarding the inquiries and quite safe in going on as they had done in the past."¹ Consequently the Committee decided to call the Board's bluff. Council met in October 1912 and discussed four alternatives. The first was to close the school and have no secondary education. The second was to carry on without the grant and increase the fees. The third was to make provision for education in other independent secondary schools. The fourth was to build a new school. The Council resolved to build a new school for 200 pupils at a cost of £10,000 if a suitable site could be found. Wardle, the Town Clerk, sent a copy of these minutes to the Board and suggested that this was the definite proposal which the Board had asked for in their letter of 29 July, and further "to ask that the Grant now in arrear may now be paid to the Authority."² The Board of Education were obviously in a dilemma. Bath had debated letting secondary education cease in the City, and Plowman had told Runciman that an influential group in the City and Council would be happy to see this happen, and thus save the £500 per annum paid out by the Council. However the L.E.A.'s promise to build a new school if a site could be found was an empty one, since the search for a site could be made to last for years with all the panoply of planning, purchase, objections, public inquiries. The Board lamely agreed to pay the grant in arrear and for one more year only to the end of 1912 subject to Bath making further progress on finding suitable accommodation.³ But then the Board had been saying that or making similar threats since 1906.

To play their part of the game Bath established a sub-committee to look into the matter and this reported in December 1912. Noting that conversion of buildings was impossible the sub-committee looked at twelve sites, but nine were immediately rejected because there was no playground area. A tenth site was rejected because the Council would not allow its educational use; an eleventh

1. Ibid.

2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 18 October 1912.

3. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit., F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 30 October 1912.

site because it was remote. The remaining site was in Marlborough Lane, quite acceptable to all and the Council was urged to accept it.¹ However site number twelve at Marlborough Lane was rejected by the Council because a petition was drawn up by owners of property nearby and presented to Council in January 1913.² Nothing daunted the Special Sub-Committee found a vacant site known as Freeman's Common, let to a local farmer. It was not very suitable and had little to recommend it beyond being available. However in March the proposal that it be the site for a secondary school was carried in Council.³ There were building restrictions and Bath appealed to the Local Government Board for help and the Board of Education supported their application. The following year the Special Sub-Committee submitted a Report on the requirements of the School, ten classrooms, Gym, Laboratories and so on,⁴ and in February 1914 Henry T. Hare, a London architect, was to adjudicate on the designs received for the School. Over a hundred were received and the designs of Messrs. Hickton and Farmer of Walsall were thought best. The Special Sub-Committee then asked for tenders.⁵ In August Bush wrote to the President of the Board to advise that he had seen a press statement to the effect that "the Board are prepared to facilitate without cost to the ratepayers the building of schools for which plans have been approved." With considerable audacity in view of all that had gone before Bush concluded that if that were the case the Education Committee "were prepared...to be responsible for the work to the pressed forward vigorously pending resumption of Committee meetings." The Board were sombre in their reply, observing that Bush was in error and that the Board "have not funds at their disposal out of which they can contribute towards the cost of erecting new school buildings."⁶ In January 1915 the Special Sub-Committee were still concerned with estimates - approaching electric companies and other companies to layout playgrounds. But no matter how

-
1. Ibid., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 8 November 1912.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 20 December 1912.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 January 1912.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 17 January 1912 and B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 March 1912.
 5. B.E.C. Minutes 18 July 1913.
 6. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit., S.W.Bush to Board of Education 13 August 1914. Board of Education to S.W.Bush 17 August 1914.

quickly those interested in secondary education tried to move and get the school built the more reactionary members had spotted their opportunity to halt this flurry of activity. On 2 March 1915 Council carried the motion that "before proceeding to obtain tenders for the erection of the new Secondary School the Board of Education be approached in order to ascertain the views of the Board and the Local Government Board upon this capital expenditure during the present national emergency, this Council being of opinion that Secondary Education in the City would not be unduly prejudiced by deferring the building of the new school until after the War is over."¹ Wardle wrote to the Board the next day. The Board could only agree "having regard to the Treasury restriction on capital issues referred to in Circular 903."² However the Board tried to salvage something and the letter continued "I am at the same time to draw attention to 2(c) of the Circular and to suggest that the submission of the finished plans of the School for their approval should not be delayed." One of the least well known consequences of the murder of the Archduke Ferdinand at Serajevo was the opportunity afforded the Bath L.E.A. to avoid providing an adequate secondary school.

No doubt those who were pleased to see the secondary school project shelved felt that the issue could be forgotten, at least for the duration of the war and possibly longer. Bush however tried to keep up the pressure and he looked at the accommodation for mentally and physically handicapped children which after the 1913 Act was a compulsory duty on Councils. A small sub-committee urged that such a school could be housed in a redundant elementary school - St. Michaels.³ This project he linked with the proposed secondary school. In 1916 the Board of Education and Local Government Board wanted to know what work local authorities would want to carry out after the war. On 20 October 1916 the Education Committee resolved to recommend to Council that these two items be included in the list of projects to be forwarded.⁴ On 31 October 1916 Council debated the Education

1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 2 March 1915.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 26 April 1915. Circular 903 was issued to all L.E.A.s on 8 April 1915 "Temporary restriction of expenditure on provision and improvement of school buildings".

3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 July 1916, see below p. 205.

4. B.E.C. Minutes 20 October 1916.

Committee's Minutes and Alderman Henshaw wanted to discuss the two proposed schools. He claimed to have no objection to these works but "he would like an assurance from the Chairman of the Education Committee that the Council should not be committed to the expenditure." Bush was quickly defensive and he "hoped there was not a thought in the mind of any member of not proceeding with the Secondary School at the close of the war." The Mayor, Alderman Hall, mediated very skillfully and suggested that the two projects be listed as "works in contemplation". Bush agreed to this and Henshaw said that the phrases met his wishes. "He only desired that they should reserve to themselves the right of fully discussing these questions when the proper time came."¹ This adroit move by the Mayor thus pleased both sides and was an admirable compromise. The Town Clerk, F.D.Wardle, eventually completed the Board's Form A Execution of Works after the War and it was returned in September 1917. Under the heading Description of Works he noted New Secondary School: on a three point scale to indicate urgency a,b, or c, he noted c [less important]: in answer to "Are the local authority prepared to undertake the works subject to any necessary capital being available" Wardle quite correctly wrote in "merely contemplated."² The Mayor's tactical compromise, translated onto an official form incensed the Board's officials. "It is effrontery on the part of the L.E.A.... to class this building as merely contemplated." wrote A.R.Guest. "This is a case in which action as soon as possible after the war should be strongly pressed."³ A letter was sent to the L.E.A. noting that a new site for a school was regarded as an urgent necessity "and that they expect that this want will be supplied as soon as possible after the war." The Board reminded Bath that continuance of grant depended on satisfactory progress and stated that though there was a war and building was perhaps impractical, "this does not mean that the conditions as to grant has ceased to be operative." The L.E.A. quite used to such harmless threats received the letter and on 19 October 1917 resolved to inform the Board of its intention to erect new premises

1. B.C. 31 October 1916.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 53/286 Secondary Education 1907-21, Form A Return by Bath L.E.A.

3. Ibid., Notes by A.R.Guest, 9 October 1917.

"as soon as circumstances permit after the termination of the war." Council adopted this resolution and Wardle informed the Board on 14 November.¹

After the war the Bath L.E.A. were aware that under the 1918 Education Act they were obliged to present a development plan. This caused them to consider all aspects of educational provision in the County Borough and not simply the secondary sector. Bush hoped not only to provide continuation schools, and made provision for the handicapped but also to seize the opportunity to re-organise the non-provided elementary schools into a junior and central school system. This was discussed in the previous chapter. At the same time he knew that the Board would want to see some positive moves towards improving the secondary school.

In March 1919 Bush moved in Council that the Beechen Cliff site be used. In fact fifteen years later this was to become the site of the boys' secondary school, but as its name suggests it is a high piece of land with a steep descent on one side. Consequently the reactionaries had obvious objections. Councillor Millett said that the site "appeared to be most inaccessible in every way. He did not know how the children were to get there unless they took them by aeroplane." The unfortunate Bush found himself defending absurdities "there might be a cliff railway up Beechen Cliff from the Old Bridge. (laughter) Gentlemen might smile but financially there would be a good return for money invested in such an undertaking."² Bush told the Council that the Board of Education accepted the site - which in March 1919 was not strictly true.

Wardle had written to the Board in February describing the site, emphasising its advantages - healthy, high level, fields adjacent for games, room for future expansion - rather than its relative inaccessibility. The Board's officials wondered what had happened to Bath's last proposal prewar, the Freemans Common site. No one knew. (In fact the Education Committee had simply noted on 12 February 1919 not to continue with Freeman's Common). H.M.I. Bettiscombe was asked and he felt that Beechen Cliff was an admirable site which would be snapped up for

1. Ibid., Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 12 October 1917. Bath L.E.A. to Board of Education 14 November 1917.

2. B.C. 4 March 1919.

residential housing if the L.E.A. did not get it. The Board replied to Bath's letter saying that all other considerations aside a loan would be needed and the Board now understood that the land was for sale by auction the next month. Treasury and Local Government Board sanction would be necessary and that could not be obtained so quickly. The Council however felt that the price was too high but the Board noted that under the 1918 Act there were powers of compulsory purchase. It was not until April 1920 that the Board formally acknowledged that the Beechen Cliff site was suitable for a secondary school but they noted that a compulsory purchase order would be necessary.¹

The Education Committee proposed to execute such an order but the Council was not in agreement. Alderman Colmer introduced a motion against and again Bush had to rehearse all of the old arguments - that Council was putting off the inevitable, and that if they had built before the war the cost would have been much less than it would be in the post war period. Bush even tried to mitigate costs. "There was no intention to present a recommendation for a stone school for secondary work. In some instances large huts had been used and personally he held that would be a wise solution to the problem...it would mean a minimum cost to the city...and it would enable extensions to be made without cost." Bush also saw another problem. "He did not wish to see those private secondary schools destroyed - many of them had been carried on with great value to the city, but he feared that the two problems of higher salaries for assistants and the superannuation scheme would mean the closing of the secondary schools of the city, not receiving recognition by the Board and not receiving grant in aid." Bush argued that if they did close them an even bigger burden would fall on the L.E.A. His reasoning was to no avail and the Council voted for Colmer's motion by 22 votes to 15.²

On 21 May the Committee pondered over why the Council had voted as they had. They felt that they had done exactly as Council had instructed. It is difficult

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit., F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 18 February 1919. Minutes by H.M.I. Battiscombe 25 February 1919. Board of Education to F.D. Wardle 22 February 1919. Undated unsigned notes. Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 21 April 1920.
 2. B.C. 4 May 1920.

to ascertain how Bush and the Education Committee members achieved it but in June 1920 Council accepted the need to compulsorily purchase the Beechen Cliff site. Possibly Bush persuaded a small number of influential Councillors that in the long term Bath had to find a suitable site. Whatever the case the matter was then laid to rest for the Committee and Council were concerned with drawing up Bath's plan in response to the 1918 Act. As the previous Chapter has shown this was mainly concerned with the elementary sector. In the Draft proposals "Secondary Schools" was the fifty third of a total of fifty seven items. The plan outlined secondary schools provided or contemplated in Bath. A classical school was outlined and a note appended, "This type is represented by King Edwards Grammar School." A school taking all pupils from elementary schools for ages eleven to sixteen was outlined. "The City Secondary School is representative of this type". A vocational school type was found to be represented by the Twerton Higher Elementary School. For girls the same three categories were found to be represented by the same schools, except Bath High School (of the Girls Public Day School Trust) was substituted for King Edward's.

Thus the only developments contemplated were an increase in scholarships at King Edwards and moving the secondary school to a better site. The section concluded that "until grants are made from the national exchequer on a more generous scale than at present the Authority are unable to provide free secondary education for all."¹ Small wonder that the three H.M.I.s for the area were sanguine when discussing the proposals for secondary schools. "No one acquainted with the history of that portion of the Authority's past can feel much confidence in what are described as 'immediate developments contemplated'". The three recommended that the Authority's proposals as set out in the scheme "offer a basis for a satisfactory development of Secondary Education in Bath, but in view of the long and inexcusable delays and procrastination which have hitherto thwarted every effort to secure proper secondary school accommodation the somewhat indefinite language which is used in referring to the provision of a new site must be noted.

1. Draft Scheme Under the Education Act 1918, City of Bath Education Authority.
(Bath Reference Library).

It must be made quite clear that the provision of new Secondary School accommodation is considered the most urgent of all the Authority's requirements." In a footnote they noted that the Beechen Cliff decision against compulsory purchase had been reversed but that there was a strong body of opinion in the city which would like to reject or delay the proposal.¹ The H.M.I.s said that Bath had requested permission to compulsorily purchase and they urged the Board to agree, which it did in May 1921. But in February 1922 Council changed its mind and decided not to use the compulsory purchase powers.²

A.M.King Chairman of the Secondary Schools Sub-Committee for nearly twenty years, weary of the endless prevarication made a decisive move. In the same Education Committee meeting in which Council's decision not to purchase was recorded, King made a statement. A property known as Oldfield Park House, set in four acres was on the market "and that, in view of the improbability of any action being possible within the next few years in connection with the proposed site on Beechen Cliff he had, after consulting with the Chairman of the Education Committee and the Town Clerk secured an option to purchase for £4,900." To keep up the momentum the Committee unanimously resolved that the action taken be approved and that the Secondary Schools Sub-Committee be authorised to engage A.J.Taylor, architect, to inspect and report on adaptations necessary to convert the building to a Girls School.³

Bush tried to present a fait accompli to the Council but Alderman Colmer, who had personally opposed every move Bush made on secondary schools "suggested that 'they saw Alderman Bush coming' and said it was a well known fact that the property could have been bought some time ago for a considerably less sum." In a previous debate Colmer had worried about costs and Bush had countered by suggesting that huts could be used. Colmer used that to his own advantage. "They ought to have an assurance that for the sake of the neighbourhood and the ratepayers living there that if any extensions were necessary they would be of a substantial character,

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 120/144 Schemes under the 1918 Education Act. Notes of the three area H.M.I.s 10 February 1921.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 February 1922.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 17 February 1922.

and not huts." However Bush allowed Councillors to rejoice in the fact that the purchase of the house would mean the end of the Beechen Cliff site. Some argued that by moving the girls into a converted house the boys could expand in the Guildhall and so there would be no further problems on this for twenty years or more. However the Board's letter agreeing to the house purchase specifically noted that premises for the boys would still be necessary.¹ In April 1922 a Report was incorporated into the Council Minutes on the proposed purchase with costings, and Council carried Bush's motion that the purchase go ahead at £4,900 and that an application be made to borrow £10,000 to cover purchase price and adaptations. This was done despite a residents protest to Council.²

King and Bush had taken a considerable risk in securing the option to purchase without either Council or Board approval. King and the Secondary School Sub-Committee having secured the agreement to purchase continued to forge ahead without waiting for loan sanction. The Sub-Committee resolved to ask the architect, A.J.Taylor, to prepare plans and to carry out work including the preliminary acceptance of tenders so that the School could open in September 1922 - six months hence.³ King was not only fighting his own Council but the ethos of the Geddes Committee in Central Government. The Town Clerk B. Ogden had advised the Board of Education of the position in March 1922 and a Board official had advised the President H.A.L.Fisher "If it is possible to allow any new Secondary School to be provided in the coming financial year I think that this is a very strong case...The Authority had not been an enterprising one and if we do not allow them to make this moderate advance now we shall throw matters back for a long time."⁴ In June 1922 the Council resolved to ask the Education Committee to reconsider the whole question of the alterations to the Oldfield Park property. Ten days later the architect A.J.Taylor had produced his Report in the form of a letter to A.M.King. Taylor overcame a number of residents' objections about siting the Assembly Hall and toilets, and concluded "if the decision of the

1. B.C. 7 March 1922.

2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 April 1922.

3. B.E.C. Minutes 21 April 1922.

4. P.R.O. Ed. 35/5799 City of Bath Girls School General File 1922-35, B.Ogden to the Board of Education 15 March 1922. Undated unsigned Minute March-April 1922.

Committee and Council upon the alternatives is to be awaited before tenders are obtained and new quantities prepared after their decision at least a month would be lost."¹

The Sub-Committee could not afford to lose a month for they had unanimously appointed Miss G.M.Thatcher M.A.(Oxon) as Headmistress at a salary of £500 per annum as from 1 September 1922 or such other date as may be necessary if the buildings were not ready. Miss Thatcher was asked to prepare recommendations with regard to staff. King was to pay the price for his precipitate action, for he had gone ahead and started the work without the Board of Education's final consent and by late 1922 he realised that a further £1,600 would be necessary. He visited the Board alone to ask them to meet the cost. H.M.I. Talbot said that the L.E.A. had gone ahead without final approval and King replied that their speed was necessary to stop others ruining the scheme. If the Board did not find the £1,600 then "there was not the slightest possibility of the L.E.A. finding it - it would only result in the work being left permanently unfinished." After he had left an official noted "I hope we shall not find that he went ahead without the L.E.A.'s authority as well as without ours." In fact the L.E.A. formally asked the Board to find the £1,600 which the Board agreed to do in November 1922.² In February 1923 the girls and staff had moved in and the Board formally recognised the school - henceforward the City of Bath Girls' School. The Council felt that the issue of secondary schools was now finished. The girls had a newly adapted school and the boys could expand within the Guildhall site. In June 1923 they agreed to rent a field at £15 per annum for boys' games. The field was on Combe Down, a long way from the Guildhall.

This brief lull in events provides a convenient opportunity to discuss the appointment of Bath's first Director of Education. Chapter Four above discussed the abortive attempt to make such an appointment in 1903. In place of a Director of Education the Council agreed to a triumvirate of the Town Clerk, the Principal

-
1. A.J.Taylor to A.M.King, 13 June 1922 incorporated into the B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 July 1922.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/3799 op.cit., Minutes of A.M.King's visit to the Board of Education 25 October 1922. Note unsigned 31 October 1922. Board of Education to Bath L.E.A. 8 November 1922.

of the Secondary School and the local H.M.I. It was wholly inadequate and effectively meant that Bath had no Director. However the Councillors felt that all the education service needed was a clerk, at best a literate and numerate administrator. In December 1924 Prosser, who had been headmaster of Bathforum and who, on retiring from that, had had a post in the Education Office on a nominal salary, finally retired from working altogether. The Education Committee requested that the chief clerk should receive a pay rise of £25 per annum and that a junior clerk should be appointed at £150 per annum. Councillor Tiley voiced the views of many when he said that "he thought things had been rather overdone in that Department [Education]. He did not see any stress of overwork, and he felt the office could be very well filled by simply having an additional clerk. The Education Committee was running up its thousands in every direction...An office boy a little bigger than they had at the present moment would do all they required." Bush was philosophical. There was a vacancy that had to be filled "and they had to take the view that some day probably nearer than they thought, there would have to be a Director of Education for Bath."¹

The Inspectorate were aware of the need for a Director and the records of the Board of Education contain frequent reference to this fact. When considering the Scheme under the 1918 Education Act the Committee of three H.M.I.s whilst observing the faults in Bath's Draft Plan also observed that "considering that there is no chief Education Officer for the County Borough the Scheme must be considered a satisfactory piece of drafting, it represents some exacting work on the part of a very few members of the Education Committee and of the very small number of Local officials who administer the Education Acts."²

The obstacle was A. Godfrey Day. He had been appointed as Director of Studies by the T.E.C. in 1892 and subsequently his title had become Principal of the Municipal Technical College. After the 1902 Act he had also had the responsibility for continuation classes, domestic and manual training, the pupil teacher centre

1. B.C. 17 December 1924.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 120/144 op.cit., Notes by the three area H.M.I.s 10 February 1921.

and his share of the administration. In 1907 to relieve some of the burden F.C.Homes had been appointed headmaster of the secondary school and pupil teacher centre. Even so in 1911 the District Auditor had reprimanded the Education Committee in general and A.Godfrey Day in particular, indeed he was surcharged. A head clerk, Cyril Clement, had disappeared and fees were missing. Clement was never caught. The Auditor remarking on the missing £153 stated that "had greater supervision been exercised it is difficult to see how so large a sum could have accumulated in the hands of this person without attracting the notice of those responsible." However the Provident Clerks Guarantee Company and the Guardian Assurance Company paid the sum, less £2.19s.0d. This shortfall was occasioned by the lapse of one day between the policies - and for this oversight A.Godfrey Day was surcharged for £2.19s.0d. It is difficult to decide who was really at fault for H.M.I. Curry was dead, the Town Clerk and Godfrey Day were both very busy. The District Auditor advised that precise accounting duties should be attributed to one person.¹

Whilst A.Godfrey Day was a Director of Education by default, Bush could not press for a real Director because Godfrey Day would be difficult to work with and the Council would complain about the overlapping expense of both men's salaries. But In December 1925 Godfrey Day indicated that he wanted to retire. In Council Bush immediately seized the initiative and "referred to the need of the new official and pointed out that hitherto it had not been possible to go to any one official to obtain information on both sides of education. If it had been higher education people had gone to Mr. Day, and if elementary education they had gone to Mr. Hopkins. Palpably the time was long overdue when there should be one man who could co-ordinate every form of education in the city and have a grasp of every detail."² Bush had considerable difficulty persuading some members of the Education Committee. Bagshaw "did not want to see any supervision which would interfere with the Headmasters or Mistresses who had the fullest confidence of the Committee." Alderman Dawe felt that such a Director "might come to be one of

1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 17 May 1911.

2. B.C. 1 December 1925.

the most expensive officers under the corporation." Alderman Long even wondered whether a Director would be able to do Godfrey Day's work. However Bush had thought it through and he urged that all of the financial administration and minuting could be done by a Clerk, leaving the Director free to guide the Committee in its deliberations.¹ The Council without a great deal of debate accepted the need. Bush visited the Board the following month to ensure that if Bath did appoint a Director the Board would not demand that Bath also appoint a separate Principal of the Technical College (since in theory this had been one of Godfrey Day's many roles).² Satisfied that the Board would not require this Bush got his Director. A.W.Hoyle who had a First Class degree in Chemistry and Physics from Manchester University and had just passed the Final Exam for the Bar was appointed in 1926. He had been an assistant master in Manchester and Bolton, and a Headmaster in Wigan and Bradford. Prior to his appointment in Bath he had been the Director of Education for Brighouse in Yorkshire. There he had re-organised the elementary schools into a junior and central school system with the break at eleven. Since this was the immediate task facing him in Bath this previous experience may well have made him more attractive to Bath Councillors. So successful was Hoyle that after only two years in the post this notoriously frugal County Borough raised his salary from £700 per annum to £1,000 per annum with Councillor Hunt observing that "sometimes the dearest officials were the cheapest."³

Hoyle was shortly to face his first difficulty for during the period of his appointment A.M.King, after a two year hiatus, had again raised the problem of secondary school accommodation. The girls' school needed extending and the boys needed new accommodation.⁴ In Council there was the usual uproar with Long saying "they had been told so often that unless such and such were done there would be a crisis in the education of the city. They were really tired of that cry of wolf." King had noted that £25,000 was needed to provide additional accommodation and that in 1925 twelve girls had been refused admission through lack of space.

-
1. B.C. 18 November 1925 and 23 November 1925.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 111/184 Appointment of a Director of Education for Bath. There are various random notes on file for the month of November 1925.
 3. B.C. 3 July 1928.
 4. B.C. 18 February 1925.

Long answered the first point by saying that he opposed higher education being made available to all girls regardless of their ability and as to those refused admission though lack of space "there was no reason why private school proprietors should not have a chance of taking in small numbers...he believed that the continual competition of the municipal school was crushing out the small proprietor."¹ King felt that £25,000 was needed, but in October 1925 the Education Committee accepted that £7,000 could finance the first stage of a three fold scheme. Application was made to the Board to borrow £7,500 for the extensions and the Board agreed. As ever the Bath L.E.A. searched for a celebrity to open the extensions to the Girls' School and in November 1927 it was Selby-Bigge who cut the tape.

In 1928 King raised the problem of the state of the Guildhall School. The H.M.I.s he said had commented in "the most stringent terms possible on the situation". Councillor A.C.Cook had a "feeling of shame" when he visited the school and found thirty boys in a room in the basement with only artificial light. H.A.Wooton, Headmaster of the public school, Kingswood, and an influential co-opted member of the Committee declared that "he had no idea it was in such a bad condition."² Consequently the Secondary Sub-Committee recommended that a new school was urgently needed for 350 boys. The Education Committee accepted this but the Council shelved it pending a consideration of capital involved. The Committee submitted the matter again, recommending the purchase of the nine acre Beechen Cliff site plus a further two and a half acres nearby. In October 1928 the Board approved the purchase and in December 1928 a compulsory purchase order was organised.³

Whilst this was being put in motion the L.E.A. drew up a review of the years 1926-29 and a programme for the years 1930-33. Caution was cast to the winds and a considerable expenditure was envisaged, including £45,000 for the boys' secondary school building costs and an unstated sum for even more enlargements of the girls' secondary school.⁴ The programme was published in October 1929 and

-
1. B.C. 2 June 1925.
 2. B.C. 21 March 1928.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 16 October 1929.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 16 October 1929.

the following month there followed the last and possibly the most bitter debate about educational provision. The reactionaries sensed that they had lost, and that secondary education was an open ended commitment - indeed they felt that was true of all provided schools. Rhodes Cook said that "without hesitation it was in the interests of the boys and girls who were going to learn a trade to start early...Educational authorities contributed to the unemployment of children because they paid too much attention to the school aspect and not enough to the industrial." From the left wing Councillor Sam Day "claimed for every child the right to a secondary school education if he or she showed ability to profit by it." and Councillor Arthur Ford said "opponents would spend a tremendous sum of money to keep their sons at school till twenty or twenty one to avoid their being hewers of wood and drawers of water, in short members of the labouring classes."¹ Despite this bitter debate the Plan was accepted and it would be possible to argue that the acceptance of the three year plan, involving expenditure of £146,000 (Council had only cut £26,000) marked a watershed in the attitude of Bath Council to educational provision. From 1902 until 1929 Bath Council absolutely refused to provide more than was necessary. Very gradually after 1929 the Council accepted the need for provided schools, and after 1945 until 1963 Bath had a high rate of educational expenditure - but always the underlying assumption was that the L.E.A. would help those who would help themselves, they would provide the moving staircase with no accommodation for sitting down. The boys' secondary school - henceforth the City of Bath Boys' School - was opened in September 1932 having cost £64,569.

One of Bush's obstacles to progress had been A.Godfrey Day. On his retirement A.W.Hoyle had been appointed Director of Education. The other main obstacle was F.C.Holmes, Headmaster of the Secondary School. As early as 1906 when Holmes had been head of the pupil teacher centre H.M.I. Battiscombe had noted the personal difficulty between Day and Holmes.² In 1922 a Board official noted "the present Headmaster is at least a worker, but unfortunately he is not very popular and

1. B.C. 18 November 1929.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 op.cit., Notes by H.M.I. Battiscombe 7 August 1906.

counts for little in the City and as a school master he has considerable limitations. (He entered the Secondary School sphere via the old time pupil teacher centre.)"¹ Holmes had been appointed as head of the City Secondary School in 1907, since he already ran the pupil teacher centre, in order to relieve Godfrey Day of some work. Parsimonious as ever the L.E.A. at that time had realised that Holmes could be asked to do two jobs for the price of one, and he had clung to office. Thus a stop gap in 1907 was in 1932 the headmaster of the only provided secondary school in Bath. However in September 1933 Holmes wrote to A.M.King to advise that he would be 65 in December 1933 "however I have no desire to relinquish my post. On the contrary I would be only too happy to continue to work for several years to come."² The Education Committee declined his offer and discussed his replacement. Some wanted a salary of £700 per annum by £25 per annum increments to £900. Long said "I beg you to go as high as you can for the top man...if however you have made up your minds to adopt a mean standard for the sake of £100 a year nothing I can say will influence your opinion."³ and Council agreed on £700 by £25 to a maximum of £850.

In February 1934 the Committee appointed R.Sayle M.A.(Oxon) Headmaster of Nelson Secondary School in Wigton, Cumberland. In 1937 the school was inspected and Sayle was congratulated on his work and direction of the school and judged very capable.⁴ But in July 1939 Sayle resigned. Mrs H. Gardiner a co-opted member of the Education Committee enquired "whether it were not a fact that Mr. Sayle would not have resigned if certain financial obligations had been fulfilled." Another member mentioned that "there are a good many rumours in circulation." The Chairman felt that the press should be excluded and the matter discussed in private. On 26 July parents and pupils made a presentation of a silver cream jug and sugar basin to Sayle. The speeches were full of vague phrases. Captain Harry Pryce, Chairman of the Governors, said "there are many of us who are firmly of the opinion that you have not had a straight deal." Pryce remarked that "a

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 35/5801 File on City of Bath Boys School. Undated and unsigned but probably mid 1932.
 2. S.T.K.Box 24 File 4. F.C.Holmes to A.M.King 30 September 1933.
 3. B.C. 16 November 1933.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5056 Report on the Inspection of the City of Bath Boys School, 1937.

certain section of the Bath community is very definitely opposed to the school in principle." and he concluded that "when this school was conceived, being built and eventually opened, it was known as 'Bush's Folly'. I venture to suggest it has been your Gethsemane and some of us feel that in that expression Bush's Folly something was implied which has occasioned your resignation."¹ The precise reasons behind Sayle's resignation are unclear. Possibly the Education Committee did not want Sayle to develop the School as he wanted, or possibly it was purely a matter of salary. A.M.King had on his file a typed list of the salary scales of the heads of many secondary schools in Bath, Bristol, Swindon and four neighbouring counties. Sayle's salary scale was amongst the lowest and the typed sheet was dated 8 June 1939, which was the same period that Sayle resigned.² His replacement was Dr. T.W.Taylor M.A.,B.D., who was appointed in December 1939. The resignation issue does illustrate that even though there was a strong provided sector, considerable opposition could still be created.

Certainly the two secondary schools had had to work very hard to establish their precise role in the scheme of educational provision in the City. In 1936 and 1937 Sayle had had difficulty with boys who wanted to leave early before completing a four year course, and indeed they were encouraged to do so by local firms. However in 1937 two of Bath's most important firms - Stothert and Pitt the engineering company and Isaac Pitmans the printers - both advised Sayle that they were prepared to encourage boys to finish their studies, and take the School Certificate. Previously these firms had preferred to have boys at fifteen for a five year apprenticeship. Consequently they had often filled their vacancies with ex-elementary school boys "some of whom are very good but are not of the same academic standard of the Secondary School boys." Sayle was delighted, because parents before sending their children to the secondary schools were obliged to sign an agreement to the effect that they would allow their children to complete a five year school course and many had chosen to break that agreement if their children found a job - "It will now be possible to draw the attention of

1. B.C. 26 July 1939.

2. S.T.K.Box 24 Loose Sheet headed Salaries of Headmasters in Secondary Schools.

parents to the importance the heads of these firms attach to a properly rounded off school course."¹ Sayle was not alone in this problem for his opposite number Miss Thatcher at the girls' school was gently criticised in an H.M.I.'s Report of 1938 for the number of girls who left school at or before the age of sixteen. Indeed the Inspector raised a fundamental issue - early leaving "coupled with the growing number of girls who on leaving seem to be satisfied with posts as shop assistants, typists and clerks invites inquiry into the interpretation placed upon the functions of Secondary School education by some parents."² A similar situation was noted in 1937 at the boys' school - of the 67 boys who left in July 1937 the majority entered local industry and commercial posts, only three went into higher education.³ In the headmaster's annual report at speech day in October 1937 Sayle spoke of eight candidates for the Higher School Certificates of whom six were successful "and I am told that six passes in this examination constitutes a school record...in a school of this size we ought to aim at a larger number than this and although an increase will not be possible for a year or two I hope we shall eventually come to regard this year's results as no more than a beginning."⁴ As the Inspector at the girls' school had suggested parents were not entirely sure of the purpose or indeed value of a secondary education. In part the Inspector had discussed the major problem when he said that "in view of the liberal provision of other branches of education in Bath the school undoubtedly has to admit many pupils low down on the scholarship list to obtain its quota and the question arises whether all its entrants are capable of deriving full benefit from a secondary school training."⁵ Although this Chapter has suggested there was a paucity of provision this is true only in the secondary sector - these two schools were faced with enormous competition from vocational schools. Chapter

-
1. S.T.K.Box 24 File 1. A.W.Hoyle to A.M.King re Stothert and Pitt 26 February 1937. Copy of J.F.Smallwood of Sir Isaac Pitman and Company to R.Sayle 6 March 1937. Copy of H.Potton of Stothert and Pitt to R. Sayle 10 March 1937. R.Sayle to A.M.King 11 March 1937.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5058 Report on the Inspection of the City of Bath Girls School 1938.
 3. Inspectors Report op.cit., 1937.
 4. S.T.K.Box 24 File 1. Draft of Headmasters Address on Speech Day 16 December 1937.
 5. Inspectors Report op.cit., 1938.

Nine below will discuss this aspect in greater detail but there were at least eight evening practical instruction centres, a Technical College, a Junior Technical School, Junior School of Homecrafts, a Junior Commercial School and a School of Art. There was also a huge independent sector with schools ranging from prestigious public schools to appalling dame schools. The two secondary schools consequently lost children to the vocational schools, and the very able went on L.E.A. and Governors scholarships to King Edwards and Bath High and the central/senior schools provided further competition leaving these two secondary schools to create their own identity. However the vocational aspect was already covered and if they tried to be highly academic they would be regarded as pale imitations of the independent schools. Occasionally this led to delightful parochial squabbles. In December 1934 W.F.Long of the Governors of King Edward's wrote a very petulant letter to A.W.Hoyle. "At the last meeting of the Governors of the King Edward School the point came up as to the similarity in caps between the King Edward School and the Bath City Secondary School. Is there any reason why these schools should follow each other in their colours. It seems to me a very bad taste for one school to follow another...As far as I can see the former Head Master [F.C.Holmes] tried to follow the King Edward School in every move and now at last he still retains the same colours...We tried to get the colours registered under the Trade Mark and Designs Act but the School failed in this respect...I should be glad if you would discuss this matter with the Headmaster and there is no reason why as soon as the old caps wear out the City Secondary School should not change its colours."¹ Regrettably the reply is not in the files. But it was inevitable that the boys' and girls' secondary schools would try to establish some recognisable link with established prestigious schools whether it be a vaguely similar uniform or important guests for speech days. In 1933 A.M.King tried to persuade the poet John Masefield to attend the annual prize giving, but Masefield with the gauche bad manners of the famous replied with a printed all purpose card declining the invitation.² In April 1937 there was

1. S.T.W.Box 24 File 4 Copy of letter from W.F.Long to A.W.Hoyle 12 December 1934.
2. Ibid., printed card from J.Masefield. Undated.

some excitement when Oliver Stanley the President of the Board of Education accepted an invitation to the girls' school prize giving, but the following month Baldwin's National Government was replaced by Chamberlain's National Government and Stanley went to the Board of Trade. Earl Stanhope who replaced him had a previous engagement and the substitute offered - Kenneth Lindsay, Parliamentary Secretary of the Board - was perhaps rather too obscure.¹

Similar caps and famous personalities are merely part of the very long haul involved in establishing schools. Five years is very little in the life of a school, it seems one generation of children through from age eleven to their School Certificate. In the years before 1944 the two secondary schools had a very difficult time, but after the war and the re-organisation following the 1944 Act these schools were a major force in Bath, beholden to none and able to face the competition of any other school.

1. Ibid., Copy of letter from B.L.Pearson, Board of Education to A.W.Hoyle
2 June 1937.

Independent Schools in Bath 1903-44.

"I'm a public-school man. That means everything. There's a blessed equity in the English social system' said Grimes, 'that ensures the public-school man against starvation. One goes through four or five years of perfect hell at an age when life is bound to be hell, anyway, and after that the social system never lets one down.'"

Evelyn Waugh, Decline and Fall.

It is ironic that the three prestigious public schools situated in Bath were all of very humble foundation. Kingswood School, founded by Wesley in Bristol, moved to Bath in 1861 and was to provide free education for the sons of impecunious Methodist Ministers. Monkton Combe School was begun in 1868 by a Missionary, the Reverend Francis Pocock, in his own house and his declared aim was to train boys as missionaries. His only pupil started in January and died in March. Finally the Royal School for Daughters of Officers of the Army opened in Bath in 1865 and was essentially for girls whose fathers had died or been killed on active service. Fees were paid by the Army - and it was only on a majority vote of the managing committee that the word "necessitous" was not included in the school's title.

These three schools, all coming to Bath in the 1860s have developed from these unpromising origins into schools of considerable repute. The headmasters of Monkton Combe and Kingswood are both members of the Headmasters Conference. The former was first elected in 1904 and the latter in 1925.¹

Kingswood was founded in 1748 by John Wesley. It was a Spartan institution. In a pamphlet written in 1749 a number of questions and answers are produced in order to give potential parents the feel of the school.

The interlocuter asks

"You leave no time to play"

and the bleak reply is

"He who plays when he is a child will play when he is a man."²

By 1845 the Management Committee reported that larger buildings were needed and a site was found on the slopes of Lansdown in Bath, and a purpose built school for 150 boys was erected at a total cost of £16,000 and the school moved in 1861.

In 1889 W.P.Workman was appointed Headmaster at the age of 26. A Fellow of Trinity College Cambridge he was author of a number of school textbooks. He

-
1. A.C.Percival, The Origins of the Headmasters' Conference, (1969) p.90.
 2. The whole tract can be found in A.G.Ives, Kingswood School in Wesley's Day and Since, (1970) pp.11-19.

raised considerable sums to build classrooms and a physics laboratory since he was eager to encourage the modern side. By 1909 he could report 32 Oxbridge awards which was a considerable number for a small public school. Indeed numbers and finance were a continual problem for Kingswood, both linked to the same cause. Since only the sons of Methodist Ministers were admitted and since they were admitted without payment (fees being paid by the Ministers' Childrens Fund) there was a finite pool of boys from whom the School could draw. By 1914 there were only 178 boys instead of 250, some of whom were under 13 and should have been at a preparatory school. The obvious solution would have been to admit the sons of laymen, which would have boosted numbers and injected money into the school. However Workman "belonged to a generation that was quick to think of the admission of boys other than ministers' sons as dilution, and as calculated to destroy the esprit de corps of the School."¹ Workman died in 1918. He had not only been a vigorous headmaster but had also served on the School Board and been a co-opted member of the Education Committee.

H.A.Wootton, Headmaster from 1919-28, knew that the school had to be improved in a number of ways. The salary scale was poor and Wootton wanted not only to improve this but also join the Superannuation Scheme run for all teachers by the Board of Education after 1919. In turn this required that a school be recognised as efficient. Indeed so persuasive was Wootton that the Governors were prepared to countenance accepting fee-paying pupils nominated by the L.E.A. since Wootton wrongly thought that this was a condition of recognition. However in 1920 the school was inspected, and the H.M.I.s whilst acknowledging Wootton's abilities noted that "the present staff is overworked and their teaching hours are inordinately long. If really efficient masters are to be secured it will be necessary to offer better salaries and prospects than at present."² In the discussion with the Governors, after the Inspection, the Regional Inspector E.M. Battiscombe urged the need for younger men with better qualifications. He noted

1. Ibid., p.187.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5072. Report of the Inspection of Kingswood School. 1920.

the poor state of the General Fund.¹ These criticisms notwithstanding Kingswood was recognised in 1921.² Wootton then prevailed on the Governors to accept laymen's sons and in 1922-23 the first arrived. In 1928 Wootton left to become head of the Perse School in Cambridge and the new head was A.B.Sackett who held the post until 1947. Under him Kingswood flourished. The H.M.I.s returned in 1930 and noted that "altogether it is a remarkable story of progress and it is the more remarkable in that so much has been done in the past five years".³ The staff was "a good staff with plenty of teaching power and without any serious weakness."⁴

In 1939 when the H.M.I.s again visited they noted a roll of 337 boys of whom 120 were sons of laity paying fees. 127 boys came from the public elementary schools. In the previous three years half of the VI Form had proceeded to Further Education and the Universities. "Materially the School has been almost entirely rebuilt or replanned in the last 18 years, and is now in a very admirable set of buildings."⁵ The Inspectors were fulsome in their praise. "The Governing Body may be congratulated on having a very fine school under inspiring leadership."⁶

It is tempting to compare this progress with the much slower progress of the State Secondary sector as discussed in Chapter Seven above. But it would be an unfair comparison. Kingswood tapped a lucrative source of funds when they accepted the sons of the laity and by having only 120 fee paying out of 337 there was no dilution. Furthermore grateful old boys would make gifts. For example in 1936 W.A.Posnett provided a magnificent library for the school. Two old boys were directors of the firm of Reckitts of Hull, of which the driving force was T.R.Ferens, a prominent Methodist. When it was known that approximately £15,000 was needed for classrooms and laboratories Ferens offered the money. When the architects report put the cost at closer to £30,000 Ferens simply wrote "It is a

-
1. Ibid. The notes of these discussions were not printed in the issued Report but were typewritten and included in the folder which housed the printed Report at the Board of Education.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2164 and Ed. 35/2165 are both General Administrative Files concerning Kingswood for the years 1904-21.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5073 Report of the Inspection of Kingswood School 1930.
 4. Ibid.
 5. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5074 Report of the Inspection of Kingswood School 1939.
 6. Ibid.

pity not to complete the whole scheme the thing needs to be done properly."

and he gave the extra money.¹

Monkton Combe School also had to rely on the generosity of patrons, as well as fees. It began in 1868 as a private school to prepare boys as missionaries and a junior school was added in 1875. The school changed hands at least once prior to 1900, and in 1900 a Syndicate was formed to run the school. Members of the Syndicate included five vicars, a Lloyds underwriter, a barrister and at least one member of staff, and Monkton Combe School Ltd. was formed. It was to be an Evangelical School, and shares were not to be in the hands of anyone not in sympathy with the school's aims. A.F.Lace has given a very lucid account of the school's financial arrangements, which were to change again during the twentieth century.² Small wonder that when the Inspectors arrived in 1925 they should note that the school "is much better than might have been expected from its curious history."³ Profit was not the purpose behind the Company. In 1935 the Secretary of the Governors wrote to the Board of Education discussing a change to charitable status and noted that the dividend was limited to five per cent "the intention being to retain any surplus profit above that percentage for the benefit of the School."⁴

Despite its financial background the school did well, the Inspectorate noting that it "has taken its place among the smaller Public Schools of the country, prepares boys for various professions and occupations." The school buildings were the result of "a series of more or less successful improvisations, buildings being acquired and additions made as financial and other circumstances permitted."⁵ This adaptation of buildings continued to be a problem. As Lace notes "the picture one gets is that the School's finances were such that the Headmaster could not afford to have, for even a short time, buildings not fully used or more than the normal proportion of staff to boys. Then, when numbers began to go up

1. Quoted by Ives op.cit., p.203.

2. A.F.Lace, A Goodly Heritage. A History of Monkton Combe School, (1968)

3. P.R.O. 109/5135 Report of the Inspection of Monkton Combe School, 1925.

4. P.R.O. Ed. 27/8374 Letter of 24 October 1935.

5. Inspection Report 1925 op.cit.

from 1935 the problem was where to house the extra boys; and when this had been arranged, the numbers again began to drop."¹ When the Inspectorate returned in 1937 whilst congratulating the Governors on the improvements that have been carried out during the previous twelve years they felt that much still needed doing, and they urged that "every effort should be made, possibly by appointing to the staff as vacancies occur a few men with high academic qualifications and some experience, still further to improve the quality of the work."²

Despite praising buildings and facilities the Inspectorate made clear that they were uneasy about the curriculum at both Kingswood and Monkton Combe. At the latter in 1925 they noted that "the amount of advanced work in Science...is comparatively limited."³ However, at Kingswood they were quite specific "the question arises whether such a curriculum is in fact wholly suitable for modern requirements and whether some time could not be spared from the major subjects in order to make more provision for the other."⁴ At both schools the curriculum was very academic, biased towards the Classics, and at Kingswood in the 1930s lacking Art, Music or Manual Instruction above the Third Form. Correlli Barnett has attacked public school education in fierce terms. "The modern side was seen as a refuge for the second rate. Most masters and the cleverest boys were classicists."⁵ In turn this meant that "British governing-class education was really appropriate to a moment in history that had already vanished - that of mid Victorian prosperity and security...They had been educated in fact to think of themselves as super prefects, administering the empire justly and efficiently in the interests of the governed. They hardly thought at all of British power in terms of industrial competitiveness, science, technology or strategy."⁶ Though Barnett goes on to analyse Eton and its provision his strictures apply to the two minor public schools under discussion. It was not until the 1940s that a really well balanced curriculum was evolved at both schools.

-
1. A.F.Lace, op.cit.,p.203.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5136 Report of the Inspection of Monkton Combe School 1937.
 3. Inspection Report 1925 op.cit.
 4. Inspection Report 1930 op.cit.
 5. C.Barnett, The Collapse of British Power, (1972) p.32.
 6. Ibid. p.42.

The Royal School for the Daughters of the Officers of the Army was founded in 1864. A philanthropist A.D.Hamilton, realised that there had been public appeals during the Crimean War for widows and children of non-commissioned soldiers and sailors, but there was no provision for Officers' dependents. Consequently he attempted to rectify this, and in 1864 Queen Victoria agreed to donate 100 guineas and subscribe 10 guineas annually. Other sponsors quickly followed her example, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, two Dukes, four Duchesses, the Viceroy of India and numerous others.¹ The School came to Bath because an earlier school, the Bath and Lansdown Proprietary College had failed in 1862 and the buildings were bought for £400. Initially there was 30 pupils, a Lady Superintendent and three governesses. Girls were admitted to the school between the ages of twelve and fifteen. In 1910 the Inspectorate reported that entry was through one of four ways. Girls were "elected" by reference to their father's service and circumstances; presentation by the Governors (one only each year); by fees; or by scholarship. Finance came from fees, donations, legacies and investments.²

The school was rather a dour place, it is reported that in the 1890s to improve their posture "some girls did their lessons with broom handles behind their shoulders, held in the crook of their elbows...They frequently walked with books on their head."³ The headmistress at that time was Miss J.M.Walker an ex-student of Maria Grey Training College and mentioned in the roll of honour in the College Prospectus along with various female empire builders "because despite her home base, she qualified for the top group by caring for the offspring of the Imperial guardians."⁴ The headmistress from 1898-1910 was Miss C.M.Blake. She had been at the school for thirty years, as both pupil and governess. The Inspectors found in her "a marked refinement of character with a business capacity of no mean order."⁵ Though they recognised the school as a result of the

-
1. The details are taken from H.Osborne and P.Manisty, A History of the Royal School for Daughters of Officers of the Army 1864-1965, (1966).
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5077 Report of the Inspection of the Royal School 1910.
 3. Osborne and Manisty, op.cit., p.70.
 4. B.Turner, Equality for Some: The Story of Girl's Education, (1974) p.111.
 5. Inspection Report 1910 op.cit.

Inspection, they were severe in their criticism. The staff worked hard but lacked qualifications, the Inspectors did not like the division of the girls into A and B groups, with the latter following a limited course. The reasons for the school seeking recognition are nowhere fully explained. Certainly the Governors had no wish to accept girls nominated by the L.E.A. and since they were catering specifically for Army officers' daughters they had no need to appeal to a wider group.

The two historians of the school are not too critical, but even the Inspectorate had difficulty keeping a balanced view. In 1926 the Inspectors wrote "the School can look back now on sixty years of high aims and successful achievement, and is worthily maintaining its great traditions."¹ However only four years later they were very critical. "The general standard of work in Science is not high...The methods employed by the teachers need reconsideration... The accommodation does not fit the needs of the school very well...Miss Collett (Maths) is sound but rather dull and her own personality is also rather dull... For the moment the children should be encouraged to shout - to do anything in fact that will show they are alive."² However after 1946 the school developed under three successive strong headmistresses into a very good public school for girls.

It is important to note that though these three schools were within Bath and could always draw local civic and religious worthies for speech days they were not in any sense local schools. All three were boarding schools, taking few if any day pupils. In each case their pupils came for a specific reason, to train as missionaries, or because their fathers were Army officers, or because they were Methodist ministers. Even when the schools altered their intake they never attracted a very large proportion from Bath. In 1910 the Inspectors' Report notes that two per cent of pupils at the Royal School came from Somerset, 89 per cent from the rest of the United Kingdom and nine per cent from abroad. In 1930 the Inspectorate wrote of Kingswood that the school drew its pupils from all

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5078 Report of the Inspection of the Royal School 1926.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/5811 A General Administrative File on the Royal School 1923-33 in which a number of H.M.I.s' Supplementary Reports are kept.

parts of the country and from abroad.¹ However these three schools had an influence on the educational establishment of the City. Though they accepted few if any local children their presence was still of considerable influence. The hierarchy of schools was firstly these three, then the town's two grammar schools, then the private schools and finally the provided schools.²

Bath had two grammar schools - for boys King Edward IV founded in 1552, and for girls Bath High School a member of the Girls Public Day School Trust. King Edward's School was an endowed grammar school,³ and by the early twentieth century its endowments (which were based on rental property) were not producing much income. In 1904 the Inspectorate noted "there is no immediate prospect of any material increase in the rental of the real property which forms the bulk of the endowment...The expenditure on the repairs of the School property other than School buildings is considerable...it appears that the School is just paying its way."⁴ Indeed not only the school's finances but also much else concerning the school was criticised by the Inspectorate. The school buildings were cramped, hemmed in on three sides by other buildings, with badly lighted and ventilated rooms. Equipment was adjudged meagre and poor - and an Art room was needed. The Inspectors urged that rather than waste money on the buildings a new site should be found. It was also felt that the Governors should institute a scale of salaries and a pension scheme. The Inspectors noted that the head "is himself an excellent teacher and takes a very full share of the teaching work" he should have more free time to attend the lessons of the staff "some of whom might profit by his counsel and experience." They noted that changes in staff were frequent. As to the curriculum they noted that the school prepared for the Cambridge Local Examinations

-
1. Inspection Report op.cit., 1930.
 2. There were two other independent schools in Bath. Prior Park College was a Roman Catholic boarding school drawing boys nationally not locally, and La Sainte Union Convent which though mainly a day school was specifically for Roman Catholics. They have not been discussed here but books and information about these two schools are listed in the Bibliography.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 27/4047-4061 and Ed. 35/2162-2162 give considerable detail about the precise foundation, and endowments, as well as sundry items such as compensation by Bath Council for the loss of a piece of land.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5067 Report of the Inspection of King Edward's School 1904. This Report and the Report for 1912 and 1920 can also be found in a General Administrative file on King Edwards Ed. 35/2161 which contains interesting correspondence and Inspector's notes.

but felt that the "external examination instead of being regarded as a convenient test of efficiency...becomes an end in itself and dominates the curriculum to the exclusion of essentials and to the violation of the elementary principles of sound teaching." However King Edward's School had a purpose - to get boys through examinations and the Inspectors had to note that "the [examination] results are such as to show conclusively that the boys are well prepared for examination by their respective form masters. The Schools examination record is a very creditable one."¹

The basic criticisms were to remain, throughout the first four decades of the twentieth century, buildings, finance and staff. However King Edward's had as much difficulty finding a site as the provided schools. On 30 May 1905 F. Ernest Shum, Clerk to the Governors and a Governor himself wrote to the Board of Education to advise them that finding a new site would be difficult and in itself create difficulties, the Governors being of the opinion "that the removal of the School from the centre of the City would be prejudicial and would probably result in a reduction in the number of the scholars, bearing in mind the fact that King Edwards is essentially a day school and that the bulk of the boys in attendance are the sons of citizens engaged in trade in the city."²

The Board did not press the point, but at each subsequent inspection some critical observation would be made about the premises. In 1912 they wrote "it is disappointing to find that nothing has been done."³ and again in 1920 that they were "insufficient" and by 1939 quite bluntly that the small size of the buildings "preclude any claim to distinction".⁴ In fact the school did not move to new premises until after World War II and the junior school still occupied the old premises in 1979.

The school had always tried to have a Classical bias but it had had to produce the kind of courses which the parents of the boys wanted. Shum in his letter to the Board in 1905 mentioned that the boys were mainly traders' sons,

-
1. All quotations from the Inspectors Report 1904 op.cit.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2161 Letter from Ernest Shum, 30 May 1905.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5068 Report of the Inspection of King Edward's School 1912.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5071 Report of the Inspection of King Edward's School 1939.

and the Inspectors noted that "this School is the only avenue through which the sons of townsmen of moderate means can hope to proceed to Universities."¹ The Inspectors' analysis of "Class of Pupils" lists 40 with professional and independent parents, 28 as merchants and bankers, 54 retail traders, 55 clerks, three farmers, two arisans and two elementary schoolmasters. Very similar figures appear for 1912. Such parents would prefer a practical education for their sons, to prepare them for the family business, or for the administration of someone elses' business. The Classical side would appeal to some parents with aspirations to Oxbridge degrees for their boys but certainly not to all. Consequently the school had a Modern and a Classical side. In an undated Prospectus of about 1900 the text describes the Classical side where "boys are prepared for the Universities, the Learned Professions and general pursuits."² and the course included Latin, Greek, French, Maths, History, Geography, Language and Literature, but no science at all. "The Modern side is adapted to qualify the boys for Mercantile Manufacturing and General Business Pursuits and for the Civil Service Examinations...No pains are spared to secure for the boys the acquirements most needful for business life."³ Subjects taught included Bookkeeping, Commercial Correspondence, Shorthand, Physics and Chemistry.

This wide curriculum caused the school to be quite popular and by 1912 it was full to overflowing for as the Inspectors observed "there is no other School of precisely the same kind in Bath and because of its endowment it should be able for a moderate fee to offer to citizens a complete education to prepare for commercial life or University."⁴ But the school never seemed to be of the first rank. The Inspectors constantly compared what might be possible with the actuality. In 1927 they wrote that "very few pupils go to University and not many enter the teaching profession...The School does not at present offer sufficiently good prospects to really able and ambitious boys."⁵ and in 1939 they noted "as formerly the majority go into business on leaving...The work in general is sound though not

-
1. Inspection Report op.cit., 1904.
 2. King Edward's School Prospectus (Bath Reference Library)
 3. Ibid.
 4. Inspection Report op.cit., 1912.
 5. Inspection Report op.cit., 1927.

distinguished...There is, on the whole, a lack of vigour and inspiration in the teaching."¹ The ultimate judgement came in an undated and unsigned note to the Board (presumably an Inspector writing about 1930). He said that King Edward's School had a new headmaster "who has pulled up the work but he seems to be satisfied with things as they are and this is not enough. There is already evidence that the new City School has affected admissions and it is to be confidently expected that a good appointment to the City School to replace the present Headmaster who is due to retire soon will have a serious effect. A vigorous enterprising Headmaster might do something to save the situation but as it is the Grammar School with its much higher fee has little more to give them than the City School except perhaps a small measure of social prestige."²

Kathleen Symons, daughter of E.W.Symons, headmaster from 1896 to 1921, has written a not unbiased history of the school to 1921. She wryly suggested, on the question of recognition that "the pressure brought to bear on Endowed Schools to surrender themselves voluntarily to Board of Education control was strongly reminiscent of the methods of the Dissolution - the results of surrender or opposition appearing in wide contrast."³ This notwithstanding the school was recognised in 1920 and in April of that year the L.E.A. resolved to support the Governors of King Edward's in their application for recognition to the Board. In return for ten per cent free places the L.E.A. offered to pay £200 in the first year to the school, up to a maximum of £750 in any one year. The Board replied on 11 May 1920 that the school would have to provide 25 per cent free places. Shum replied in August arguing for only ten per cent on the grounds that the Municipal Secondary School had a high percentage of free places provided by the City, and that if the Board were to insist upon 25 per cent the King Edward's School finances would not stand it. Later in the same month the Board accepted ten per cent for the school year 1920-21 but would give no commitment as to the

1. Inspection Report op.cit., 1939.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/5806.

3. K.E.Symons, The Grammar School of King Edward VI Bath, (1934) p.366.

percentage for the future. In effect however ten per cent of free places remained constant.¹

It is ironic therefore that a school which the Inspectors felt was lacking distinction and in poor premises should attract talented boys from the elementary schools, when they equally felt that the provided secondary school offered a better and cheaper alternative. A similar situation obtained at Bath High School for Girls. This began in 1875 and was the seventh school founded by the Girls Public Day School Trust. Initially this was a Company run on profit making lines. Indeed Turner bluntly states "the idea was to sell education to the Victorian middle classes in terms they could best understand. A school...did not have to be a charity or a state supported institution; it could just as easily be run as a business with a profit and loss account."² Shortly before the turn of the century the Company limited dividend to not more than four per cent and in the first years of the twentieth century it became a Trust, and local authorities were given places on governing bodies of the Trust's schools. H.M.I.s visited Bath High in 1901. They felt that the local management committee were apathetic since they had little to do. Events were controlled from the centre. "No doubt dual control of this sort is extremely difficult to work. It might be worth considering the analogy offered by the relations of Local School Managers to the School Board in London."³ They were not happy with the buildings which consisted "of two picturesque old private houses thrown together". There was no Gym, the science laboratory "only fair", the Library needed developing and playing fields were half a mile away. They did feel that under the new headmistress Miss Shackleton, (who was the first women to be co-opted by the new Bath L.E.A.) "that the school will reach a higher level of efficiency and prosperity than it has yet attained." As a result the Regional Inspector recommended that the school be

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2161 F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 15 April 1920. Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 11 May 1920. F.Ernest Shum to Board of Education 4 August 1920. Board of Education to F.Ernest Shum 24 August 1920. See also Ed. 59/88 Bath County Borough 1921 Grant Files, being administration of grant aid to non provided secondary schools, which contains sundry correspondence and notes on King Edward's School's grant.
 2. B.Turner, op.cit., p.111.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5061. Report of the Inspection of Bath High School for Girls 1901. The Report and the Reports for 1909 and 1914 can also be found in the General Administrative File Ed. 35/2160 which contains interesting correspondence and Inspectors' notes.

recognised. However he did enter one caveat when he noted "this is one of the G.P.D.S. Company's Schools which meets regularly in the mornings only. I understand that this is the case with all the Company's Schools."¹ All of the G.P.D.S.T. schools met from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. - the afternoons were entirely free. The Inspectorate frequently remarked upon this until the school adopted a full day in the 1920s. The concomitant of recognition was the Higher Grant to the school if the Governors wished. On 20 October 1907 the Board of Education advised the Trust of this and on 29 October 1907 the Trust replied that they did not wish to apply for the Higher Grant since they believed "that they will best serve the cause of education in the districts where the Schools are placed by maintaining their position as girls' schools of the highest type and that they would not be able to do this if the conditions for the management of the Schools and the admission of scholars necessary for obtaining the Higher Grant were adopted for the High Schools of the Trust."² However it must not be assumed that Bath High School was socially exclusive. Like the boys' equivalent King Edward's School it had a high proportion of girls whose fathers were traders and manufacturers. In the Report of 1909 and 1914 the H.M.I.s listed the occupation of the girls' fathers.

Occupation	1909	1914
Professional	65	46
Traders	19	19
Manufacturers Wholesalers	23	13
Commerce	19	5
Farmers	3	2
Artisans	4	2

In 1909 the Inspectorate noted that "with the exception of girls holding Scholarships awarded by the Local Authority there are hardly any pupils from Public Elementary Schools."³ By 1914 they noted "only four girls at present come

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2160 Note by H.M.I. E. Battiscombe on Form 122 P.R. Inspectors Report on the Suitability of a Secondary School for Recognition. 20 December 1905.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2160 Council of the G.P.D.S.T. to the Board of Education 29 October 1907.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5062 Report of the Inspection of Bath High School for Girls 1909.

from the Public Elementary Schools and owing to a modification of the Local Scholarship system in Bath it appears probable that the number may be even smaller in future."¹

In a booklet published in 1972 to celebrate the Centenary of the G.P.D.S.T. the headmistress of Bath High School in the 1970s, Miss D.J.Chapman, wrote "a search for knowledge has always ranked high among the school's aims. Because of the intellectual ability of women like Maria Grey and Mary Gurney and their conviction that girls would enjoy studying at a serious level, full opportunities were available from the beginning for the study of mathematics, classical and modern languages, as well as English, history and geography."² However the Inspectorate had reported in 1914 that "in view of the social conditions of Bath it is natural to find that the great majority of the pupils are being trained for home life."³ In 1925 the school was not then full and pupils had only to pass a "not over severe"⁴ entrance examination and in 1934 the Inspectors felt that "the academic equipment of the mistresses indicates soundness rather than scholarship."⁵ However by 1934 the school had a junior school, which led to a five year course in the senior school, and School Certificate, and then on to the VI Form.

However as with King Edward's School the inevitable problem was accommodation. Even after the school moved in 1924 the Inspectors could only say that "compared with other public schools the School lacks the external dignity and attraction that attach to and grow with a permanent school house or building standing in grounds of its own."⁶ On a more prosaic level in 1934 they observed that the site was noisy, rooms were small, the sloping site made extension difficult, and there was no formal library, some 2,200 books being kept on shelves in the hall.

During World War II the school premises were hit by bombs and as a result the Trust seized the opportunity to rebuild, keeping the facade but creating a modern school interior. Since 1946 both Bath High School and King Edward's have become

-
1. P.R.O.Ed. 109/5063 Report of the Inspection of Bath High School for Girls 1914.
 2. D.J.Chapman, 'Bath' in G.P.D.S.T. 1872-1972 A Centenary Review, (1972) p.30.
 3. Inspection Report op.cit., 1914.
 4. P.R.O.Ed. 109/5064 Report of the Inspection of Bath High School for Girls 1925.
 5. P.R.O.Ed. 109/5065 Report of the Inspection of Bath High School for Girls 1934.
 6. Inspection Report op.cit., 1925.

schools of considerable academic repute in very modern buildings.

These two schools have spent many decades establishing themselves but Bath College was in existence for only twenty five years. The College was founded in 1878 and moved into purpose-designed accommodation. In 1899 it was ailing financially and was taken over by the Bath College Company Ltd. with "the object of maintaining it as a School providing a classical mathematical and general education of the highest class."¹ However its Company status did not detract from its qualities. "Though Bath College is technically a proprietary institution its function, spirit and traditions are essentially those of a first-grade Public School."² Certainly its intake was socially exclusive. In 1908 it had only three boys whose fathers were retail traders, whereas 72 were professional or of independent means. There were 41 day boys and nine boarders from Bath and 38 boarders from other counties.³ The school had a modern side by the early twentieth century preparing boys for the Forces and business careers. But the school was primarily Classics based. Its first and most important Headmaster was T.W.Dunn. When he died in 1930 The Times published a long obituary claiming that from 1878 to 1902 under him Bath College was "for its size, probably quite the best classical school in the country"⁴. Despite being so successful the school failed. The Times obituary suggests that it was a question of finance only. "To give a liberal education without endowment, as all schoolmasters know, is almost impossible and through no fault of Mr. Dunn's...it became more and more apparent that [the school] was not a paying concern."⁵ However had Bath Council so desired the school could have continued, and the real interest of Bath College in relation to education in Bath lies in its failure.

On 8 June 1909 Lord Bath as Chairman of the Governors wrote to the Bath Council to ask if they would advance a loan of £8,000 for the school and grant £300 p.a. for a scheme to place it on a Public Educational Trust basis.⁶

-
1. P.R.O. 109/5050 Report of the Inspection of Bath College 1908.
 2. Ibid.
 3. These figures are taken from the Inspection Report op.cit., 1908.
 4. The Times, 8 October 1930.
 5. Various details can be found in a Scrapbook about Bath College at Bath Reference Library.
 6. Copy of the letter can be found in B.C.B.C. Minutes 1909.

The Council established a sub-committee to look into the matter which in turn wrote to the Board of Education for advice.¹ The Board were prepared to acquiesce but felt that it was a matter for the Governors and Bath L.E.A. In May 1909 H.M.I. Battiscombe in an internal Board Minute had noted that "there is no question of competition with other schools...It is definitely an asset to Bath but its future is now hanging in the balance...It would be a great pity if it were closed but the situation is very precarious."² In fact the Board had recognised the school in August 1908 and Bush, knowing the school's financial difficulties had arranged for the Council to pay two scholarships for boys from the L.E.A.'s elementary schools. In April 1909 he had visited the Board with the school's Governors and stated that the school played an important part toward the provision of secondary education in the Bath area and Bush hoped the school would continue. He hoped that the Board would not press the school to make 25 per cent of its places free since it was already admitting elementary school pupils. The Board officials made the obvious point that it could not receive a grant whilst a proprietary company. The Governors readily agreed to become a Trust.³ The advantage to Bush was that he would have a few more secondary school places, for by 1909 he had realised that to persuade Council to make adequate secondary provision was very difficult.

But despite this careful preparation the debate in Council on 21 September 1909 resulted in a vote of 21 to 14 against the idea of aiding the school. Some were concerned only with finance, suggesting that it would be wasteful of ratepayers' money and that there was still no guarantee that the school would survive. The previous day there had been a meeting of ratepayers who objected to the idea, as did the Labour Party and the Trades Council. Alderman Plowman "objected to the Trades Council thinking only of what concerned themselves and disregarding wider interests. Bath was paying in rates not less than £10,000

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2159 Bath L.E.A. to Board of Education 17 August 1909.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2159. E.M. Battiscombe, 9 May 1909.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2159. Minutes of the Meeting between Board of Education Officials and Ald. S.W. Bush, Chairman Bath L.E.A. and Governors of Bath College, 27 April 1909.

per annum in connection with Elementary education alone, and practically the whole of that sum was going to aid the working classes." Certainly financial prudence dominated the debate, but a more substantial objection, almost left undiscussed, arose at the very end and is well illustrated by the exchange between Bush and Councillor Long. Bush said "if a boy had capacity and knew how to behave himself it did not matter whether he was poor or rich. He was treated as he ought to be." To which Long replied "If what Mr. Bush said was correct why did the Governors of Bath College formerly exclude the sons of tradesmen from attending the College." Bush did not reply.¹

Possibly the real reason for refusing to support the College was fear of the future cost, but the debate was an opportunity for many to voice their deepest social prejudices and it was this latter which remained in people's minds as the reason for the school's failure.

The day after the debate the Headmaster A. Trice Martin wrote to H.M.I. Mitcheson. "In July all was going apparently well - but during August all sorts of agitation was stirred up by a few firebrands. There were undercurrents of opposition of which I had suspected nothing and yesterday to my amazement I found that even in the minds of one or two respectable and aged aldermen there was rankling the fact that more than ten years ago the College was not open to tradesmen's sons. This is rather hard in view of the fact that the restriction was abolished more than ten years ago and of the work which I have done for elementary schoolboys."² Forty years later at an old boys' dinner Alderman Plowman bluntly stated that "resentment was shown by leading tradesmen who had put up the money for the college, when they found that their sons were not allowed to enter the college, they withdrew their support when the establishment tried to revive it after financial difficulties."³

The local tradesmen, whether Liberal or Conservative, were the real power in Bath and were the establishment. Self made men who like Bush had left school at

-
1. B.C. 21 September 1909.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2159 A. Trice Martin to H.M.I. Mitcheson 22 September 1909.
 3. B.C. 24 September 1949.

ten or eleven or twelve wanted a good education for their children. The three major public schools were for Methodists' sons, officers' daughters or putative missionaries, thus local tradesmen looked to Bath College and were rebuffed on social grounds. But they still had children who needed education. Consequently they turned to those schools which they understood, which provided an education which was practical not classical and in which they felt comfortable. It was not the major public schools which distorted educational provision in Bath, it was the private school industry.

By a careful use of files at the Public Records Office, newspapers, minutes and sundry items it is often possible to chart the history of an individual school. But with the private schools little survives. Consequently rare items reveal only a blurred snapshot of a school captured for one moment. Rarely did the schools last for long enough to have several generations of pupils forming Old Boys Associations. Equally few old pupils have written histories of these schools. Prior to 1944 the Board of Education only inspected non-provided schools if the school wished to be recognised as efficient and qualify for a grant. Few private school owners cared whether the Board thought they were efficient or otherwise, and anyway grants could only be paid to endowed schools or schools run by charities. After the Teachers' Superannuation Scheme was introduced some such schools asked for recognition in order to join the scheme. Presumably this was to attract better staff, but very few seem to have taken up this option, few private schools even paid salaries on the Burnham scale. Consequently the Board of Education had very little material on file about these schools. The 1944 Education Act required private schools to be registered, recognition was a further option. However registration was not carried out until the late 1950s. Consequently the D.E.S. now has files on all schools in the non-maintained sector whether charitable or private but under the Public Records Act these will remain closed for thirty years, or fifty years in the case of H.M.I.s' Reports. Despite this sparsity of material it is possible to glimpse the extent of the private school industry in Bath. The Post Office Directory for each year from 1870 to the 1970s carried a list of maintained and private schools as well as tutors. The

Director also had advertisements paid for by the tutors and school proprietors. Prior to the 1902 Act there were a multiplicity of tutors offering all manner of tuition. In 1880 the following appeared:

"The Rev. E. Pelham Pierpoint M.A.Cam.

Late First Mathematic Master for twelve years at the Somerset College
receives at his residence

18 Park Street, Bath

As Boarders or for Private Tuition young Gentlemen whose leading
subjects for Competitive Examination are in Mathematics, English
and Natural Science."¹

In the same edition the Ladies College at 27 The Circus discreetly advertised -
noting its staff, Lady Principal Mlle Hurbert de Fonteny, Bible Classes Rev. T.P.
Methuen, English History and English Literature J.W.Morris, Professor of the
English and Latin Language, Mr. S.Edwards, A Resident German Lady, a Resident
English Governess."²

The purpose of the advertisement was to appear to offer culture and breeding
to the middle class. Indeed there was a fashion at this time for schools to call
themselves Avon House Middle Class School, or Portway Middle Class School. Indeed
this latter dropped Middle Class from its title and became the Portway High
School. Bath Reference Library has a Prospectus for the school dated 1902. Inside
the Principal had written "With J.Knight's Compliments. Soliciting your kind
recommendations."³ Evidently it had been used as a business card, and left in
the hope that it might generate custom. The school was housed at 93 Newbridge
Road - today a private house - and the Prospectus stated that the Principal was
a Member of the Royal University of Ireland and a science and art teacher. The
curriculum was specially "arranged to qualify youths for professional and business
life" and pupils were prepared for the "Examinations of the Royal College of
Preceptors, the preliminary Examinations of the Law Society, Pharmaceutical Society,

1. Post Office Directory 1880.

2. Ibid.

3. Portway High School Prospectus. (Bath Reference Library).

Civil Service, Royal Drawing Society, Matriculation at London or Dublin Universities etc."¹ The Prospectus stated that the school began in 1837 and the last entry in the Post Office Directory is for 1914.

Generally the private schools gave a very practical education with the emphasis on the 3Rs, plus a little French and Latin, leavened with Bookkeeping Typewriting, Shorthand and occasionally 'Swedish Drill'. Schools had their specialities. Grosvenor College advertised not only "Home Comforts" and "Careful Home Training" but also "Entire Care of Indian and Colonial Pupils".² In the same year the Green Park College advertisement illustrated another facet of the business minded proprietor (in this case Mr. F.S.Wells B.A.) the ability to cast very wide and offer as much as possible to as many as possible. Thus the school had Preparatory, Junior and Senior Departments, as well as external students, and made provision for "backward and weakly pupils" and had boarders by "the day, week or term."

In the 1902 Directory there were eleven private schools advertised, five tutors, and five music tutors. By 1974 there was one private tutor and seven private schools. One closed in 1975. In 1976 St. Nicholas School in Pulteney Street closed, its Principal Miss Willis had opened the school in 1930. In 1978 Trevoise School closed, having been opened by its Principal Miss M.K.Minnet B.A. in 1947. Throughout the period these schools rarely had more than twenty or thirty pupils.

However between the wars at least three private schools applied to the Board for Recognition. In 1920 Duke Street School for Girls was inspected. The Inspectorate noted that the school had thirty four girls whose fathers were professional men, thirty two were retail traders (Bath College had three such) eighteen were farmers and fourteen were clerks or in public service. The school had two spinster Principals, five part-time and five full-time staff, and with 123 pupils the school was full. The Inspectors rather than list what facilities the school possessed found it easier to list what it did not possess. There was

1. Ibid.
2. Post Office Directory 1910.

no gym, no lab, no art room, no staff room and only a small yard. As for the curriculum there were many faults which "can hardly be remedied unless the services of an adequately qualified and efficient staff can be obtained. This is not practicable without largely increased expenditure."¹ There was a further inspection six years later, presumably to allow the Principals to have corrected faults noted by the Inspectors in 1920. One of the most interesting comments in the 1926 Report is that "the opening of the City Secondary School for Girls caused a serious drop in numbers from which it would seem that the School is now beginning to recover."² This clearly suggests that the private schools flourished in the absence of adequate state secondary provision. However there was still much amiss at the Duke Street School. Burnham Salaries were not paid and "the organisation will not be satisfactory until a clear four years course above Form III is planned."³ In February 1927 the Board refused to put the school on the recognised list, but agreed to consider the matter the following year.⁴ In November 1927 the Board accepted the School as efficient.⁵ Regrettably there are no Inspectors' notes to explain this and so it can only be conjectured that the Principals must have made radical improvements. But in 1932 they moved the school to another area of Bath and changed the school's name to Combe Park High School and in October 1936 the school closed.

Victoria College was inspected in 1925 and recognised in the same year. It accepted boys between the ages of seven to sixteen, at which they entered other unspecified schools. The premises were two adjoining houses and were cramped. The Inspectors felt that the school was generally sound up to school certificate level but "the curriculum is determined too narrowly by the requirements of external examinations."⁶ But then success in external examinations was practically the

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5059. Report of the Inspection of Duke Street School 1920.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5060. Report of the Inspection of Duke Street School 1926.
 3. Ibid.
 4. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5060. Board of Education to the Principals of the Duke Street School. 2 February 1927.
 5. P.R.O. Ed. 35/5803. General Administrative File on Duke Street School. Letter of 14 November 1927 from the Board of Education to the Principals.
 6. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5081. Report of the Inspection of Victoria College. 1925.

sole raison d'etre of these schools. St. Christophers School was essentially a preparatory school working towards the common entrance examination. It had moved into the premises vacated by the junior school of Bath College in 1911 and was inspected in 1931. The Inspectors found the school "satisfactory though not a conspicuously high standard is reached in the various subjects of the curriculum."¹ They noted that in the previous two years no boy had failed the common entrance examination, but equally none had gained scholarships.

One important point is that in practically every Inspection Report they note the poor quality of the staff and their lack of qualifications. A modern apologist has taken a very robust attitude towards unqualified staff in private schools. "There can be no doubts at all that the best of our unqualified staff make an invaluable contribution to the schools. It is not only in cricket that the enthusiastic enterprise of the amateur can sometimes be more vitalising than the safety first tactics of the professional."² Unqualified staff were not only enthusiastic they were also cheap. If the provided schools were offering better salaries, pension schemes and facilities a qualified teacher would have little reason to work in private schools. Writing of the Duke Street School the Inspectors thought that "it would be difficult for the school to secure graduate Mistresses unless they, for family reasons, wished to live in Bath."³

Proprietors ran their schools to make a profit, though one, Miss E.J. Silversides, inspired considerable devotion. The Clarendon School opened in 1894, Miss Silversides retired in 1918 and the school closed in 1919. However in the 1970s over forty old boys and girls still met annually.⁴ The sole record of the school is to be found in 'Clarendon Memories' 1894-1919. Compiled by two past pupils in 1974 it is simply four duplicated pages of the verbal statements of other pupils. They remember with affection the headmistress, her deliberate policy of charging low fees and giving "handsome prizes". Notwithstanding her personal qualities the school work was dull. A former pupil recalled that "one

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 109/5080. Report of the Inspection of St. Christophers School 1931.
 2. P.L.Masters, Preparatory Schools Today, (1966) p.50.
 3. Inspectors Report op.cit., 1926.
 4. B.C. 11 May 1972. A Report of a Reunion of Old Boys and Girls.

of my main efforts was to memorise Gray's Elegy, the reward being a small edition beautifully illustrated. At a later date the groups in the main classroom were required to express some thoughts in verse form. A General Election was pending for I remember writing in praise of the Liberal Party and extolling the virtues of Mr. Lloyd George." Perhaps the most revealing quotation in the booklet suggests not only the teaching methods, staffing and curriculum but also hints at an innocence long since lost by school children. "On two occasions Dr. Sparkes from next door came in to give a demonstration in anatomy; at one time a bullock's eye and then a sheep's heart. There was great excitement to have a man teacher, especially that while showing the sheep's heart and holding it over a plate his watch fell out. He had to ask Miss Silversides to put it into his breast pocket which she quickly did. Later the girls enacted the scene in the cloakroom." However the real value of the pamphlet is the fact that it notes that the daughters of both Alderman Bush and Alderman T.B.Silcock attended the School. "In 1907 a party was given to the School by the Mayor and Mayoress of Bath to mark the school leaving of their daughter Muriel Bush. On another occasion the prizes were presented by Mrs. Silcock Mayoress of Bath and mother of Peggy and Agatha."¹ This was considerable patronage since Silcock and Bush were important members of the Bath educational establishment. These two would presumably have had an entree to most schools in Bath for their daughters, and yet they chose the Clarendon School which lasted for only 25 years. Its premises at 1 Prior Park Buildings (by 1979 derelict) and 5 Widcombe Crescent (simply a house with a little garden) could not have meant it was particularly prestigious, nor do these notes suggest that the facilities or curriculum were first rate. However it is a measure of the influence of the private schools in Bath that these two men should send their daughters to such a school. If private schools in Bath were an industry, they were essentially a cottage industry. But one man, R.E.Cannings, was a tycoon of the school industry. Though his origins at the beginning of the century were humble, by the mid 1950s

1. I. Willway and J. Huntley, 'Clarendon Memories 1894-1919' (1974) (Bath Reference Library).

he could assemble the religious and lay establishment of Bath to attend his various schools' functions.

R.E.Cannings was an ex-pupil of the City Secondary School. Feeling that he might like to teach he applied to A.Godfrey Day who advised him that there were no vacancies in Bath but urged him to look to Chippenham Secondary School. Cannings applied and was successful and taught on Tuesday and Thursday evenings at Chippenham, as well as getting more work on Monday and Wednesday evenings at Bradford on Avon and on Friday evenings he was teaching in Melksham. Instead of a restful weekend after so much mid-week travelling, he organised his own students for all of Saturday. He had been trained in basic business practice - bookkeeping, shorthand and typing - and it was these skills which he taught to his students. He did this immediately prior to and during the first years of the First World War. In 1915 he hired a room in Northumberland Building for ten shillings a week. It is a prestigious site on a through way between Queens Square and Milson Street, both of prime importance in Bath. For his first thirteen weeks he had but one student. At the end of that first term his second student arrived. Cannings though in his early twenties showed that he had a brilliant intuitive grasp of his product and its marketing. "I remember I charged seven shillings and sixpence a quarter in those days - then I had a brain wave and decided to raise the fee to half-a-guinea a term. It was a difference which gave a little more prestige to what I was trying to do."¹

In 1917 he enrolled a young girl of thirteen, Edith Jones. However because of the school leaving age he advised the Board of Education and his letter had none of the servility which others felt it politic to adopt. He wrote "I consider her parents have the right to pay a private fee if they wish" but he was prepared "to co-operate with the Local Authorities sending particulars of any students commencing training here under fourteen years of age." Not that he thought much of L.E.A. schools for he told the Board that "my experience with the students

1. A speech by R.E.Cannings made on the occasion of Cannings' College 25th Anniversary. The whole speech is recorded verbatim in The Link Vol 1 No. 4 Spring Term 1938 being the magazine of Cannings' College. It is from this speech that much of the biographical material on R.E.Cannings is taken. The magazine can be found in the Bath Reference Library.

enrolled here from other schools corresponds with the complaint of the Local Chamber of Commerce - of which I am a member - that boys and girls leaving school have a poor knowledge of English, imperfect Arithmetic and unsatisfactory Handwriting." He even told the Board "I do not consider you have any jurisdiction over this establishment more than you have with the Duke Street, Miss Budgett's or similar schools."¹ In fact he was correct, the Board could not inspect his school other than at his invitation for recognition purposes. However school attendance was a legal matter, but one in which the Board's officials did not wish to find themselves entangled. On the minute paper one official wrote that "if the instruction is bona fide and substantially full time a prosecution for non-attendance at school would be hopeless. It is however more a matter for the L.E.A. than us."² F.D.Wardle, the Town Clerk, wrote to the Board to say that Cannings' College "has attained a considerable development since the war...training girls to take appointments in offices and business houses. The advertisements are of an attractive nature and in one instance at least they stated that positions would be guaranteed." The letter concluded by asking the Board to visit the premises and ascertain the standard of elementary education since Cannings' regarded himself "as providing equivalent education to that afforded by the Local Authority."³ Before the Board had replied Cannings wrote to say that he was receiving lots of applications from parents with young girls. He enclosed a Prospectus and asked if he could continue to enrol them. The Board replied within five days side-stepping the whole issue. It was a question "for the determination of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction in the event of a summons being taken out against the parents. The Board regret that they cannot undertake to advise you in the matter."⁴

In his letter Wardle noted the attractive nature of Cannings' advertising. Indeed Cannings quickly established his College by using aggressive advertising

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 18/205. Bath County Borough Attendance Files 1871-1925. R.E. Cannings to the Board of Education 12 February 1917.
 2. Ibid., Minute of 28 February 1917.
 3. Ibid., F.D.Wardle to the Board of Education 3 July 1917.
 4. Ibid., R.E.Cannings to the Board of Education 20 October 1917. Board of Education to R.E.Cannings 25 October 1917.

and promoting his successes. At one point he took advertising space on the side of Bath buses. The first letter to the Board, cited above, was written on blank typing paper. The second letter eight months later carried an extremely elaborate design in monumental lettering with whorls and whirls. The Prospectus which Cannings sent to the Board is much longer and more descriptive than others which are extant. Not only snippets from the letters of satisfied customers, but also pithy phrases inside covers "Training is Vital for Future Careers." One paragraph has key words underlined - "The training at Cannings is Strict, the standard of efficiency High, the appreciation of business firms Sincere and a visit to the College little short of a Revelation." He had already told the Board that he thought little of maintained schools, he clearly thought little of other private schools. "Canning Business Training College secures more first class positions for business trained boys, youths, girls and young ladies in one month than the majority of other similar institutions in the District do in twelve."¹

This was to be his constant approach, an attempt to make the words Cannings' College synonymous with success. Every week he took large block advertisements spreading over three and four columns in the local newspaper. In 1938 an advertising headline stated "Cannings' Colleges Win Many Distinctions" and the copy stated that "Two hundred and twenty two diplomas and certificates...have been awarded to Cannings' College Students during one term from September to December 1937."² However this list of awarding bodies were the Faculty of Teachers in Commerce, Association of Bookkeeping Teachers, Incorporated Phonographic Society, National Gregg Association, National Order of Gregg Artists, Civil Service Clerk Typists, Great Western Railway Entrance Examination, Royal Life Saving Society and the Boys' Army Entrance Examination.

Such drive and understanding of his market led to expansion. Branches of the College were opened in Radstock in 1918, in Chippenham in 1924 and in Bristol

1. Cannings' College Prospectus (c.1917).
2. B.C. 15 January 1938.

in 1935. By then the group were called Cannings West of England Colleges Ltd. The peak was reached immediately after World War II. In 1953 the Speech Day was held in the Bath Theatre Royal. The platform party included the Bath M.P., the Mayor of Bath, the Deputy Mayor of Bath, the Mayors of Chippenham, Calne and Devizes, the Archdeacon of Swindon, the Director of Education for Bath, and many more. Cannings himself, who had left school in his early teens, had an ostensibly impressive but rather obscure string of letters after his name - R.E. Cannings, F.R.S.A., A.L.A.A., F.F.T.Com., F.C.C.S., F.C.T.S., F.N.G.A.

In 1953 three adjoining Georgian houses were bought in Grosvenor Place and an all-age school was started - Grosvenor High School. As with any other business in which the proprietor is the sole driving force, as his health failed so did the Colleges. One by one they closed in the late 1950s. He died in the early 1960s and his wife ran the remaining branch Grosvenor High School. In 1974 she sold this and retired. The history of Cannings College had been discussed here at length because it well illustrates the vast potential which one able entrepreneur was able to exploit, and which should really have been exploited by the L.E.A. Although Cannings was primarily interested in commercial work he had had junior and senior children at his schools since the 1920s.

If the independent sector in general was influential in Bath, it was the private proprietorial sector which created a distortion. Without it the maintained secondary sector would have developed earlier, and been established in better buildings. But with so many private schools, with crudely vocational courses, in converted houses, being well patronised the maintained secondary sector could not flourish.

If Councillors such as Bush and Silcock sent their children to private schools, then other Councillors much less committed to educational reform, would also send their children to such schools. This robbed the maintained sector of a strong lobby in the Council Chamber. Furthermore private schools were plentiful, and so it seemed unnecessary to build state schools; private schools charged fees and many reasoned so should the state schools; private schools were in badly converted houses lacking most amenities, so why should state schools have

halls and gyms and labs; the curriculum of private schools was vocational and geared to exams passing and if the state schools did not push pupils through examinations they would be deemed to have failed in the comparison.

However the true irony of the situation is that the whole independent sector in Bath between the wars was in a very poor state. The inspectors bemoaned buildings, facilities, staffing, curriculum and only rarely - as in the case of Kingswood - did they feel that an independent school was really good. Twice the Inspectors noted that the growing secondary maintained schools had affected the intake to the independent schools. If the Bath L.E.A. could have been as aggressive as R.E.Cannings in the 1920s and 1930s the competition would have closed most independent schools. Parents however seemed blind to the faults of these independent schools. Perhaps the truth lies in the comments of the Inspector, already quoted above, discussing King Edward's School, but which could be applied to all of the independent schools in that they "have little to give [pupils] than the City Schools, except perhaps a small measure of social prestige."

Further Education and Technical Education in Bath 1903-44.

"Good work is being done in the Painters' and Decorators' Class...The absence of painting drawing or modelling from the nude life is to be regretted."

Letter from the Board of Education to the Bath L.E.A. 12 September 1903.

The Bath Councillors were slightly more interested in vocational education than they were in secondary education. Many believed that an artisan's place was in the workshop, and that schools which taught and improved upon skills learnt at the place of employment were worthwhile schools. They could see the logic behind a good elementary schools teaching basic academic skills - literacy and numeracy - and then at thirteen or fourteen either transfer to a vocational school for a one or two year course before taking a job, or evening or part-time classes for those in work. Superficially there would appear to have been considerable provision between the wars with a pupil teacher centre, Domestic Science College, Technical College, Schools of Art, Commence, Languages, Cookery, and various evening classes. But very often these institutions had few pupils - some even less than twenty - and were really only departments and not schools in their own right.

In the sphere of teacher education the L.E.A. simply administered that which they inherited in 1902, which was both a pupil teacher centre and a Domestic Science College. This latter had been started by the T.E.C. in 1892 when they had appointed Miss M.H.Lawrie to teach Needlework, Laundrywork and Cookery at 19 Green Park. This was not a teacher training course in any sense, but simply a course in maidenly skills for interested ladies. However a student who wished to train as a teacher was enrolled and a nascent college for teachers commenced. The Education Department recognised the College in 1895, and in 1896 it was housed in the newly built wing of the Guildhall, along with other educational groups. The College (its title had become the Bath Training School of Cookery and Domestic Science) still maintained a genteel image and figures of attendance were very low. Between 1907-08 there were ten pupils and by 1911-12 there were fourteen.¹ In 1910 the Authority acquired premises at Longacre, a mile from the Guildhall and part of it was adapted for laundry work. In 1907 the College first received grant under the Board of Education's Regulations for the Training of Teachers. Helen Sillitoe is of the opinion that teachers of this subject were becoming more

1. P.R.O. Ed. 115/74 Training College of Domestic Science. This file includes the H.M.I. Report of the College for January 1913.

important because "housecraft was regarded in many schools as seriously as any other occupation and treated as intelligently."¹ The Governing body of the College was the Bath County Borough Council and the Director was the ubiquitous A. Godfrey Day. The head was Miss A. M. Heygate and she had three staff, one of whom was part-time. The H.M.I.s noted in 1913 that operating a small college in premises a mile apart was no easy matter and Miss Heygate spent her time at the Guildhall. Whilst they felt that the organisation and curriculum were good, they also felt that the syllabus in the Theory of Education left something to be desired. Generally however they felt that it was an efficient and well run college. By 1925 the Inspectorate found that more space was being used in the Longacre premises and that the College's courses had been extended to include one year courses for matrons and housekeepers, and a preliminary course in elementary science for teachers of domestic subjects whose education in science had been neglected. The Inspectors did not list the numbers of pupils, but they could reasonably be expected to be higher than they had previously found. The Inspectors felt that the College needed more equipment since it did not have a refrigerator, vacuum, washing machine, or electric stove, all necessities in a college "where it might be expected due regard would be paid to the wise expenditure of time and human strength and energy."²

As in 1913 the Inspectors were generally content with the courses and the staff, but not with the buildings. However the L.E.A. was slow to move and it was not until 1932 that the opportunity arose to move the College into the premises vacated by the Somerset Boys' Home. The total cost including conversion was estimated to be around £20-30,000 and the Bath Chamber of Commerce strongly opposed the idea,³ nevertheless in 1932 the College did move into these premises. The Principal between 1915 and 1945 was Miss W. M. King and she saw the College through its most difficult period. After the second World War the College was very successful.

-
1. H. Sillitoe, A History of the Teaching of Domestic Subjects, (1933) p.182.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 115/75 Training College of Domestic Science. This file includes the H.M.I. Report of the College for 1925. The College was not inspected again until 1951, and that Report will not be available until the year 2001.
 3. B.C. 16 November 1932.

The other aspect of teacher education during the inter-war years was the pupil teacher system. The School Board had begun the scheme and the T.E.C. had taken it over. Chapter Two above has shown that the School Board were happy to shed their responsibilities in order to keep down their costs and thus their demands on ratepayers. In September 1892 they first asked the T.E.C. to house the pupil teacher classes, but the T.E.C. declined.¹ However in July 1895 on the initiative of the T.E.C. it was agreed with the School Board that the T.E.C. would conduct pupil teacher classes (and not merely house them) and that at the same time arrangements were made for starting a Secondary School as part of the scheme for the conduct of these classes.² The Board of Education considered the provision for pupil teachers in 1903 noting that the centre was run by a sub-committee of eight, four from the School Board and four from the T.E.C. with the Board paying a subsidy to the T.E.C. All of the voluntary schools sent pupil teachers on the same terms and conditions as the Board Schools and paid £2 a year to help defray the costs. The school had between 100 to 120 pupils all over twelve and had the basic aim of getting pupils through the King's Scholarship Examination. Pupils attended for four and a half days a week and one evening. There was a staff of five, two of whom were part-time.³ The centre was recognised in June 1903.

In February 1904 the newly created Education Committee established a new syllabus for pupil teachers. There was to be a three year course with a maximum of 25 pupil teachers in each year. H.M.I. Curry who had forced himself on the Committee in place of a Director⁴ had agreed the syllabus. This was identical for both boys and girls and was a basic course in Maths, Sciences, English, French, Physical Exercises and lasted 30 hours a week with twelve hours of homework. The Committee felt that pupils would be able to take nine of the eleven subjects offered at the Oxford Junior Examination level. Furthermore if the pupil teachers were successful and passed the King's Scholarship they had to remain in the employment of the Bath L.E.A. until they entered training college. It was agreed

1. T.E.C. Minutes 10 September 1892.

2. T.E.C. Minutes 22 July 1895.

3. P.R.O. Ed. 35/2158 General File on Bath City Secondary School. Unsigned note 15 June 1903.

4. See Chapter Five above.

that there should be 30 scholarships lasting two years for pupils aged fourteen and 30 three year scholarships for pupils aged thirteen.¹ In March 1904 the precise form of the Scholarship Examination was agreed upon. It was to take place over two days and arithmetic, reading, handwriting, composition and dictation were to be obligatory. There were a number of optional subjects including French, Botany, History, Geography and Needlework. There were to be three local examiners - the head of the Bath pupil teacher centre, and one representative of both the elementary and the secondary sectors.

At this same meeting there was an analysis of the Bath results in the King's Scholarship Examination for 1903. Thirty candidates had entered and Bath had 50 per cent success in the First Class division against seventeen per cent nationally. The Education Committee decided that any pupil teacher who failed to complete the three year course would have to have his parents reimburse the Authority for any money expended.² (and indeed on 20 April 1906 an account was sent to a Mr. Milburn for £7.17s.10d. "being the amount of fees due on account of his daughter under the [pupil teacher] scheme for scholarships on her withdrawal from the school.") This scheme with some 60 scholarships for pupil teachers may appear generous, but as Bush advised the Council "if they did not adopt the scheme the effect would be that the Council would have to employ more qualified assistants with the result that the cost would be more than the proposed scheme."³ Holders of these scholarships could attend the City Secondary School, King Edwards or Bath High School for Girls.

In 1906 the arrangements for training pupil teachers were altered slightly in that a four years educational course was envisaged, to be followed by one year of practical experience. In May 1906 the Town Clerk - F.D.Wardle - wrote to ask the Board's approval of the scheme. The Board felt that they could not agree to pay grants for such a scheme since grants were paid to aid pupil teachers who should "as the name implies be engaged both in the learning and in teaching and

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 19 February 1904.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 18 March 1904.
 3. B.C. 1 March 1904.

that the processes should be in some sense concurrent during the period of his engagement." The Board suggested that Bath might prefer to interpose a continuous year in between two years in an elementary school. "Many authorities have adopted this plan in preference to the half time arrangement now adopted by the Bath Authority and have found it to produce satisfactory results." Not unreasonably the Bath L.E.A. replied that the Board's suggested method was no more concurrent learning and teaching than their own scheme and they asked the Board to reconsider. An official noted "I do not think we shall get the better of an argument with the L.E.A." and Bath were allowed to go ahead with their arrangements.¹

In May 1907 the arrangements for pupil teachers were changed again. The Board were prepared to allow L.E.A.s to end the half time system and to allow one years full time training at a secondary school, and a year training in an elementary school. During the first year the pupil teacher would not receive a salary but a maintenance allowance of £5 per annum to be matched by the Board of Education's £5, making £10 in all. The Education Committee were in favour of this idea, it would be a cost saving exercise since the pupil teacher centre and secondary school could be united in the same buildings under one head.² This was indeed done and Bush declared that there would be a total saving of over £400 per annum. Councillor Spear objected to advertising for a new head at £275 per annum when the head of the pupil teacher centre, F.C.Holmes, was available. A new head would mean that Holmes would lose his job. Councillor Tonkin agreed that it would be hard on Holmes but noted that Holmes did not "have that experience in secondary education which it was desirable that a Headmaster should have". However Bush felt that Holmes should have the post at £250 per annum and it was eventually agreed.³ This is one of the few occasions when Bush's judgement was in error - for Holmes did not make a good head and the Inspectorate and the Secondary School Sub-Committee were aware of the fact. Holmes clung tenaciously

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 53/285. Secondary Education Files. F.D.Wardle to Board of Education 2 May 1906. Board of Education to F.D.Wardle 11 May 1906. Unsigned note 19 June 1906.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 27 May 1907.
 3. B.C. 4 June 1907.

to his post and did not retire until 1932. Possibly if a new head had been appointed Holmes may have lost the post but he could have been kept in a job.

However the new scheme after 1907 was better than the previous arrangement. Potential teachers had to have completed a four year course of full time education and between the ages of sixteen and eighteen the scheme outlined above operated. At eighteen a student transferred to training college. Bath preferred candidates for training college to have some practical experience in schools before they went to college. In November 1926 A.W.Hoyle the Bath L.E.A.'s Director of Education wrote to the Board to ask for continued recognition of Bath's system of appointing these student teachers. The Board agreed and acknowledge the arrangements for training and the continued education of its student teachers. The Board only reserved to itself the right to impose an upper limit on the numbers of such students.¹ It was not until after 1944 that the L.E.A. re-thought its teacher training schemes.

Further education in Bath was encouraged between 1902-44. The system was rather ad hoc, created as and when there was demand, and lacking an overall plan. In 1922-23 Bath asked the Board to recognise some eight different centres in which evening classes were held. The centres varied between Kingsmead Council School, St. Philips Church Institute and the General Post Office. Often they tended to be practical instruction centres offering facilities during the daytime for several schools, and then running classes in the evening. For example the Longacre Technical Institute was bought by the L.E.A. in 1909. It was an old coach factory, and after conversion part of the space was occupied by the Domestic Science College as an annexe for its Guildhall rooms. Also other parts of the buildings were used for teaching woodwork and in 1922 H.M.I. Grindod recorded that the centre was attended by four hundred boys per week from four different schools under the care of three staff.² In the evenings both the domestic science and the craft facilities were used for evening classes. In 1913 Twerton became part of Bath and the L.E.A.

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 67/60. General File on Teacher Training 1926-33. A.W.Hoyle to Board of Education 5 November 1926. Board of Education to A.W.Hoyle 4 February 1927.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 70/2794 Longacre Technical Institute. Brief Report by H.M.I. Grindod November 1922.

acquired the unused house of the Governor of Twerton Goal and a piece of land, and built a manual training and domestic science centre - the Twerton Technical Institute. This provided rooms for cookery, laundry, housewifery, drawing and manual instruction. The buildings were available for both day and evening use.¹

In 1926 Bath summed up the activity in evening institutes in a syllabus. This noted that the evening centres were linked to senior schools so that scholars on leaving their senior school could keep in touch, meet their old companions from their day school and continue their education. Admission was available to those persons exempt from day school attendance. Studies were grouped in occupational courses and were designed to lead to more advanced courses for older students in the Technical College. There were courses in business for those entering offices or the retail trades; industrial courses for those boys entering manufacture and construction; and "Domestic or Home Occupation Courses" to qualify girls to assist at home or to become competent housekeepers. The pupil at each centre with the highest aggregate marks received a book prize, and a Certificate of Merit went to each candidate with at least 70 per cent.² In 1929 an H.M.I.'s Report was published which was generally favourable noting that premises, equipment and staff were quite good. When children were about to leave school the L.E.A. took steps to advise the leavers of the precise provision of evening classes. Examinations, such as those of the Union of Educational Institutions, were taken, but many employers would accept the L.E.A.'s Certificate of Merit.³

Clearly these courses were for school leavers and teenagers generally and designed to help them to improve their work skills. The Bath L.E.A. also maintained four vocational day schools. In 1926 a Junior School of Commerce was established, in 1927 a Junior School of Applied Science, in 1929 a Junior School of Art and in 1933 a Junior School of Homecrafts. They were initially housed in the Guildhall - however the L.E.A. hoped to be able to move these schools to better premises eventually. The intention was to recruit 30 pupils annually to each school at the

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 70/2797 Twerton Technical Institute. Details of the establishment of the Institute.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 5/88 Further Education in Bath 1921-31. Syllabus of Evening Classes 1926.
 3. Ibid. H.M.I. Report July 1929.

age of thirteen. There was to be a two year course and all pupils were to sign an agreement to the effect that they would complete the course or pay a £2 penalty. In 1934 the four schools were inspected. The Junior School of Art had 30 boys and fifteen girls, Commerce had seven boys and 54 girls, Applied Science had 57 boys, and Homecrafts had 22 girls. The majority came from the senior schools of the City, only two came directly from the elementary schools. The Inspectors noted that since the schools had only recently started it was not possible to discuss with accuracy their success, but they observed that pupils appeared to be doing well and a number had gone on to take courses at the Technical College. The Principal of the Technical College also held the post of headmaster of the four Junior Schools, assisted by nineteen staff, described as "adequate for the present organisation and numbers."

The curriculum of the four schools was in each case English, History, Geography, Maths and then the rest of their timetable was allocated according to the speciality of the school. In the Applied Science school it was Science Engineering Drawing, Mechanics and wood and metal work; in the Commerce school it was commerce, shorthand, typing and bookkeeping. All of the schools did games and physical exercises but there was great difficulty since they were located in the Guildhall which lacked sport facilities and the pupils had to travel to hired pitches.¹ In 1939 the Inspectors visited the Bath Art School, and in their Report discussed the Junior School of Art. By 1939 this School had only 46 pupils and the Inspectors felt that there should be more pupils and that steps should be taken to advise the public of the school's facilities and courses. The course, along with pupils of the other junior technical schools, was divided half on the speciality of the school and half on general education - which the Inspectors' felt was too academic.² In each case selection to the four schools was by examination at thirteen. The examination was in mental and written arithmetic, general English and an essay. An order of merit was drawn up and places were then

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 114/788. Report on the Inspection of the Junior Technical School, the Junior School of Homecrafts and the Junior School of Commerce 1934. The Junior School of Art was not inspected on this occasion but the Inspectors' referred to it during their report.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 114/785. Report on the Inspection of the Bath Art School 1939. In report the Junior School of Art is discussed as a department of the Art School.

offered to candidates by the teachers in charge of the four schools. In 1934 the Inspectors made the obvious point that the entrance examination did not test for specific skills. "It is not easy to determine particular aptitudes for particular types of courses...So far there seem to have been comparatively few definite misfits and doubtless as further experience of selection is gained there will be very few."¹ However in 1939 when the Junior School of Art was inspected the H.M.I.s noted that "children with special ability in Art may possibly be found in one of the other Junior Departments, while children with little artistic ability are found in the Junior Art Department." They suggested a change in the selection procedure noting that "the method of selecting pupils for admission does not appear to secure the most suitable type of pupil."²

It is difficult to test for specific aptitudes such as art, and to expect a child to make a vocational choice such as commerce, or applied science, at the age of thirteen is unwise. These four schools were not schools in their own right but rather four junior departments of the Technical College, indeed they were its preparatory schools. Whilst it seemed sensible to the Councillors to train children for future employment the practicalities of the situation defeated that objective. The 180 pupils in the four schools during the 1930s would have been better in the two secondary schools, where their skills could have been trained but in a broader context.

Bath L.E.A. maintained a Technical College, and this was housed in the Guildhall. This College had evolved over many decades. The T.E.C. had started it in the 1890s by amalgamating various classes for science and art,³ and by the beginning of the twentieth century when the Education Committee took over there were five departments - a School of Art, Science and Technical Classes, School of Cookery and Domestic Sciences, Technical Day School for boys and girls and a pupil teacher centre. Of these the pupil teacher centre amalgamated with the Technical Day School in 1907 and became the City Secondary School. The girls' department

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 114/788 Op.cit., H.M.I. Report 1934.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 114/785 op.cit., H.M.I. Report 1939.
 3. See Chapter Three above.

of this latter left the Guildhall in 1926 and the boys' department in 1932. The remaining departments moved out of the Guildhall as the opportunity presented itself. In 1910 the College of Domestic Subjects moved to Longacre and in 1913 to temporary rooms at No. 23 High Street.¹ In 1914 the Twerton Technical Institute opened and students for handicrafts and some domestic subjects left the Guildhall. In 1928 the Walcot Handicraft Centre opened and more students from the Guildhall moved out.² Consequently by the late 1920s only the four main departments of the Technical College were left in the Guildhall - Applied Science, Art, Commerce and Homecrafts. These provided courses for students between the ages of fourteen and twentyone who were working in industry or commerce. The staffs of the four departments taught both day and evening classes.

The Board of Education was not always happy with the College. In 1921 the College wanted to be recognised for the teaching of the National Certificates of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. The visiting H.M.I., Boxendall, advised rejecting the request "mainly on the ground of the inadequacy of the equipment for Engineering Science...although I have reason to expect a slight general improvement in the work this session I feel certain that owing to a lack of teaching power, inadequate response on the part of a considerable section of the students...the instruction and work done will not reach that standard which the Board and the Institution contemplate."³ Four years later A. Godfrey Day who was Principal of the College tried to get it recognised for the examinations of the Institute of Gas Engineers. The Board refused, Day enquired why and was told that "a course which includes two subjects of First Year standard in the Third year is inadequate for a Certificate in Gas Engineering". Day asked the Board to reconsider, and H.M.I. Creasey noted "Discussion with Mr. Day...on these national schemes has always been difficult. Because his proposals are not accepted he appears to have a fixed notion that the Board are not sympathetic towards them. But I think it may quite fairly be said that in drafting letters and filling up

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 70/2793. High Street. This issue and the Board of Education's objection to the use of these premises is discussed in this file.
 2. P.R.O. Ed. 70/2798. Walcot 1933.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 90/207. Bath Technical College General File 1921-33. Note by H.M.I. Baxendall 26 November 1921.

forms relating to these schemes he does not always exercise that degree of care which we may rightly expect of him."¹

Both the Principal and the premises mitigated against the Technical College. In 1926 Day retired. A.W.Hoyle was appointed as Director of Education in that same year and he was also the nominal Principal of the Technical College. Bush had had a difficult task persuading the Council to accept the appointment of a Director, without also having to appoint a separate College Principal. However as soon as was feasible a Principal was appointed - even then the Board had had to insist in April 1930.² In November of that year Major L.J.Castle O.B.E., M.C., B.Sc., was appointed at £750 per annum. The Council had only agreed to the principle of the appointment by 20 votes to 19.³

However the College was still housed in the Guildhall but by 1930 the Council were discussing the possibility of moving the College into another building. The Royal United Hospital had vacated its premises in the centre of Bath for a spacious modern block on the outskirts. Though the old premises were rather small they could be converted for use as a Technical College and thus release space in the Guildhall urgently needed for municipal administration. In April 1929 the Education Committee had published a Report discussing the need for the new block and an estimation of the costs - some £80,000 for purchase, conversion and equipment.⁴ The Board gave their agreement to the scheme in June 1929⁵ and the new premises were finally opened in 1935.

Prior to that date much of the College's work had been confined to evening classes with only a little daytime work. This was because so many groups required space in the wing of the Guildhall given over to educational use.⁶ However in 1935 with the transfer to new buildings the facilities of the College were considerably improved. In 1939 it was inspected and the Report notes large airy

-
1. Ibid., A.Godfrey Day to Board of Education 11 March 1925. Board of Education to A.Godfrey Day 22 September 1925. A.Godfrey Day to Board of Education 24 September 1925. Note by H.M.I.Creasey 17 October 1925.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 30 April 1930.
 3. B.C. 4 November 1933.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 9 April 1929.
 5. P.R.O. Ed. 90/208 Bath Technical College General File 1929-33. Board of Education to A.W.Hoyle 17 June 1929.
 6. P.R.O. Ed. 114/787. Report on the Inspection of the Municipal Technical College 1921.

rooms, excellent equipment and a good library. The College occupied the whole building except the top floor which housed the School of Art. (Though formerly the School of Art had been a Department of the Technical College after 1935 they both separated and in 1946 the School of Art moved to its own premises). The Inspectorate were effusive in their enthusiasm for the Principal, noting that he supervised all of the evening institutes in the County Borough, had good contacts with the elementary and secondary schools, had organised countless local activities, exhibitions, national conferences, receptions, as well as meetings of local societies.

There were 19 full-time staff and 76 part-time staff, which must have created a considerable timetabling task. Courses, both day and evening, part-time and full-time were offered in English, History, Modern Languages, Law, Commerce, Homecrafts, Building Subjects, Science, Gas Subjects (i.e. the manufacture and installation) Engineering, Horticulture and many others. The Report concluded that the College rendered a valuable service to local industry and commerce.¹

In the same year, 1939, the School of Art was inspected. The Inspectors regretted that it was not housed in a purpose built school, but acknowledged that the staff were good and the Headmaster "is an industrial designer of established reputation who, in collaboration with his wife has been responsible for the design of works of such importance as the mosaic floor of the British Pavilion at the Paris Exhibition". Bath had a number of industries which would gain by a high standard of design and crafts generally - printing, book binding, and cabinet making. The students of the school, of whom there were 228 in 1939 shared the staff of the Technical College. The Art School had organised Trade Advisory Committees in co-operation with employers for printing, bookbinding, painting and decorating. These Committees met three times a year and the Committee members were representatives of the various branches of the industry. In the Printing Committee it was agreed that firms would pay the relevent fees and their employees could attend day release courses.²

1. P.R.O. Ed. 114/789 Report on the Inspection of the Municipal Technical College 1939.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 114/785 Report of the Inspection of the Bath School of Art 1939.

By 1939 the Bath L.E.A. had a satisfactory technical sector. The Technical College was in very good premises which the School of Art shared, as did the four junior Technical Schools. There were numerous evening classes in rooms and halls and occasionally well equipped technical institutes, and the Domestic Science College though relatively small in student numbers was under the control of a capable Principal. However the four junior technical schools simply deprived the two Bath secondary schools of talented children. Some able pupils had gone on scholarships to King Edward's and Bath High School, and some to the private schools in Bath. Other pupils went to the Twerton higher elementary school, and others to the senior schools. The secondary schools had to compete for the talented children that remained. Rather than see technical education as a separate sector, apart from secondary schools the Education Committee should have established stronger craft and science departments within the secondary schools.

However by 1939 the system of technical education had been rationalised and established in reasonable premises with good staff and the Councillors and public knew what to expect from that sector, which had not always been the case. In 1906 a motion from Councillors Hatt and Chivers, Council asked that instead of putting the redecoration of the School of Art and the first floor corridor of the Guildhall out to tender, the Education Committee should report "upon the advisability of this work being done by the students...in order that the students might have the advantage of real practical experience under ordinary conditions of working and that a proper test of the efficiency of both Teacher and Student may be applied."¹ Councillor Hatt was later persuaded by the Education Committee members that his idea was not feasible but they agreed "that something might be done to obtain permanent specimens of students' work by means of decoration schemes for a part of any room actually used by such students."² By 1939 no Councillor would expect Technical College students to be a cheap direct labour organisation. However the Bath Councillors were not unique in this conception of technical

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 3 July 1906.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 8 October 1906.

education for A.J.Peters suggests that "before the 1850s and then between 1904 and 1938 official and majority thinking [about the purpose of technical education was that it was for] the training of artisans who formed a specific social group, irrespective of individual abilities."¹

1. A.J.Peters, 'The Changing Idea of Technical Education', in British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XI. No. 2 May 1963 p.164.

Chapter Ten.

Bath School Health Service, School Meals Service and the effects of War, 1903-44.

"Major Pickard said that the question of evacuating children to country districts was a national scheme, and he did not think it would apply to Bath."

Report of a Council Meeting, Bath Chronicle, 31 September 1938.

"The Total number of Evacuees detrained at Bath was 6,717."

Bath Education Committee Minutes, 19 September 1939.

In view of the reluctance of the Bath Council to spend ratepayers' money on educational provision it is surprising to find that in the area of health and the provision of school meals the Councillors, after an initial doubt, made reasonably generous allocations to these two areas during the interwar years. Lowndes is of the opinion that "the Boer War was probably the turning point...when Parliament found that 4,400 potential recruits had to be rejected every year on the grounds of defective teeth alone, they bestirred themselves."¹ The new Liberal Government introduced two Acts, the 1906 Education (Provision of Meals) Act and in 1907 the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act. The 1906 School Meals Act was in fact introduced by a Labour member and empowered L.E.A.s to give assistance to the voluntary feeding societies and to spend money on meals up to the value of a half penny rate. The only children to be fed were those who were unable to take advantage of the education provided for them because of lack of food. The 1907 Act made it the duty of L.E.A.s to provide for the medical inspection of children as soon as possible on their entry to elementary school.

In Bath the scholarships for the pupil teachers saw the introduction of medical inspections, for in June 1905 the Education Committee resolved that the 32 candidates for the three year scholarships should be medically examined by Dr. Wilson Smith.² In February of that year he had examined 45 children thought to be feeble minded and had discovered that 28 were so, the rest were backward. A sub-committee on feeble minded children suggested that a special school should be built which after the capital costs would have running costs of about £343 per annum, of which £100 would come from the rates.³ In fact little came of this plan but the two incidents illustrated that the new L.E.A. was trying to get the measure of its full responsibilities. Not that the Education Committee were eager to be embroiled in the costs of a school medical service, for when the Medical Officer of Health for Bath raised the question of medical inspection under the 1907 Act the Committee promptly resolved that "having regard to the onerous duties, the great

-
1. G.A.N.Lowndes, The Silent Social Revolution, (Second Edition 1969) p.174.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 16 June 1905.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 17 February 1905.

responsibilities and the heavy costs imposed on Local Authorities [by the 1907 Act]...the Government be requested to repay the whole, or just a part of the cost involved." and a copy of the resolution was sent to the Association of Municipal Corporations, the two Bath M.P.s (D.MacLean and A.Gooch), the President of the Board of Education (R.McKenna) and Campbell-Bannerman the Prime Minister.¹ It would appear that their clarion call went unheard and the following month the Finance and General Sub-Committee reported that if medical inspection must be done then it should be done by the Bath Medical Officer of Health, who should receive £50 per annum for inspecting elementary school children and be assisted by a full-time nurse to visit homes, a full-time female School Medical Officer and a full-time clerk. The scheme was costed at £382 in the first year rising to £466 over four years, plus £100 for stationery.² But as always seemed to happen in Bath, once the Education Committee decided to do something they wanted to do it well, whereas the Council refused to provide the expenditure involved. Consequently in April 1908 the report on the medical inspection of children was referred back by the Council³ so the Education Committee resolved to cut the extra staff, pay the M.O.H. £50, have a part-time clerk for £52 and one Lady Doctor at £200 who should "be prohibited from practising privately."⁴ In June 1908 Miss Mary Morris was appointed as a Lady Medical Inspector of Schools. Throughout this period the Bath Chronicle reported only the barest details, there does not appear to have been any large scale debate on the issue, or if there was the newspapers did not regard the debate as sufficiently interesting to discuss it. Possibly the other prewar issue, specifically the difficulties surrounding secondary education, dominated the available newspaper space.

The children returned from the school holidays and in the Education Committee Withy reported that the medical inspection of returning children had proceeded smoothly. All of the infants had been inspected - the parents had been invited to attend and some 60 per cent did so "showing that they welcome it and did not treat

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 21 February 1908.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 20 March 1908.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 7 April 1908.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 16 April 1908.

it hostilely." The medical inspection staff "could only point out defects and trust to the parents taking steps to have them remedied; in almost all cases they were capable of being remedied."¹ Dr. Morris continued her inspections each year. She showed that she could be insistent with truculent managers. In 1910 the managers of Lyncombe St. Marks refused to admit children coming from homes where there was a case of measles. Dr. Morris decreed that a child who had had measles was immune and should be admitted, the managers refused. The Education Committee instructed the managers that they must not ignore the instructions of the S.M.O.²

By December 1910 the Board of Education intimated that they were happy with the arrangements for inspection in Bath³, but the Committee discovered that inspection was not sufficient. Having brought a defect or illness in a child to the parents' attention some parents refused or did not bother to seek the remedy. In January 1911 the Attendance Sub-Committee presented a Report on this issue, particularly on parents "who are absolutely neglectful of the interests of their children and will not even take the trouble to bring or send them to the institutions where treatment necessary for their condition will be gratuitously afforded." The sub-committee were loath to recommend prosecution but they felt that under Section 12 of the Childrens Act 1908 prosecution was possible. The Education Committee decided that since other authorities had done this they would recommend that the Town Clerk be authorised to take such proceedings.⁴

The following month, February, a Special Sub-Committee established to consider defective children reported its findings. The Report stated that it was imperative that something be done since "there is ample evidence that the presence in the ordinary classes of weak and backward children prevents the progress of the average child while they are themselves unable to receive the specialised and individual teaching which they need." The policy of the Education Committee since the earlier report in 1905 on 45 backward and defective children had been one of dispersal,

-
1. B.C. 18 September 1908.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 11 June 1910.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 16 December 1910.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 20 January 1911.

even though in 1905 the recommendation was for a special school. The sub-committee noted that Dr. Mary Morris had found 60 children with physical defects or mental deficiencies, and urged that one or more special classes should be established in an elementary school - possibly St. Michaels. The managers of this non-provided school were willing to let the ground floor be used for this purpose. The sub-committee argued that it was central and could easily be reached by tramcar. Costs were to be about £200 per annum since 60 pupils would need two teachers plus a 'motherly' teacher. Since these children could not return home for mid-day lunch, meals would have to be provided. It was estimated that total grants would be about £170, capital outlay about £250 and annual running costs would be about £7.10s.0d. per child. "Unofficially H.M. Inspector Mr. Tillard... is fully in sympathy with this object but would request a visit from an officer of the medical branch of the Board of Education before giving any official advice to the Board."¹

However the P.R.O. files reveal a rather different picture. St. Michaels was built about 1840 and was by 1911 in poor repair. Hemmed in on all sides by buildings it was in a non-residential area and the numbers were falling. The Board had demanded a long list of repairs from the managers and advised them that even if they were carried out the school was unlikely to be recognised beyond the next five years. The school was put on the Black List in 1909. In May 1909 H.M.I. Curry urged the Board to close the school. He knew of the Education Committee's plans to use it as a school for defective children "this is entirely out of the question", furthermore "Dr. Mary Morris informed me that the Water Inspector had had his salary raised because he had kept down the amount of water used in connection with the schools."² In fact in 1913 St. Michael's School was closed. Bath's defective children remained dispersed in various elementary schools.

In 1916 a further Report was presented by Councillors Miss Hope and F.W. Spear. These had been asked in 1914 to prepare their report. The situation had been changed by the 1913 Mental Deficiency Act which had made provision of special

1. B.E.C. Minutes 17 February 1911.

2. P.R.O. Ed. 21/15562 St. Michael's School. Report by H.M.I. Curry 29 May 1911.

schools mandatory on L.E.A.s. The two Councillors observed that they had not been able to do very much since 1914 because of the Board's demand that a new secondary school be built and so "precedence was given to this scheme and our scheme was held in abeyance." However they felt that the impact of war and the loss of life created an atmosphere in which they could present their recommendations. "We came to the conclusion recently that if no ambitious scheme could be proposed, we might make a beginning and start with a school which, while dealing seriously with the problem, would not create financial difficulties." In fact they urged the use of St. Michael's School. "This building was condemned by the Board of Education some years ago for this purpose, but [Dr. Wilson of the Board]...stated that she would recommend the Board of Education as no other children will be educated in the same building and the entire block will be at our disposal, to allow us to begin operations in this building and deal with eighty children there as a start." There followed a very tight budget for the operation and a plea that the plan be allowed to go ahead.¹ Since the Bath L.E.A. spent £210 per annum keeping only nine defective children in Special Schools outside the County Borough the sub-committee's annual costs of £430 did not look extravagant. The Report was accepted and St. Michaels was brought into use.

It was noted in the Draft Proposals for the 1918 Act that "when a site for an Open Air School is secured certain classes of physically defective children will be transferred to it...The use of St. Michael's school premises for the instruction of mentally defective children will be discontinued as soon as this other provision is available." The proposal concluded that "in view of the abnormal cost of building materials and labour, army huts instead of permanent buildings will be erected on the site when acquired. These huts will prove adequate for the purpose."² It was evident that special education for 80 defective children was not a priority with the Education Committee. Indeed in October 1916 a resolution was passed in which the proposed new secondary school and a special school for defective children were to

1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 July 1916.

2. Draft Proposals under the Education Act 1918. City of Bath Education Authority p.27.

be put on the list of works to be completed after the end of the war. Thereafter the fate of the special school - which without even being built came later to be called the open air school - was inextricably linked with the fate of the secondary school. When the girls were moved out of the Guildhall in 1926 into converted premises, the open air school was linked with the boys' secondary school.

In 1925 Dr. R.P.Williams, a Medical Officer of the Board of Education said that the staff worked hard in the St. Michaels premises and the school was progressing well but recognition of the school "which has always been for a strictly limited period will be continued only for such further limited time as will enable the authority to provide more suitable accommodation."¹ In February 1926 the Education Committee decided to include the provision of an open air school in the programme of development to be submitted to the Board, and as an interim measure to take a lease on a part of Widcombe Boys' School and use it as a special school for defective children, thus vacating St. Michaels. The S.M.O. for Bath Dr. J.F. Blackett was extremely sanguine about getting a special school and by 1933 could only observe "As far as a certified Open Air School is concerned there has been little change in the position described a year ago...unless it be that the prospect of having such a school in Bath has become even more remote."² The school was to be moved twice more, to premises in St. Michael's Place, and in 1939 to the premises once occupied by a cafe in Combe Down. It was not until after the war that the Education Committee really made effective provision for handicapped children, be they physically or mentally handicapped.

The school health service in Bath progressed steadily, but in the early years parsimony was the byword. In 1911 Twerton was incorporated into Bath and because of the extra work it was suggested that Dr. Mary Morris should receive two extra increments of £15 each when she reached her maximum of £260. There was to be no immediate increase although obviously her work load had increased. The Council objected, and the Education Committee withdrew the proposal and Dr. Morris received no extra reward.³ In July 1912 the S.M.O. Dr. Symonds resigned, and Dr. Morris

1. B.E.C. Minutes 15 April 1925.
2. Annual Report of the School Medical Officer, J.F.Blackett, 1933 p.21.
3. B.E.C. Minutes 15 December 1911. B.C.B.C. Minutes 6 February 1912.

was offered the post for an extra £40 per annum. She was not required to give up her private practice but her days were to be given over entirely to school inspection. However it was made clear to Dr. Morris that the post as S.M.O. was only temporary and that the Council reserved the right to end the arrangement if it became possible for the M.O.H. to also be the S.M.O., thus saving the S.M.O.'s salary. Dr. Morris would thus revert to her original role as Medical Inspector of Schools. In fact in April 1917 Dr. Morris resigned. In the subsequent debate on this Councillor Crossman asked "whether the work had really increased so much as to necessitate a full-time officer". He was told that it was and it was resolved to appoint someone full-time at £500 per annum and Dr. Blackett was appointed.¹

In fact despite the difficulties over the provision of a school for defective children Dr. Morris had achieved a considerable amount and in 1913 the Board told Bath that they would give the maximum grant possible £130.17s.6d. under the regulations governing grants in respect of medical treatment "and the Board are glad to have it in their power to recognise to this extent the good work done by the authority and the progress which they are making in the development of the school medical service."²

A Report of that year discussed the work involved in both inspection and provision of treatment. The medical staff were concerned not only with ringworm and similar ailments but defects of vision and teeth. The purpose of the report was to urge the Education Committee to appoint more qualified staff and to buy equipment - a dentist's chair and eye testing equipment.³

Thus when Dr. Blackett commenced he had the bare essentials for a school medical organisation. In 1925 the Blue Coat School premises were taken over and adapted for the use of the S.M.O. and M.O.H. The details in Dr. Blackett's 1936 Report illustrates the size of his department. He himself had a deputy, two assistant medical officers, dental surgeon, two eye specialists, a psychiatrist for

-
1. B.C. 23 July 1917.
 2. B.C. 20 March 1913.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 6 May 1913.

child guidance, two ear, nose and throat specialists, an orthopaedic specialist, a care secretary, two school nurses, and three clerks. This staff carried out 5,299 inspections of elementary pupils, and referred 2,685 for treatment, and of these 2,314 received the treatment. The report lists the number of spectacles obtained, visits to homes, children given country holidays and proudly records that the cost to the city was covered by a penny rate. Both children were relatively healthy and on the scale for malnutrition 79.1 per cent were normal and only .2 per cent were bad. Equally uncleanliness of body or clothing was rare.¹

This Report for 1936 showed an effective school medical service and a relatively healthy school population. It is difficult to assess how far the school health service was responsible for improved standards of health between the wars for there had also been welfare legislation since 1906 and the general improvements in housing. Not least the provision of school meals had specifically improved the health of school children. The 1906 Act gave L.E.A.s the power to assist voluntary groups providing meals and to spend up to a half penny rate.

In January 1907 a deputation from the Childrens' Dinner Committee saw the Education Committee and said that they had nearly come to the end of their resources. The Dinner Committee provided 3,400 dinners per week at a weekly cost of £12.10s.0d and the balance in hand was only £52 - enough for four more weeks. The committee wanted to supply meals for nine more weeks which would take them through the winter. Another statistic which they provided was that the meals were served from nine centres at a cost of 1½d. per head. The teachers in the elementary schools and the school attendance officers decided between them which children should have the free meals. The deputation was questioned. Dr. Paton of the Education Committee "thought they should be down on the parents of dissolute habits", Miss Smith of the deputation "gave particulars of some very sad cases of poverty but said in other cases there was no doubt the parents were to blame." The Education Committee discussed ways in which they could help. There was fear of spending rates but the Town Clerk suggested that the expenditure up to a halfpenny in the pound would be recognised by the Board "if the Authority resolved that any

1. Annual Report of the School Medical Officer, J.F.Blackett, (1936).

of the children were unable through lack of food to take full advantage of the education and has ascertained that private funds were not sufficient to defray the cost of the food."¹ The Education Committee decided to raise the £50 needed to see them through the winter and in the longer term to ask the Finance and General Purposes Sub-Committee to report as to the best way of proceeding under the 1906 Act. The sub-committee reported in May 1907 noting that the Committee to provide free dinners had begun in 1904 and had provided 30,000 meals annually. In the first year there had been voluntary subscriptions of £176.10s.0d. and in the second year £134.0s.0d. However in 1906 they had had to ask for £50 and by mid-1907 they had a deficit of £6.9s.3d. The sub-committee advised that "there is no doubt that the new Act empowering Local Authorities to undertake the work of providing meals for necessitous children has largely hindered the flow of voluntary subscriptions." The head teachers reported that there were 816 children improperly fed.² However the Education Committee were not to be easily persuaded, Alderman Bagshaw "agreed that every child had a right to be fed but the parents could obtain relief under the Poor Law. When people knew they could get their children fed without any loss of self respect they put a stop to all frugality and thrift."³ However the Education Committee agreed to pay the Childrens Dinner Committee's deficit of £6 and pay £100 to see them through the winter.

The Council however referred this back, asking that the precise amount needed to see the Committee through the winter be specified.⁴ The Education Committee reconsidered, doubled the number they had first thought of and said £200 was needed. Bagshaw however complained that if people knew rates were to provide for shortfalls there would be even less voluntary subscriptions. The Town Clerk explained that it was simply a legal fiction - first they had to ascertain that subscriptions were not sufficient and then they could use the rates.⁵ The Education Committee resolved to accept this sum, as did Council and that sum of £200 was voted annually until

-
1. B.C. 18 January 1907.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 17 May 1907.
 3. B.C. 17 May 1907.
 4. B.C.B.C. Minutes 4 June 1907.
 5. B.C. 21 June 1907.

1910 even though the Childrens Dinner Committee was feeding some 400 children¹ and in 1911 the sum was increased to £250.² However the sum varied depending upon the children to be fed and the subscriptions collected, in 1914 only £50 was needed.³ The Education Committee were doing nothing beyond providing such sums as were necessary. In October 1912 Councillor Curtis told Council that he objected to the fact that Bath was leaving school meal provision to charity saying "that in other towns meals had been provided by the Education Committee and he did think that the Education Authority might have been able to carry out some of the same work...He did not wish to decry the offerings of the philanthropic people but where the Council could do it themselves let them do it." E.A. Withy however pointed out that the Council was fulfilling the terms of the 1907 Act and aiding a voluntary committee because their subscriptions were not sufficient.⁴

In 1914 a further Act was passed which increased the powers of L.E.A. in respect of school meals and a sub-committee of the Education Committee reported on the new situation in September 1914. They noted that the Voluntary Committee which had hitherto fed children had "decided that the time has arrived when the Authority should become responsible for the future organisation of this branch of the social service." The reporting sub-committee advocated that dinners be provided on six days a week instead of three which had been the situation before and in an emergency meals should be provided on seven days a week. They recommended that the Voluntary Committee's facilities were inadequate and that the authority should provide their own premises and equipment. They anticipated that there would be voluntary assistance in serving and supervision of meals, plus the help of teachers. "From preliminary enquiries it has been ascertained that about 1,500 children will require to be provided for, but, from the nature of the circumstances facilities must be provided to meet a greater demand than such information as this period indicates." The criteria for having a meal was still as set out in 1906 - meals were for children who through lack of food could not

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 24 May 1910.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 17 July 1911.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 21 February 1913.
 4. B.C. 1 October 1912.

take advantage of the provided education.¹ A Special (School Canteen) Sub-Committee was established and this first met in October 1914. It was agreed that 1,189 children needed meals and pending the Authority establishing a centre temporary centres would be used. A sample menu showed soup, rice and cake, fish, chips, peas, cocoa and currant bread.²

In April 1916 the School Canteen Sub-Committee published a report on its first year of activity. Some 18,400 meals had been served at mid-day, 131 breakfasts and 72 teas. Furthermore one third of a pint of milk had been supplied to infants and half a pint to older children as directed by the S.M.O.

In November 1915 the sub-committee took possession of premises Nos. 1 and 2 St. Michael's Place at a £60 rent per annum and this had been equipped as a central canteen. Thus from November about 330 children received meals, though in February and March 1916 this figure rose to over 500. Originally this sub-committee felt that over a thousand children might need meals but this was not the case "the greater prosperity of our poorer people and the requirements that personal application should be made to the Care Committees by parents who desire their children to be fed have reduced the number of dinners to about 350 daily five days per week."³ Nonetheless this would appear to have been reasonably generous provision. Riddell discovered that after 1914 the Liverpool L.E.A. only proposed to feed ten per cent of its children, about 1,500, and preferred for many years to use contractors rather than establish their own centres. Also Liverpool fed a child for two months and then the meals stopped. When the child was again undernourished he was again fed.⁴ In Bath the feeding was continuous and through the holidays if necessary.

In 1918 the Education Committee proposed to provide dinners for children who could pay the whole of the cost. This was to be tried first at Oldfield Girls'

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 18 September 1914.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 1 December 1914.
 3. B.C.B.C. Minutes 2 May 1916.
 4. J.Riddell, 'A Study of the History and Development of the School Medical Service in Liverpool from 1908 to 1939 and an attempt to assess its consequences on the health of the Liverpool School child,' University of Liverpool M.A. Thesis (1946).

Council School, and Walcot Boys' Council School where 67 and 23 pupils respectively could take advantage of the scheme. Children were to provide their own utensils and pay threepence per day.¹ The relevance of this is that it was the first move away from a policy of only providing meals for necessitous children, and providing them for children who lived long distances from school or who had working mothers. This system was gradually extended and in 1923 new plant was installed at the St. Michael's premises. The Board agreed to this but advised that they could pay no more by way of grant.²

In 1934 an officer of the Board analysed the school meal provision in Bath. Five sub-committees met once a term to discuss what was needed. Urgent applications were received by the Care Secretary of the School Medical Service. During 1933 there were 393 such applications granted to 151 parents representing 315 individual children. 255 of these children had free meals, and only 60 were asked to contribute toward the cost. Of those 151 parents 79 were unemployed, 22 were below the income scale, 14 were widows, seven were hawkers, five children were illegitimate, ten had invalided parents, eleven of the parents were separated and three unclassified. 170 children in Bath had "a wholesome balanced and adequate meal every weekday except Saturday throughout the year." The main canteen was at St. Michael's Place, but there was a similar canteen on the outlying district of Odd Down at St. Philip's Institute.³

In 1938 a report was mildly critical suggesting that children had a plate and two spoons and that food was always mushy, meat was always served as mince. "The children should be given foods which require manipulating with a knife and fork and need masticating."⁴ The Board wanted the L.E.A. to extend its canteen provision and provide meals for more children, those who could pay as well as providing free meals. In a personal letter to A.W.Hoyle these points were made, as well as a suggestion that children should be selected for free meals by economic criteria as well as medical and education. Hoyle visited the Board in May 1939 and advised them that a new school canteen was to be built at the Kingsmead Council

1. B.E.C. Minutes 21 June 1918.

2. B.E.C. Minutes 19 December 1923.

3. P.R.O. 123/208 School Meals Service 1934-45. Notes dated 24 January 1934.

4. Ibid., Note dated 18 October 1938.

School, where free and paying children could be fed together. As for the selection of children the Board had recommended periodic nutritional surveys, but Hoyle felt that with the approach of war his staff and the staff of the S.M.O. would have too much to do to institute these surveys.¹ By 1939, therefore, the Bath L.E.A. had an efficient School Health service and was providing meals in two centres for children and more were planned.

This will be a convenient point to consider the effect of the Second World War on educational provision in Bath, primarily because it was these two welfare services which were stretched to the very limit during 1939-46. Two of the major problems which taxed the administrators in Bath were the evacuees and the arrival of the Admiralty department and large sections of the Ministry of Works. All had to be accommodated. Bath Council had been advised that in the event of war some 7,000 evacuees would be sent to Bath. The costs of transport, reception and education would be met by the London County Council "No additional expenditure will fall to be met by the Bath City Council."² The Council resolved to use the Bath Pavilion for five days as a distribution centre, and to appoint a Chief Billetting Officer. St. John's Roman Catholic School in the South Parade was to be used as the central office for Food Control. There were some 70,000 ration cards to be prepared, all food retailers were to be registered, receipts of all returns of stock in hand from retailers were to be gathered.

When H.C.Dent discussed evacuation he observed that "in many places the rate of despatch was phenomenal. At one London junction for example 8,000 persons an hour were entrained...Yet the whole vast operation which lasted altogether for eleven days and was at its height for four, was carried out virtually without mishap of any kind."³ Perhaps the best first hand account of the arrival of the evacuees is contained in a handwritten letter by H.M.I.Bendall, who lived in Bath, to the Board. It is undated but was presumably in early September 1939. Apparently the

-
1. Ibid., Board of Education to A.W.Hoyle. Minutes of Meeting A.W.Hoyle and Board of Education Officials 4 May 1939.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 19 July 1939.
 3. H.C.Dent, Education in Transition, (1944) p.2.

first two days went smoothly, the trains were punctual, they were cleared quickly and the bus transport was adequate. Children were met by L.E.A. officials, teachers and helpers. It had been a long summer "Days were hot and journeys involving seven sub-journeys were tiring...but I heard of no serious mishaps and the spirit of the children and teachers was wholly admirable." The weekend brought trains with mothers and babes in arms. It is remarkable that this vast exercise was carried on without crisis, though there was one amusing misadventure. "A large school of 670 arrived at Ealing tube station together. In moving to the main line platform they were separated into two groups - 350 and 320. The 350 group got onto the Bath train at once, the 320 were a little slower and the Bath train, partly empty, started without them. Probably the 320 left on the next train - but they did not come to Bath." The writer concluded with the hope that the two groups would eventually rejoin - which they did.¹

The organisation for the evacuees in general was formidable, and for the evacuated school children the problems were considerable. By 22 September 1939 the City of Bath Boys' School had 377 on roll plus 44 evacuees and the Girls' School had 333 on roll, 59 evacuees plus 90 evacuees and their teachers running as a self contained unit. The elementary school teaching staff in Bath was augmented by 92 assistants and twelve heads from the London area. Small wonder that the Report by Hoyle to the Education Committee on evacuation observed that "the clearing of all the finance consequent upon these great changes will prove to be a formidable task."²

In her Report on Speech Day 1939 Miss Thatcher of the City of Bath Girls' School remarked that despite difficulties she was still in her own school. "How many are the headmasters and headmistresses who would give anything to be in a similar position." She had been able, by careful organisation to avoid a system of double shifts which all regarded as unsatisfactory.³ Goodwill seemed to help overcome the most intractable problems. In February 1941 the Bath children and

-
1. P.R.O. Ed. 134/384 Evacuation 1939. H.M.I. Bendall's undated letter is the only item in the file.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 22 September 1939.
 3. S.T.K. Box 24. Unfiled Copy of Miss Thatcher's 1939 Report.

the evacuees from Barking took the papers of the Bath Scholarship Examination whilst evacuees from the L.C.C., West Ham, East Ham, Liverpool, Portsmouth and Surrey sat the examinations set by those authorities.¹ However some parents preferred to get their children out of England altogether and over 500 applications were received for the Childrens Overseas Reception Scheme and a number of Bath teachers were given paid leave of absence to take children to ports of embarkation.²

After the first wave of evacuees in late 1939 very few more came. In April 1940 H.M.I. Bendall advised the Board that no more children should be sent to Bath under the new evacuation scheme, because although Bath was not on the list of closed towns there were already 1,400 evacuated children to cater for.³ In July 1944 however some 8,000 more evacuees did arrive in Bath from London as a result of the V1 and V2 flying bomb raids. Accommodation was found for the majority but the Council complained that the Ministry of Food had not made efforts to feed them and rationed food could not be supplied from Bath's own resources.⁴ Evacuation placed considerable demands on individual schools, making long term educational provision practically impossible. To take one example, at Walcot Senior School an H.M.I.'s internal report of June 1940 found 135 evacuated children from London, 31 boys from Sutcliffe School (a Bath industrial school), 37 girls from Avonside Girls' Home, plus 68 more from the county area around. This meant four distinct groups plus the school's own children - a total of 570 children in fourteen classes, plus six evacuated teachers. By June 1940 there was only one evacuated teacher and 82 evacuees left. Though the headmaster was within sight of retirement he had coped well in difficult circumstances and the staff had responded readily.⁵ But evacuation of children from such areas as East Ham to Bath brought difficulties other than purely administrative. In his Report for 1939, written in May 1940, the S.M.O. Dr. Blackett observed that evacuation proved "to be a large scale social

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 19 February 1941.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 17 July 1940.
 3. P.R.O. Ed. 134/141 Wartime. Notes by H.M.I. Bendall 1 April 1940.
 4. B.C. 25 July 1944.
 5. P.R.O. Ed. 21/60495 Walcot Senior School 1936-44. Unsigned internal report 12 June 1940.

upheaval with consequences far beyond those which were anticipated or can yet be told."¹ He discussed the overwork caused by evacuation on his staff and referred to the fact that the general behaviour of evacuated children in many parts of the country had caused criticism. "To the extent that this referred to uncleanliness and in particular nitty heads, we are bound to agree that it had a large measure of justification. The proportion of infected heads discovered by us among evacuee children in four months was nearly four times as great as in Bath children in the whole year." But the real problem was billeting - "naturally there were misfits in the allocation of the children to Bath homes and, as a result of the emotional stress involved, many cases were brought to the Child Guidance Clinic where by advice and assistance we were usually able to remove the difficulties."² Evidently the two nations were getting acquainted.

Not only did the Education Committee and S.M.O. have the problem of evacuees they also had to face the difficulties created by the requisition of school buildings. In February 1940 Oldfield Council School was taken over by the Ministry of Works and the children were dispersed to available halls and church rooms, some 760 children in total. A.W.Hoyle told the newspaper that the Education Committee had tried to avoid the situation but after a secret meeting they realised "it was essential that the Civil Servants have these buildings. We would like parents and scholars to understand that. I hope stories I hear about a strike of parents will vanish in view of this."³ The Technical College premises were requisitioned and some classes were relocated in Manvers Street Baptist Chapel. The Domestic Science Training College was also taken and the Education Committee tried to find a large empty house for the College's use. E.H.Bence the Headmaster of Oldfield Boys' School gave an account of losing his School at four days notice and moving everything to the disused Widcombe School, and the schoolrooms at the Ebenezer Church and the Congregational Church.⁴ Some schools did not have to decamp to handy church rooms. When Kingswood and the Royal School were requisitioned the former shared

-
1. Annual Report of the School Medical Officer, J.F.Blackett, 1939 p.5
 2. Ibid., p.28.
 3. B.C. 29 February 1940.
 4. E.H.Bence, Oldfield Boys' School The First Fifty Years. This is a pamphlet written by Bence, a copy is in the Bath Reference Library.

the premises of Uppingham School and the latter were invited by Lord Bath to spend the war at Longleat.

With several thousand evacuees, both adults and children, and schools and colleges requisitioned, the welfare and educational services were at their full capacity, indeed in danger of breaking down. During the nights of 25 and 26 April 1942 enemy bombers attacked Bath. Damage was considerable to all types of property, but for the schools it was a disaster. Twerton Parochial was burnt out, West Twerton was completely wrecked, Kingsmead was destroyed, St. Marys and St. Johns R.C. schools were unsafe, as was East Twerton. At the girls' secondary school there was minimal damage, at the boys there was much broken glass. H.M.I. Tann tried to assess the situation for the Board (which had itself evacuated to an hotel in Bournemouth) "At the moment therefore the educational service of Bath is almost completely out of action but it is anticipated...that instruction will be resumed in about a weeks time as soon as the urgent demand for rest centre and feeding centre accommodation is reduced." The next day H.M.I. Tann again wrote to the Board noting that the Ministry of Supply had obliged him to agree to the use of the hall and gym of the boys' secondary school by a firm doing urgent work whose own premises had been destroyed. He hoped that it would only be for a few months.¹ Ten days later Tann again wrote to advise that in fact the position was worse than had at first been feared, because of the distribution of damaged schools. However by 11 May the undamaged schools re-opened and again the authorities somehow tried to find more halls and rooms.² But re-opening the schools led parents, children and staff to ponder and fear the possibility of a bombing attack during daytime. The discussions on this naturally had to contemplate the most horrific possibilities - from a direct hit on an occupied school to the effects of shattered and splintering glass. In turn the authorities - and indeed the public through the newspaper columns - debated the best policy to be adopted in the event of a bombing raid. The two options were that children should stay together in the school and risk a

1. P.R.O. Ed. 134/235 Wartime: H.M.I. Tann to the Board of Education 27 April 1942 and 28 April 1942.
2. Ibid., H.M.I. Tann to Board of Education 7 May 1942 and 11 May 1942.

direct hit, or scatter in all directions and risk being shot at by fighter planes.¹

Without doubt the bombing of April 1942 marked the bleakest point of the war for the people of Bath in general and the Education Committee in particular. The L.E.A.'s buildings were overcrowded because of evacuees, lost to Government Departments and smashed by enemy bombs. By a supreme effort the provision of education continued - but the Council were bitter between 1940-42 and could be vindictive. In April 1940 the Education Committee wanted a laboratory assistant for the City of Bath Boys' School. The weekly wage was a derisory £2.10s.0d. per week, and in consequence few applied, and those who did had little or no scientific knowledge. However an Austrian Jew, Stefan Zuckerbaker, applied. He was aged 23 and had escaped into Switzerland (on skis - presumably over mountains) and both of his parents were in concentration camps. Zuckerbaker had completed a science course at Vienna University and he had ultimately made his way to England, and to Bath, where he was employed as a waiter at Monkton Combe School. He was given the laboratory assistant's job by the Committee "because he had the necessary efficiency, and training and there would be a saving a money", said Councillor Major G.D.Lock. But when the Committee's Minutes went to Council, Zuckerbaker's teutonic name, complete with umlaut, created a most unpleasant xenophobia. Councillor Andrews declared "I have no room for foreigners...England first, England second and all the time. If they could not find a man for the job they should put in an English lady." F.C.Holmes retired head of the Boys' School in question protested "against the giving to an alien of a job which ought to be given to an English man and for preference to an unemployed ex-serviceman." Fortunately one voice rose above the clamour - Councillor Cook of the Labour Party "Surely we members of the Council of a city which is supposed to be cultured never ought to emulate that man Hitler". But to no avail - the issue was referred back to the Education Committee by 26 votes to 20. The Committee accepted the inevitable and

1. This issue was first discussed by the Education Committee in 1940 for example B.C. 29 November 1940.

the second on the list - Hale - acknowledged to have no scientific training was appointed. Zuckerbaker disappeared from the files.¹

The following month, June 1940, the Council turned to the problem of conscientious objectors. Councillor Hale gave advance notice of his motion that any registered objector should be barred from employment, or continuing employment, by the Council. This motion was amended slightly to the effect that such objectors should be dismissed or kept on, but at a soldier's pay. Council accepted this by 39 votes to 1.² The Education Committee had been somewhat anxious about this issue and in May 1940 they pondered the problem of asking a man outright at interview whether he was an objector. A teacher had been appointed to the West Central School and it was subsequently discovered that he was an objector. Councillor Male observed that if the Committee had know "I think the vote would have been different from what it was."³ However with the Council ruling, the Education Committee promptly decided to dismiss objectors or keep them on with soldier's pay in provided schools and advised managers of non-provided schools to do the same.⁴ In August two objectors at the City of Bath Boys' School - R.C.Allen and M. Rutherford - were dismissed and reinstated on soldier's pay. L.Brooks a handicraft instructor went to work at Filton near Bristol (involving work on aeroplanes) since he was also an objector and the Council had also suggested that objectors who did war work should be given leave of absence without pay, which leave should not count for purposes of salary increments.⁵ Later four more lost their jobs, two were reinstated on soldier's pay, a third worked on the land and a fourth left.

The arrangements were not without their difficulties. In April 1941 the Council wondered what to do about a female conscientious objector. A recent female appointment to Oldfield Girls' School was discovered with her husband to be an objector. Alderman Long "did not think they had any business to ask the woman's views. They had no legal right". Mr. J. Plowman said they were never told when

-
1. B.E.C. Minutes 20 May 1940. B.C. 18 April 1940, and 4 May 1940.
 2. B.C.B.C. Minutes 27 June 1940, 16 July 1940.
 3. B.C. 23 May 1940.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 17 July 1940.
 5. B.E.C. Minutes 30 August 1940.

they made the appointment that the woman's husband was a conscientious objector."¹
Eventually the Council ratified the agreement.

The First World War had also seen the problem of objectors. But wars end and warriors and objectors alike have to return to normal life. In April 1919 H.R. Wilkinson the Headmaster of the School of Art, and a registered conscientious objector was due to return to his post. The Council did not want him. Major General Bradshaw moved the motion not to accept him back "He knew that legally they were entitled to exemption...but all the same if the manhood of the country had been of the same mind as the conscientious objector he dreaded to think what would have been the result of this terrible war." Bush took a more compassionate view. "Had he been a young man he would have gone like a shot, but this was the thing that worried him - that Mr. Wilkinson in his attitude which he believed to be absolutely sincere might be right and he might be wrong. It was possible as the months and years went by we would see things in true proportion and if they discharged Mr. Wilkinson they might have seriously to regret it." Despite Bush's plea the Council voted 22 to 19 to dismiss Wilkinson.² After the Second World War Bath Council to their credit showed a great magnanimity. An objector applied to be reinstated in his post in the Library in August 1945. Councillor Plowman observed that their decision of 1940 was not meant "to penalise conscientious objectors for the rest of their lives. This man had paid the penalty and Mr. Plowman thought he should be reinstated on his previous pay",³ which he was.

By 1943 a new spirit invigorated the Council, and the Education Committee. No longer were they immersed in the problems of daily survival, but turned instead to long-term planning, and of the opportunities which might be available after the war. In July 1943 the Abercrombie Committee was formed. The Chairman was Professor Abercrombie, and the City Engineer (Owens) and the City Planning Officer (Mealand) were the other two members. These were to consider the plans of the different Committees of Council for reconstruction. The Education Committee formed

-
1. B.C. 1 April 1941.
 2. B.C. 8 April 1919.
 3. B.C. 1 August 1945.

a sub-committee of Hoyle, the Director, and E.E.Clements and Major G.D.Lock, respectively Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Education Committee. Their Report was precise, but at the same time bold. Schools were to have tennis courts and playing fields which would be available at evenings and weekends for Youth Service Organisations. Five schools were to have swimming pools, all of the larger schools were to have canteen and dining hall facilities. There was discussion of Community Centres and Libraries.

In previous decades the Bath Council and the Education Committee had been very long on promises and short on performance. The Reconstruction Sub-Committee report contained the caveat "That these proposals are only tentative and...have not yet been submitted to the Board of Education...and that the Education Committee will have the opportunity of reconsidering the proposals."¹ However the Education Committee were not to use the possibilities in these sentences to later avoid any expense at a later date. The very opposite was the case. Even before the war was over they were spending money and making plans in a totally new way bearing in mind their attitude since 1902. In February 1943 nine acres of land at Weston Park was purchased at a cost of £1,150 for a new site for the Domestic Science Training College.² The next month - March 1943 - the Education Committee resolved unanimously to move from Scale II to Burnham Scale III costed at £4,500 per annum less £2,250 from the Exchequer.³ In May 1943 the Education Committee pondered the possibilities of using the old bomb-damaged Brougham Hayes premises of the Domestic Science College as, for example, a day continuation school.⁴ In February 1944 they resolved to purchase twelve and a half acres on the Moorlands Estate and more land at Odd Down to build new infants schools.⁵ In July 1944 the Committee were eager to remove the Admiralty and Ministry of Works from their requisitioned buildings. They refused to go but released some buildings under licence at twentyfour hours notice of need to re-occupy.⁶ After the 1944 Education Act the Education Committee

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 6 July 1943.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 17 February 1943.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 17 March 1943.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 19 May 1943.
 5. B.E.C. Minutes 28 February 1944.
 6. B.E.C. Minutes 19 July 1944.

promptly formed eight sub-committees each of eight members and carried on with their work.

It is impossible to discover precisely why the Bath Councillors embraced education in such a determined manner. Had the initiative ceased after the war then the conclusion would be that they were swayed by the emotions of the time, but the momentum continued long after the war and into the 1960s. Even then their energy was only dissipated by the comprehensive debate. The Council turned from running a County Borough where educational parsimony was their watchword to the other extreme of liberality with money for education despite occasional rages from the ratepayers. Perhaps it was in part the influence of the war, of new men, and of the possibilities of the 1944 Act. One random comment by a Councillor in 1943 sets the tone for the post-war years. Bath wanted to help with the Government's emergency training scheme for teachers. The only room they could find was a poor site, derequisitioned by the Ministry of Works. Declared Councillor Jenkins, the Education Committee "should not be too concerned now about accommodation. As they wanted to establish Bath as an educational centre the scheme was an opportunity to get a good foot in at an early date."¹

1. B.C. 18 December 1943.

Chapter Eleven.

Post War Developments and Secondary Re-organisation.

"For my third example I would like to look at the local organisation of schools. This is a problem which is likely to shorten the lives of some of us."

A.B.Clegg, 'Presidential Address to the Association of Chief Education Officers', Education 5 February 1965.

The years 1946-63 saw in Bath a completely new approach to education to that which had gone before.¹ Instead of a penny pinching determination to avoid all but the mandatory provision, the Bath Education Committee and the Council decided upon a high rate of expenditure in return for the best schools possible. Naturally the best organisation of secondary schools after 1964 was open to discussion, but prior to that date the tripartite system was most usually adopted and Bath had a very successful tripartite system. As had happened before there were two strong men in control - H.W.Brand the Director of Education and Major G.D.Lock as Chairman of the Education Committee.

Brand was from London, a teacher of modern languages and games. In 1937 he became an H.M.I. and in 1940 deputy chief education officer in Bristol. In 1945 A.W.Hoyle had declared that he was to retire, eager to hand over to a younger man² and Brand was appointed Director of Education at the age of 36. Ten years earlier King's College London had awarded Brand an M.A. degree for a thesis on education in the borough of West Ham.³ This work showed that he had a considerable feeling for the poor who because of their poverty and lack of opportunity to study and stay on at school, often failed to break out of the circle of poverty which passes from generation to generation. He was especially critical of the inability of poor children to secure places in secondary schools solely because they were poor. In Chapter Three he asked "can the aggravation of every social problem in the poorest wards be fairly attributed to the low standard of intelligence of the inhabitants or do these social problems so weigh the future against the child that he is not able physically or mentally to enter upon some form of higher education?"⁴ (i.e. secondary education). He looked at the poor home background "overcrowding means sheer inability to do homework in preparation for the scholarship examination... broken sleep because different members of the family sleep together in

-
1. The period 1944-74 is discussed at greater length in N.P.Simpson, 'The Development of Secondary Education in the County Borough of Bath 1944-74 with particular reference to the period of comprehensive re-organisation 1963-73', University of Hull M.Ed. Thesis. (1977).
 2. B.C. 19 April 1945.
 3. H.W.Brand 'West Ham: its educational problems and facilities', University of London M.A. Thesis. (1935).
 4. Ibid., p.67.

but rise at different times...constant noise from machinery in the factories and heavy traffic to and from the docks."¹ The result of being debarred from secondary education either because parents could not afford the fees, or because the home environment of an inherently bright child mitigated against it was that such a child could not get a job and was thrown on the labour market. "Small local firms make a regular practice of taking boys straight from school, employing them only on semi-skilled labour and discharging them at twenty one when they have a right to a man's wage."²

To avoid the indignity of the labour market a person needed an education, academic for the clever child, practical and vocational for the less able, but above all an education. Brand's thesis shows a clear compassion for those unable to secure an education, and he evidently felt it was the duty of government at local and central level to make education available to the mass, and to remove any obstacles. It would be foolish to suggest that a thesis written when a man was twenty six could be reviewed forty years later to show that he had followed those earlier policies, however it is not unreasonable to say that the sympathy for the underprivileged and a determination to open the way to all levels of education for them remained with him throughout his career.

The other influential man of education was Major Lock. He first appeared in local politics in the late 1930s and was a co-opted member of the Education Committee. By 1942 he was the Vice-Chairman and from 1948-52, 1953-58 and 1959-61 Lock was the Chairman. Council had ruled that five years was the maximum tenure of a chairmanship of any Committee in one run. Consequently in 1952-3 Councillor Gallop and in 1958-9 Councillor Mrs G. Maw were brought in almost by agreement simply to allow Lock to take over the chair for a fresh five years. It will be seen that Lock dominated the Education Committee allowing no one to spoil plans or cut expenditure and on this latter point they were even prepared to challenge the Minister.

1. Ibid., p.68.
2. Ibid., p.31.

In 1943 A.W.Hoyle and Lock, along with Councillor Clements, had prepared a Report for the Reconstruction Sub-Committee of the Council.¹ This Council Report summarised all of the development plans of the Council's Committees for the post war years, Hoyle's plan hoped for swimming baths and playing fields and a large school building programme. Brand however had to write a Development Report that would satisfy the Ministry of Education in the light of the 1944 Education Act. In the past the Bath L.E.A. had failed so conspicuously in the area of secondary education. The 1902 Act had made the provision of elementary schools compulsory but not secondary, and Chapter Seven above has shown that no matter how much the Board of Education might alternately bully and cajole it could not force an L.E.A. to provide secondary schools. The 1944 Act made the provision of both junior and secondary schools mandatory, and the Bath L.E.A. accepted this. The precise type of secondary system was left to the discretion of the individual L.E.A. and only Angelsey and part of London adopted other than a tripartite system. The Development Plan did acknowledge that "in the field of secondary education the Committee have had the greatest difficulty in determining the nature of their recommendations and they have interviewed the Heads of the Secondary Modern and Secondary Technical Schools on more than one occasion, in order to discuss their proposals with them."² In fact it would have been difficult for an L.E.A. to adopt a comprehensive system unless as a result of bombing they had the space to rebuild large purpose built schools. This was not the case in Bath and the obvious course was to allow the elementary schools up to Standard IV to become infant and junior schools, and the senior schools to become the secondary modern schools. The two secondary schools could become grammar schools, and the various technical schools of the technical college could become the technical school with an intake at eleven instead of thirteen. Thus the Art School became a single form entry school, predominantly secondary modern in character. The Junior Schools of Applied Science and of Engineering became the technical school with an eleven to sixteen intake. The School of Commerce was closed and one year courses for secondary modern children

1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 6 July 1943.

2. The Bath Education Committee Development Plan 1946 (Guildhall) p.20.

aged fifteen were provided. As to the ratio of grammar places to secondary modern the Education Committee took the advice of Circular 73 of 1945 from the Ministry. This urged that 70-75 per cent should be secondary modern and 25-30 per cent grammar and technical.¹ Bath could fulfil this for the modern schools and for the grammar schools the Development Plan argued that there was more than enough places. The L.E.A. not only had the two municipal grammar schools but also reserved fifteen places at Bath High, ten at King Edward's and after 1946 three at the Convent School, an Independent Roman Catholic Girls' School, recognised as efficient but not in receipt of grant. Consequently the Authority provided for 168 places per year which was generous by the Ministry's standards. "It is capable of further expansion if the Authority desires; either by a reduction in the number of places offered to the neighbouring counties or by an increase in the number of places tenable at the Independent Grammar Schools."²

This acceptance of a tripartite system was almost inevitable given the buildings available in 1946. The Plan did envisage the need for two further secondary modern schools, both two stream entry one for boys and one for girls. There was also a considerable amount of rebuilding envisaged. The Oldfield Boys' and Girls' Schools were very badly sited and the buildings very old, equally West Twerton Boys' needed additions and improvements. The two aided schools, Walcot Parochial and St. John's Roman Catholic needed rebuilding and the managers of both schools were eager to achieve this. There was also a considerable building programme necessary amongst the junior schools in general.

However a change of mood on the part of the Education Committee and Council did not change the practicalities of the situation where school buildings were concerned. Bath is situated in a valley and there is little room in which to build. It is no easy answer to knock down an existing school and rebuild on the site because often the site was too small, or in the wrong place. Also Bath is a town which has not seen people flee from the centre to live on the outskirts. The centre of the town is inhabited, many of the high Georgian buildings in the very centre have shops below and flats above. The results of this pattern of occupation is

1. Ibid., p.21.

2. Ibid., p.22.

that schools have to be sited in the town, they cannot be flung out on far away housing estates. Consequently despite a very real will on the part of the Education Committee to rebuild it was not always possible in the post-war years. Nevertheless by 1963 the City of Bath Girls' and City of Bath Boys' had both been the subject of rebuilding and enlarging. The Technical School had grammar school status, a VI Form, and it had been renamed the City of Bath Technical School. Oldfield Girls' Secondary Modern had moved to a purpose built school at Kelston Road and Oldfield Boys' had expanded to take over the extra space. West Twerton Secondary Modern Boys' was in modern premises at Rush Hill and had been renamed Westhill. The equivalent girls' school had spread into the boys' school when it moved. Walcot Parochial was to become a single sex girls' school and move into a purpose built school - the Diocesan - in 1964. The Roman Catholics had built a new mixed school at Odd Down in 1962 - Cardinal Newman. The 1946 Plan had envisaged two new secondary modern schools, but of these nothing more had been heard. Consequently although the whole plan had not been carried through there had been a substantial secondary school rebuilding programme. Equally there had been rebuilding of the junior schools and in the further education colleges but it was the secondary schools which had the bulk of the spending. Even the Art School had been moved into a fine detached house which had been adapted - Cranwells at Weston Park.

Naturally these plans had been expensive to implement, but the Education Committee and Council had pushed ahead ignoring the complaints of some Councillors and ratepayers. In 1947 Councillors Jenkins and Tranter moved a motion that "in view of the serious financial position of this country Council establish a Select Committee to investigate and report on Education Committee spending." Tranter suggested that the Committee by spending over £57,000 on Newton Park Training College, £15,000 on Bath Academy of Art, and the purchase of Nos. 1 and 2 Portland Place as hostels for the Domestic Science Training College was robbing the housing programme. Councillor Jenkins, who in 1943 had declared that Bath was to become an educational centre, argued that if such projects were stopped immediately the Government would not allow one more house to be built. Lock simply said "it was

a panic resolution. He thought Bath had started to become an educational centre of some repute. Were they going to throw it all away the minute there was a serious crisis?"¹ Not only did the Council not accept the motion, it continued to spend - £60,500 was proposed in 1950 on a five year further education programme and accepted unanimously.² The Council not only initiated spending and defended the education service from cuts by its own Councillors, it also warded off demands for cuts from the centre. In 1951-52 Miss Florence Horsbrugh, the Minister of Education, had asked for five per cent education cuts during the financial year 1952/53 as part of a saving overall in national expenditure. The Bath Committee cut £16,800 from its educational budget, being 3.5 per cent, and declared that it could do no more. This £16,800 came by cutting back on redecorating for one year, saving £6,000, £2,330 was saved by increasing evening class fees by 50 per cent. The Committee did have to cut some vital educational items, nursery classes and new staff appointments, but they would not budge from 3.5 per cent.³ As a result of this determination when Major Lock vacated his seat as Chairman in 1958 half the authority's children were in new, enlarged or substantially adapted premises.⁴ Even then the Education Committee were prepared to go on and spend and the newspaper article for the 1961 debate on education opens with the pithy phrases of one or two anguished Councillors. "This terrific burden...these formidable figures...the cost of this service...all aspects clamouring for more money...a bitter pill for ratepayers." These were a few of the phrases used when Bath Education Committee announced on Wednesday night plans for a 1961-62 budget costing £1,921,575."⁵ On this occasion there was press debate and discussion and the usual ill informed letters with evocative pseudonyms ('Struggling of Bath' in one instance complained about one school's six washing machines and called for a ratepayer's strike⁶) but the spending plans were adopted. By 1963-64 the Education Committee was spending over two and a half million pounds a year.

-
1. B.C. 18 September 1947.
 2. B.C. 19 January 1950.
 3. B.C. 18 January 1952.
 4. B.C. 22 May 1958.
 5. B.C. 16 February 1961.
 6. B.C. 6 March 1961.

When the Committee had determined to make Bath an educational centre they were in earnest. They maintained three colleges for teacher training. The Domestic Science College had moved to purpose built premises in Sion Hill in 1959 and taught students for a teachers' certificate of the University of Bristol. Extensive premises had been acquired in Somerset Place for a students hostel. Furthermore in 1945 the ancestral seat of the Temple Gore Langton family at Newton Park on the outskirts of Bath was de-requisitioned and the Bath L.E.A. took it over on a 99 year lease from the Duchy of Cornwall to establish a college of education for women teachers in primary and secondary schools.¹ This College expanded through the 1950s and 1960s and in 1960 men were admitted. Even then Bath did not stop for Lord Methuen offered part of his house and grounds - Corsham Court - to the Bath L.E.A. to be used as a training college for teachers of art. Bath seized the opportunity. However Bath did not maintain this College alone, it was part of the provision of the Area Training Organisation of the University of Bristol. Nonetheless Bath L.E.A. did maintain two training colleges, Somerset did not maintain any and nearby Bristol only one. On his retirement Brand observed "you haven't got another authority maintaining four colleges until you get up to populations of a quarter of a million."²

An education system is more than buildings and budgets, but this activity does illustrate the new view and determination of the Bath Education Committee. Their policy within the schools was formal, experiment was not to be encouraged. I.J.Pitman, Bath's M.P., had helped to devise the Initial Teaching Alphabet, but in June 1960 the Education Committee were told by Lock - once again back as Chairman - I.T.A. would not be used in Bath's junior schools.³ Equally organisation was formal in junior schools. A Report issued in 1962 in Bath suggested that some heads were apprehensive about streaming. Brand however stated "we are perfectly satisfied with the system at Bath. Brighter children are put in the A stream, the slower ones in the B stream." He felt that since most of Bath's junior schools

-
1. B.C.B.C. Minutes 14 September 1945.
 2. B.C. 23 September 1971.
 3. B.C. 16 June 1960.

were two forms of entry this was satisfactory, objections only arose in larger junior schools. "The C stream had a concentration of slower children and heads had found it was better to mix the B and C streams to obtain a greater range of ability in the combined stream so that the slower pupils had some stimulus from others in the same class."¹ It would not be unreasonable to ask whether the A stream pupils could not also do a little stimulating of their less able fellows but they were too busy working for their scholarships.

The eleven plus was not new in Bath since children had been working for scholarships at Bath High and King Edward's since 1921 and also scholarships to the City secondary schools. Consequently after 1946 the Education Committee already had a fair amount of experience in this kind of examining. In 1946 the Committee agreed on three papers - English, Essay and Arithmetic - graded A to E and a headmaster's report, again A to E. Any child with five As or four and a B was offered a grammar school place.² This examination was refined over the years but the main elements remained the same. As with educational spending, attacks on the scholarship examination were fended off. When in 1962 Councillor A.L. Ricketts said "this is the annual battle of nerves which affects children and parents alike. I am most strongly of the opinion this is not the best method of selection," the chairman of the Scholarship Sub-Committee Dr. A.H.Ashcroft replied "we have no evidence - strong evidence - of this dislike."³

In the secondary schools L.E.A.s were faced with a problem. The grammar schools inherited a prewar tradition of scholarships, some modest social exclusibility since fees were charged, and in fact no great change in their way of doing things. Prewar and post war their purpose was to take able children at the age of eleven and prepare them for the professions or the universities at eighteen. The modern schools however had no such inheritance - or perhaps no inheritance which they cared to advertise. In many instances and certainly in Bath, the modern schools were housed in the old elementary schools with the same

1. B.C. 1 May 1963.

2. L.E.C. Minutes 20 February 1946.

3. B.C. 22 November 1962. (Dr. Ashcroft had been the Headmaster of Fettes College, Edinburgh from 1915 until his retirement in 1945 when he had settled in Bath where he was Governor of several schools and a co-opted member of the Education Committee).

elementary school heads and staff. Instead of preparing for the dead end at fourteen, or the senior schools' slightly better dead end at fifteen, the modern schools had somehow to create for themselves a role as an alternative to the grammar schools. It was a difficult if not impossible task. Entry to the grammar school was by passing an exam, entry to the modern school was by failing it. As time passed ex-grammar school boys ran large offices, ex-modern school boys painted the office walls and cared for the grounds. Olive Banks suggested that "it is the vocational qualification of the academic curriculum which enables it to exert such a pressure on all forms of secondary education."¹

To establish parity of esteem was extraordinarily difficult. No matter that the teachers were paid on similar scales, and similarly qualified, that the schools looked very similar and had similar facilities, ultimately a school was judged by parents and society on the basis of what the children did when they left the school. Grammar school children passed G.C.E.s and went to universities, modern school children did not. Consequently in an attempt to give the modern schools an acceptable ethos and role the Education Committee deliberately decided that Bath modern schools would be highly vocational. Any boy or girl in modern schools would have the opportunity provided to learn work skills, and a trade, so that at fifteen when they left school they could get a good job, or go on for further training at the Technical College.

In the Development Plan this was outlined, "it is anticipated that within the next year each secondary modern school will begin to develop a distinctive technical bias at the discretion of the Head Teacher and Governing Body and with the approval of the Educational Committee which will be responsible for preventing unnecessary duplication. This will involve specialist staffing and equipment in each of these schools." Pamphlets were to be produced outlining each of the options for parents so that they could chose when their child was eleven. There were to be facilities for transfer at thirteen between modern schools. So strong was this vocational bias to be that "as each of the secondary modern schools

1. O. Banks, op.cit. p.245.

becomes established with its distinctive technical bias it should cease to be known as a secondary modern school and should adopt the name of the area in which it is situated or claim to be known by the specific craft for which it provides."¹ In 1974 Brand wrote that "it was never intended that the vocational bias should dominate the curriculum even in the final year of a modern secondary school course, but approximately two half days per week were devoted in most schools to the vocational courses and the remainder of the week to subjects of a more general character...In time the Printing Industry increasingly sought its recruits from Oldfield Boys' School because of its printing courses and the Nurserymen sought their recruits from Westhill with its Horticultural courses."²

A modern age may well regard such an intense degree of vocational bias as unnecessary, since people frequently need to be retrained during their lives to learn different skills and trades, and such an early specialisation is unwise. However in 1946 Brand and the Education Committee hoped "to stimulate the interest of pupils who were staying on compulsorily until the age of fifteen was freely accepted by the community as the normal school leaving age."³ This aspect had been in Brand's thoughts since 1935 when in his thesis on West Ham he discussed "those areas where nearly everyone is out of touch with the need for higher education, where no scholastic tradition exists few parents can be persuaded to consider further education because they know so few other parents who do so. The boy or girl who goes to secondary school from these areas is oftimes regarded as a poor unfortunate who is debarred from earning his living at fourteen."⁴

Brand wanted to give these modern schools a meaning to the Bath community and not have them seen as nebulous repositories for the academically lame, drifting between the ages of eleven and fifteen. Indeed Brand and the Education Committee not only tried to create a parity of esteem by making the modern schools seem a valid alternative to the child and parents because of the vocational bias, but they went on to encourage the modern schools to develop G.C.E. courses. Indeed this

-
1. Development Plan, op.cit., pp. 23-4.
 2. Brand, Unwillingly to School, op.cit., p.32.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Brand, 'West Ham', op.cit., p.69.

idea was first discussed in the very early 1950s when the G.C.E. examination first replaced the School Certificate. It had been necessary to take a group of subjects in this latter examination and thus elementary school children had rarely had the ability (indeed they would not have been at school at sixteen). However the G.C.E. could be taken as individual subjects and after the 1944 Act the leaving age was fifteen and so some children could be persuaded to remain an extra year to try a few G.C.E. subjects.

There was some argument as to whether passes in a few subjects was within the spirit of the examination since it was supposed to be a General Certificate implying a wide range of subjects studied and examined.¹ The topic had first come to light when the Development Sub-Committee of the Education Committee called attention to the fact that Oldfield Boys' Secondary Modern was preparing a G.C.E. course and other Schools' Governors were considering the same.² This Sub-Committee urged the Committee to discourage the modern schools on the grounds of expense. In fact after considerable discussion the Education Committee accepted that limited subject entries in the G.C.E. could be made by modern schools, and following the Development Sub-Committee's recommendation called for a Secondary Modern Leavers Certificate - not unlike the Certificate of Secondary Education which was to develop in the mid 1960s.³ A Report was submitted on the results obtained by modern schools in 1952 and "the Committee noted with approval the successes obtained."⁴

In June 1956 a deputation of all the modern school heads attended a Development Sub-Committee meeting to discuss the Ministry's Circular No. 289 on G.C.E. in Modern Schools. The sub-committee declared that it did not want the Education Committee to change its policy allowing modern schools to enter G.C.E.⁵ and this led to an inevitable conclusion. In December 1958 the Bath Chronicle reported that the Education Committee was considering a proposal to introduce sixth forms into modern schools and thus allow pupils to take 'O' and 'A' levels

-
1. B.C. 19 January 1952.
 2. B.E.C. Minutes 19 December 1951.
 3. B.E.C. Minutes 16 January 1952.
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 15 October 1952.
 5. B.E.C. Minutes 15 June 1956.

without transferring to grammar school. "This is education's reply from Bath to the few diehards who still insist that the Secondary Modern School is the quickest pathway into the academic blind alley."¹ In fact there were some difficulties establishing modern school sixth forms because of staff quotas - but clearly the Committee was intent on making the modern schools as academically respectable as possible.

The two grammar schools - City of Bath Boys' and City of Bath Girls' - both flourished during the 1950s and early 1960s. The D.E.S. publications List 69 and List 71 illustrated their success.² In essence these lists showed that in every age group over fifteen the Bath L.E.A. had more pupils remaining in school than the average of other L.E.A.s in England and this was not simply in the grammar and technical schools but also in the modern schools where 12.4 per cent of boys and 13.7 per cent of girls in the sixteen age group stayed on. In 1963 21.7 per cent of Bath children were in grammar schools against a national average of 17 per cent. Equally 20.2 per cent of Bath girls (as a percentage of those aged thirteen three years previously) and 10.9 per cent of boys were at school against a national figure of 10.6 and 8.0 per cent respectively. It is convenient to note here that the Secondary Technical School - renamed the City of Bath Technical School - had an 11 to 18 intake with well adapted premises at Brougham Hayes (which had belonged to the Domestic Science Training College). The school was an important part of the grammar school provision in Bath. Kenneth Richmond has observed "the sheer indifference with which all but a few L.E.A.s regarded the secondary technical school and their readiness to allow it to relapse into desuetude must be ascribed to the British dislike of seemingly banal educational services. This snobbish dislike is one of the less admirable legacies of Hellenism and a vice for which the nation has paid dearly."³ But in Bath the

1. B.C. 2 December 1958.

2. List 71 was "Selected Statistics relating to Local Education Authorities in England and Wales."
List 69 showed the percentage of thirteen year olds in Secondary Education in different types of schools according to their area of residence. Both lists were published annually.

3. W.Kenneth Richmond, "Education in Britain since 1944", (1978) p.87.

technical, or to use Richmond's word, the banausic, was of prime importance. From the late nineteenth century the T.E.C. was very influential, between the wars the junior technical schools deprived the nascent secondary schools of potential recruits and so it was almost inevitable that the Bath Education Committee should maintain a technical school and encourage its development.

When the pupils of the three grammar schools left their sixth forms they were encouraged to seek places in higher education establishments. Writing in 1961 Brand declared "there are probably more undergraduates at the universities from Bath, having regard to the size of its population than from most cities of comparable size, largely because from the type of population resident here there is a larger proportion of highly intelligent people than in most cities of comparable size." Consequently Bath had to spend money on awards and Brand gave a figure of £865 per 1000 population on university and other awards which was well above the average of £596 per 1000 population. (For good measure Brand noted that Bath L.E.A.'s administrative costs were £371 per 1,000 population against a national figure of £481 per 1,000).¹ List 71 for 1963 showed that Bath's awards for university places in 1963 were 62.8 per 1,000 against 32.6 per 1,000 nationally. For Further Education Colleges the figures were 46.9 per 1,000 in Bath against 27.1 nationally and for Training Colleges it was 46.0 per 1,000 against 32.1 nationally.²

In every sphere of education the post war Education Committee had redeemed the reputation of its prewar predecessor. It would be possible to find areas where there was still much that needed improvement - junior school rebuilding for example, or in the provision of nursery classes - but as far as they effectively could improve the provision of education in Bath the Education Committee between 1946-63 had not shrunk from doing so. After 1946 the Committee accepted a tripartite secondary system and determined to make that system as effective as possible. That anyone could suggest that the tripartite system was not effective, or could be totally replaced by a different system with social and not academic

1. B.C. 15 September 1961.

2. List 71 (for 1963 published in 1964).

goals would have shocked many of Bath's Education Committee members. However in 1963 the Committee unanimously passed the following resolution: "Resolved: that with a view of ending secondary school selection at the earliest practicable date the General Purposes and Finance Sub-Committee be requested to examine various alternatives and recommend a suitable comprehensive system of secondary education for the City utilising existing buildings and staff to the best advantage."¹ Twelve days later the Council accepted the motion.

The casual observer might be led to assume by this that all of the Education Committee members had undergone a radical conversion to the comprehensive cause. In fact each section of the Committee had accepted the motion for varying reasons, and only a small group of Labour Councillors really knew what the institution of a comprehensive system implied. The Labour Party had rarely done well in Bath, a loose coalition of Conservatives and Liberals had always been in a position to outvote them. Nationally the Conservatives by 1963 were in decline and the Wilson Government was formed in 1964. This move to the Labour Party was reflected in Bath when in 1963 there were sixteen Labour councillors, eleven Conservatives and eleven Liberals. Thus the Liberals held a decisive position, and a Liberal - Mrs G. Maw - was Chairman of the Education Committee. Councillor Roy Hiscocks of the Labour Party has explained why the Labour group were so quick to introduce the motion on comprehensive schools. "We knew that the implementation of comprehensive education in this country, while a plank in the policies of the Labour Party would probably take a number of years before it eventually reached the statute books."² Thus Bath Labour Party were taking advantage of their electoral success to prepare the way at local level for a national policy which they expected to follow on from a presumed national Labour victory. The newspaper report of the Education Committee debate noted Hiscock's words "each authority he contended should be left to devise its own version of the comprehensive system. The common feature should be the end of segregation at eleven." Mrs Maw the Chairman replied that the

1. B.E.C. Minutes 18 July 1963, B.C.B.C. Minutes 30 July 1963.
2. Letter from Councillor R. Hiscocks to the writer 26 November 1976.

Committee had always looked to other authorities to see if there was anything that Bath could emulate.¹ Herein lies one of the reasons why the comprehensive motion was accepted unanimously. Many Committee members were thinking that a comprehensive school was an educational novelty, and if other authorities had one then Bath should have one too. They felt that one single comprehensive school could be built as an experiment and possibly later more could follow on and if the school was not a success then it could be scrapped. Few Education Committee members realised the fundamental change which the motion implied. Indeed on a superficial level the motion did not appear to imply such change. Firstly it required that secondary school selection should be ended at the earliest opportunity. In fact many Councillors had realised that the test at eleven was fallible, otherwise why was it that the modern schools had pupils who were capable of G.C.E. work. Even if they felt that there was a broad difference between the grammar and the modern school child there was certainly imprecision at the margin. Thus that part of the motion calling for the selection procedure to be re-assessed and possibly ended did not worry them. Secondly in 1963 comprehensive schools were simply an unknown quantity and so the second part of the motion calling for an examination of alternatives with regard to comprehensive systems again did not worry most Education Committee members. Consequently the motion was accepted. Only the Director of Education - H.W.Brand - realised what the Labour Party motion meant. The Liberals and Conservatives thinking that a comprehensive school would merely be an addition to the already rich pattern of schools in Bath did not appreciate that if the selection test was abolished then irrefutable logic demanded that all children went to the same type of school, regardless of ability, social background or sex. (Bath did not have a single co-educational secondary school). Brand has aptly summarised the position, "Many people, elected representatives, co-opted members, teachers, and parents, wished to see the abolition of selection but they did not wish to introduce comprehensive schools. They were searching for an alternative which would retain the fine tradition of grammar and modern schools alike and yet abolish selection. Such an alternative did not exist."²

1. B.C. 18 July 1963.

2. H.W.Brand, Unwillingly to School, op.cit., p.34.

That there was no real agreement on the issue is illustrated by the fact that over ten years were spent trying to implement a comprehensive system. Five major sub-committees were established and Brand wrote over 70 reports on different aspects of comprehensive re-organisation. Once the Conservatives and Liberals on the Council realised the implications of a full comprehensive system, they quickly changed their views and prevaricated. Had it not been for the pressure from a Labour Government during 1964-70 the 1963 Minutes would have been rescinded.¹

Brand's task was to devise a plan which would show how Bath could be re-organised on a comprehensive system, and to report back to the General Purposes and Finance and Development Sub-Committee. This he did in September 1963, and it was evident that Brand in his Report was trying to warn the Education Committee of the real meaning of a comprehensive system. In his covering letter he stated that his "personal view is that the system in Bath has reached a very much higher stage of perfection than applies to many parts of the country and that the quality of the Modern Secondary Schools here in particular is such that it would be most unwise...to make any substantial change in them."² His Report then went on to list the difficulties of going comprehensive, such schools were untried; the large independent sector in Bath providing an attractive alternative; the religious problem; the fact that Bath could not start afresh with new purpose built schools; and the selection test which had been foremost in the reformers' eyes he declared "it is important to realise that the test could be abolished or simplified without the necessity of re-organising the secondary school system. Alternatively the secondary school system could be re-organised along comprehensive lines without abolishing the school selection test."³ This is in fact impossible but it was an attractive alternative to the Education Committee who began to realise the enormity

-
1. N.P.Simpson op.cit., pp.68-191 discusses in detail the struggle within the Bath Education Committee and Council for a comprehensive system. P.T.White "The Re-organisation of Secondary Education in Bath and Southampton". University of Southampton M.Phil. Thesis (1974) is also of interest. White did not have access to the confidential files of the Bath L.E.A. between 1963-73 which Simpson had, and thus relies on interviews and printed Minutes. His work is a comparative study of Southampton L.E.A. which was committed to the comprehensive cause and Bath which was not committed.
 2. Secondary Re-organisation 16 September Document 1, Box 1.
 3. Ibid., p.2.

of the changes which their motion of July 1963 would bring about. Brand's first report was not a plan to implement re-organisation but a statement of the achievements of the Committee since 1946 and a careful explanation of the reason why they should not re-organise. Brand urged that a small sub-committee with teacher representatives should be established to review the London comprehensives, and the Leicestershire scheme (the comprehensive scheme devised by the Leicestershire Chief Education Officer Mason).

On 30 September 1963 the Education Committee established such a sub-committee, the Technical Sub-Committee, which had four members from the Education Committee, two representatives from the Anglican Diocese, two teacher representatives and one representative of the chief examiners. Their brief was to consider Brand's Report.

Meanwhile changes were proposed in the eleven plus examination. In place of part of the examination primary school heads were to send in examples of candidates' work. The newspaper interviewed Brand who declared that the 1944 Act created a problem of selecting children. "The social aspect still remained as most people felt that grammar school education gave a child better advantages and that children from secondary modern schools did not have the same opportunities. This was true in some parts of the country where secondary moderns were the poor relations but it was genuinely not true in Bath...Everything has been done to make them as good as grammar schools. Brand said the curriculums were different but the introduction of the G.C.E. had given secondary modern children similar opportunities to those available to grammar school children."¹ The timing of the changes and Brand's words were intended to assuage the demands for change. However the next evening Fred Moorhouse, prospective Labour Party parliamentary candidate for Bath, told a meeting of the N.A.S. "it is delusory to suggest [the proposed eleven plus changes] abolish the eleven plus. It merely changes the nature of the examination. Children will still be labelled grammar and moderns with all the unfortunate - even if unintended - social overtones associated with these terms."²

1. B.C. 17 September 1963.
2. B.C. 18 September 1963.

Thereafter attitudes hardened on both sides as it became apparent that neither would give way. Between October 1963 and March 1964 the Technical Sub-Committee had frequent meetings, finally deciding to ask the Chairman of the Education Committee, Mrs Maw, to submit a re-organisation plan, and also the leader of the Labour Party, Councillor Purdie to do the same. This latter plan was produced in April 1964 and called for a two tiered scheme in order to make the best use of the existing buildings.¹ Brand's reply to this was that the proposals were "administratively possible and educationally disastrous."² Mrs Maw did not produce a Report of her own but Brand had suggested a scheme which would provide one comprehensive school in Bath, and this idea became the basis of Mrs Maw's Report.³ In essence the Report looked to one ten form entry school and the type of curriculum which could be taught therein. "When these developments, which clearly would not take place until 1972 having regard to the limitations of the building programme and many of which might not come into effect until a much later date, had time to show a truly objective result, the Education Committee might like to consider the consequences and amend its policy along new and evolving lines."⁴ The Report looked to 1972 as the starting date and a further wait to test the public's reaction.

The Technical Sub-Committee called on Brand to precis the three systems under discussion for circulation to all schools. Scheme A was simply to carry on and develop the status quo; Scheme B was Councillor Purdie's two tier system; and Scheme C was Mrs Maw's one single comprehensive school.⁵

All of the Bath maintained secondary schools were invited to discuss and vote on the three options, as were the three independent schools with scholarships, King Edward's, Bath High and the Convent. The five selective schools favoured

-
1. Two Tier Scheme of Comprehensive Education April 1964, Document 5, Box 1.
 2. Two Tier Scheme Comments by the Director of Education April 1964, Document 6 Box 1.
 3. Brand to Councillor Mrs Maw 1 May 1964 Px2c(1).
 4. Report of the Chairman of the Education Committee on suggested Re-organisation, May 1964. Document 7, Box 1.
 5. Report on the Comparative Costs of the Three Systems for Secondary School education, June 1964. Document 8, Box 1.

Scheme C which called for the development of one comprehensive. Possibly their staffs knew that nationally their position was under attack and so a limited experiment was in order. The modern school staffs were all in favour of Scheme A which was to simply continue to develop the existing system. Possibly the staff at the modern schools felt that they and their pupils would somehow lose in an all ability school, and preferred the chance to develop their own G.C.E. courses and sixth forms. Only the Technical College voted for Councillor Purdie's Scheme B, primarily because the two tier scheme envisaged a role for the college.

Brand had every reason to be pleased. Seven votes were cast for his view, the development of the existing system, five votes for a very limited experiment not due to commence for some six years and only one vote for Purdie's scheme.¹ The Technical Sub-Committee met again in March 1965 and Councillor Hiscocks proposed "That the Education Committee be informed that this Sub-Committee while recognising that the present system of secondary education is highly satisfactory and while Scheme C does not fully meet the requirements of July 1963 nevertheless recommends the acceptance of Scheme C in order to provide an opportunity for experiment in the field of comprehensive education."² Thus the Councillor whose motion of July 1963 was designed to destroy the educational status quo, was now persuaded to propose a motion which in effect delayed any change for years ahead. The initial enthusiasm of two years earlier had worn away, the Education Committee members realised the full implications of going comprehensive and drew back.

However they could not draw back too far for a Labour Government was in power and had declared its intentions on the comprehensive issue. Consequently in April 1965 the Committee decided to take no action but await the circular which all L.E.A.s were expecting. In the event Circular 10/65 made many, including Brand, realise that this was no longer a local issue. Consequently the General Purpose and Finance Sub-Committee met again to discuss a Report by Brand on re-organisation

-
1. Various letters from Head Teachers recording their votes and expressing their views can be found in Px2c(2).
 2. This motion and a complete account of the Technical Sub-Committee's work can be found in Report for the Joint Development and General Purposes and Finance Sub-Committee 26 March 1965 Document 11, Box 1.

in the light of the Circular. In fact Brand's suggestion was very broadly the basis of the system which was to be adopted four years later. He realised that because of the lack of finance to rebuild old schools or build purpose designed comprehensives the Bath L.E.A. would have to adapt its existing schools. He thus proposed to have schools on two sites under a single head. This would create viable six form entry schools he felt. However Brand felt that this would not be completed until 1980 - a fifteen year wait.¹ Various other schemes were discussed at this meeting, and eventually it was decided to approach the D.E.S. direct. This meeting was not very helpful and little was gained, other than an impression that the Secretary of State might well countenance long periods before final re-organisation was implemented.² For a further six months plans and schemes were discussed by the sub-committee. A deputation again visited the D.E.S. which meeting was even more inconclusive than before. The D.E.S. Minutes concluded "the Ministry of State said he did not propose to tell the Authority what to do" whereas Bath's Minutes concluded "the Minister has no suggestions to make as to the way in which the Authority might re-organise its schools."³ The plan on which the Education Committee had pinned its hopes was an adaptation of one of those in 10/65 which consisted of linking schools. The deputation to the D.E.S. felt that their plan was not acceptable and as E.F.Warren, the Deputy Director, wrote to Councillor Mrs Hanna "There seems therefore no alternative but for the Committee to start again from scratch."⁴

Brand began afresh by writing to the leaders of the three political parties, urging them to come together and form a joint plan which would then be more likely to be acceptable to the Council as a whole. "If there is a report submitted only by one political party, the likelihood must be that the other parties will feel bound to oppose it...There is, already as we saw in the taxi going to the

-
1. Report on the Possible Re-organisation of Secondary Education in accordance with the requirements of D.E.S. Circular 10/65, July 1965. Documents 12, Box 1.
 2. Notes of Conference held at D.E.S. on 10 November 1965. Undated Memorandum in Px2c(2).
 3. Both sets of Minutes are in Px2c(4).
 4. E.P.Warren to Councillor Mrs Hannar 18 August 1966. Px2c(4).

Department a very substantial measure of agreement and I personally would hope that the remaining differences could still be bridged."¹

The initiative appeared to succeed and in September 1966 Hiscocks and Purdie (who was Mayor) of the Labour Party, Mrs Maw, Liberal and Major Caden, Conservative, met in the Mayor's Parlour. They agreed to establish a sub-committee of the three of them and try to present a common report. This Special Sub-Committee set to work and Brand drafted their Report which envisaged enlarging one existing Bath school every year between 1970-77. In the interim there would be a two tier system - all children transferring to the modern school serving their area, and then at thirteen either transfer again to a school in order to be prepared for G.C.E. 'O' Level, or remain and leave at fifteen.² Hiscocks urged that the Council accept the plan, but Council felt that a discussion with the Minister before detailed planning might be useful. The Town Clerk advised Brand that "I cannot see that Bath can expect to receive any clearer indication of Government policy than that given to other Authorities in Circular 10/65 and I can only reiterate the advice which I have given you on this aspect of the matter, namely that it would be unwise for you to seek such an interview."³ This advice notwithstanding Bath went ahead to be told "Miss Harte said that Bath was unique in approaching the Minister before submitting a final report for consideration by him." Furthermore Miss Harte continued "speaking as an administrator she could approve the present scheme of the Authority, she could have approved the former scheme and she would also be prepared to approve a scheme providing for a limited degree of transfer at thirteen plus. It was her function to advise the Minister as to the schemes to be accepted and she said that the schemes submitted varied from extremely carefully thought out schemes which could be accepted to schemes which were so designed and involved so much building work that they were clearly merely an attempt at procrastination...All such schemes were being rejected by the

-
1. H.W.Brand to Councillor Hiscocks 26 August 1966. Px2c(4).
 2. Advantages and Disadvantages of the Alternative Systems of Comprehensive Education 31 October 1966, Document 27, Box 1.
 3. J.E.Dixon to H.W.Brand 16 December 1966. Px2c(4).

administrative staff and hitherto the Minister had accepted their advice. She did not know what the policy of the new Minister would be, she had not met her."¹ Such bureaucratic side stepping did nothing to help Brand.

However the Director and his staff spent the winter of 1966 and 1967 visiting schools, colleges, local business groups and organisations discussing the proposed plans. Letters and views were invited and the replies collated.² On the evening of 8 February 1967 Brand and Councillors Maw, Caden and Hiscocks met to consider the collated comments and prepare their Special Sub-Committee's recommendations for the Education Committee meeting on 15 February. Brand made his position clear - he objected to the interim scheme with its break at thirteen. He also objected to the Labour Party's desire to speed re-organisation.³ Brand and the Sub-Committee were divided and so little could be expected from the Committee meeting which followed. In the event the Education Committee resolved "that the Council be informed, with regret, that this Committee cannot come to any clear conclusion on the re-organisation of secondary education in Bath and has asked its Chairman to call the Technical Sub-Committee again to consider a new scheme."⁴ It was on Brand's initiative that the three Councillors, one from each party, had got together and in fact he had not been happy with their proposed plan and dissension had spread. Brand's letter of 9 February to Councillor Hiscocks was a statement of his fundamental beliefs. Brand reviewed his years as Director and discussed the high academic standards of all Bath schools and the introduction of G.C.E. courses in the modern schools. "I am convinced that comprehensive schools in buildings designed, staffed and equipped for the purpose with the age range eleven to eighteen could fully maintain these standards."⁵ Few on the Education Committee would have disagreed with Brand by 1967 but purpose-built comprehensives were out of the question and Brand should have concentrated on devising an ad hoc scheme

-
1. Notes of Interview with Miss Harte and H.M.I. Fuller at the D.E.S. on 12 January 1967. Px2c(4).
 2. Summary of Resolutions and Comments from Various Bodies and Organisations, February 1967. Document 34, Box 1.
 3. Brand's views are contained in his letter to Councillor Hiscocks, 9 February 1967. Px2c(4).
 4. B.E.C. Minutes 15 February 1967.
 5. H.W.Brand to Councillor Hiscocks 9 February 1967. Px2c(4).

which would have utilised such buildings, staff and resources that Bath had available.

The Education Committee decided that they must reconstitute the original Sub-Committee - the Technical Sub-Committee - to begin again their discussions. They first turned to the old idea of a two tier system with a break at twelve or thirteen.¹ By including the infant and junior schools in the scheme - a system of 5 to 9, 9 to 13, 13 to 18 schools - then the junior schools could perhaps have some money spent on them as part of the re-organisation. The secondary schools had had the major share of resources since 1946 and this alternative was attractive, and when the Technical Sub-Committee met on 25 April 1967 they concluded that such a re-organisation was fraught with problems and they decided to keep the age of transfer at eleven. They recommended to the Education Committee a system for four six form entry schools and two eight form entry schools with ages 11 to 18. In May 1967 the Education Committee accepted this, but though this agreement may have seemed productive, in fact no mention was made of how the Committee were to proceed to the desired end - six comprehensive schools.

Brand advised the Technical Sub-Committee that they could either improve schools in any one area as the opportunity presented itself and make that area non-selective. Or they could adopt the foregoing as their ultimate aim but in the interim place all children in non-selective modern schools at eleven and transfer them or keep them at thirteen according to their parents wishes. This latter was the suggestion of the tripartite Special Sub-Committee which Brand had so vehemently opposed six months earlier. In the event Councillor Purdie, now Alderman Purdie, produced a linked schools scheme which he hoped would avoid the problem of transfer at thirteen.² The Education Committee opted for the progressive adaptation of each of the six schools as the opportunity arose, and on 25 July 1967 the Council concurred. The Minister was notified³ and for the remaining months

-
1. Middle School Comprehensive 17 April 1967. Document 36, Box 1.
 2. Purdie's Linked Schools Scheme and Brand's Area by Area Scheme are discussed in the Report on Two Methods of Carrying out Comprehensive Re-organisation, 28 June 1967. Document 43, Box 2.
 3. T.E.Cleeve (of the D.E.S.) to Bath L.E.A. 28 July 1967. Px2c(5).

of 1967 more meetings were held and Reports written on how the desired end could be achieved.¹ However in December 1967 Purdie's Linked Schools scheme was reconsidered and Brand had to produce yet another Report on this.² In March 1968 the Technical Sub-Committee agreed unanimously to link various schools as a prelude to the long term arrangements.³ After further modification a linked school scheme was presented to the Education Committee in May 1968. However the Committee resolved that the Council be recommended to reject the proposals of the Technical Sub-Committee. Brand threatened to resign, Hiscocks did so. Purdie declared that the rejection was not only "an exercise in political duplicity and an affront to the progressive forces in this Council but it condemns to sterility any secondary school development."⁴

There was a brief period of confusion and the Town Clerk had to advise Brand that the Education Committee could start again completely from scratch committed to nothing.⁵ The original motion had been passed in July 1963 and so in July 1968 after four sub-committees, four different alternatives had been rejected. Other problems were rising up, for example, further secondary school building and appointments of heads due shortly to retire, but none could be settled until the precise pattern of secondary provision was decided upon. At a national level Bath was getting bad publicity. The Times observed that "some twenty to fifty areas such as Bath, Croydon and Leicester are delaying the submission of schemes as long as they can. Schemes were due at the Ministry last year."⁶

Consequently Brand began by writing to each member of the Technical Sub-Committee and various teachers' organisation (N.A.S., N.U.T., Joint Four,) asking that they decide upon a number of specific points, for example, single sex or mixed; precise age range in each school; and the ever pressing problem of the

-
1. Minutes of the Technical Sub-Committee 21 December 1967. Px2c(5).
 2. Report to the Technical Sub-Committee on a proposal to introduce Paired Schools and to Abolish Selection by 21 February 1968. Px2c (6).
 3. Minutes of the Technical Sub-Committee 15 March 1968. Px2c(6).
 4. B.C. 5 June 1968.
 5. N.J.Pearce to H.W.Brand 12 July 1968. Px2c(6).
 6. The Times 23 February 1968.

interim stage. A similar letter was also sent to each Education Committee member.¹ Obviously Brand hoped to secure agreement on fundamentals before everyone met again in the Education Committee.

In July 1968 a new sub-committee - the Secondary Re-organisation Sub-Committee - met for the first time. This agreed on the long term objective, six purpose built comprehensives and Brand drew their attention to the interim stage.² The sub-committee again considered linking schools, and area by area re-organisation but inconclusively. Then in October 1968 Councillor Jones who was Chairman of both the Education Committee and the Re-organisation Sub-Committee was replaced by Councillor Elgar Jenkins. Though a Conservative he was a deputy head of a Catholic Modern School in the City and actively supported the comprehensive principle. Because of this and because Brand was anxious about the many other problems which had to be solved, events moved to a speedy conclusion. In October 1968 four different options for the interim organisation were presented to the sub-committee.³ They accepted the linked schools alternative, and whilst this was not a new scheme on this occasion the stages were carefully listed and the observations of W.N.Bence, Surveyor to the Education Committee were also taken into account.⁴ Consequently on 19 February 1969 this Report which linked schools was considered by the Education Committee which resolved that it be accepted. The next month, March 1969, Council by 40 votes to 15 accepted the plan.

On 13 March 1969 Brand was able to advise the D.E.S. of Bath's secondary re-organisation plan.⁵ It may be useful at this point to summarise precisely what Bath proposed to do. Five schools were capable of expansion on their sites

Oldfield Girls' School (name retained)

Diocesan Girls' School (name retained)

City of Bath Girls' School

-
1. H.W.Brand to various individuals and organisations 20 June 1968. Px2c(6).
 2. Minutes of the Secondary Re-organisation Sub-Committee 15 July 1968, 10 September 1968, Px2c(6)
 3. Each option is outlined in Documents Numbered 52, 53, 54 and 55 in Box 2.
 4. Assorted items in Document 61, Box 2.
 5. Report to the D.E.S. with regard to the Re-organisation of Secondary Education in Bath 13 March 1969. Document 65, Box 2.

City of Bath Boys' School

Westhill Boys' School

These last three were to be linked:

City of Bath Girls' with West Twerton Girls' (renamed Hayesfield)

City of Bath Boys' with Oldfield Boys' (renamed Beechen Cliff)

Westhill Boys' with City of Bath Technical School (renamed Culverhay)

To complete the re-organisation the City of Bath Technical School and West Twerton Girls' would exchange buildings after suitable adaptations. Oldfield Girls' and Diocesan Girls' would be extended on their own sites. In the very long term it was hoped to replace the West Twerton Girls' School buildings by rebuilding on the Westhill Boys' School site and extend the City of Bath Boys' site thus replacing the Oldfield Boys' site; and find a new site and buildings for the City of Bath Girls' School.

The long term goal of having six purpose built comprehensives had found ready agreement amongst the majority of the Education Committee after about 1966. They realised that with a Labour Government in power for some years ahead there was no real alternative to a comprehensive system. However the problem was always the interim period, what to do with the schools and when to abolish selection. Their ultimate answer was to make the interim scheme of linked schools the final long term scheme. Hopes were expressed that some of the very old buildings might be removed eventually and schools put together on one site, but in effect the Education Committee and Council were happy to have found a solution which solved immediate problems without worrying about the future.

It could reasonably have been assumed that the hardest task that the Education Committee and its permanent officials had to face was the formulation of a plan for secondary re-organisation acceptable to all of the Councillors and to the D.E.S. However the years of implementing the Plan after 1969 were to be as fraught with problems as the years before 1969 were in devising it. There was a vociferous campaign to keep the Art School open; another campaign to preserve the identity of the Technical School; a determined attempt to introduce the co-educational principle which reached the City Council; the usual lack of finance for building;

disagreement between Heads on switching of school buildings; as well as the major overall problem of putting into effect the plan of secondary re-organisation which the D.E.S. had accepted.¹ However despite these problems in September 1973 Bath secondary schools were all comprehensive.

The Bath Education Committee had only one year in which to administer these schools for in April 1974 Bath was subsumed by Avon in the local government re-organisation of that year. It is sad that an Education Committee which had brought about so many improvements in education since 1946 - even getting the University of Bath - should at its last meeting have to discuss the problems caused by disruptive children obliged to remain in schools because of the raising of the school leaving age.²

1. N.P.Simpson, op.cit., pp.179-190 discusses this period.
2. B.E.C. Minutes 20 March 1974.

Chapter Twelve.

A Consideration of the Years 1870-1974.

"Education is a nubile Cinderella; scantily clad and much interfered with."

If... A Film by Lindsay Anderson.

The development of a maintained system of education in Bath between 1870-1944 was hampered by a lack of consensus as to what should be provided and for whom. Between 1944-63 this had been resolved to the satisfaction of all three political parties and the L.E.A. was able to adopt a radical approach toward educational provision. After 1963 the regle du jeu were changed and the comprehensive debate created a second lack of consensus as everyone was again required to decide what should be provided and for whom.

The Bath School Board began in 1870 with a fiercely contested election and considerable public debate and interest. However having provided only three schools the Board's members settled themselves to administration not innovation feeling that the provision of schools by the churches, specifically Anglican, was sufficient. In fact the provision was inadequate, the schools too small and in poor accommodation. The Board members felt that they were performing a religious duty not an educational one. Maclure's comment is particularly apt with respect to the situation in Bath "Motives for starting schools varied: for the churches ownership expressed the prescriptive right to provide education as the by product of some other more evangelical aim."¹ Small wonder that the Bath Board had problems with poor attendance. Neither parents nor children saw the schools as relevant to their lives. The Board ultimately provided a fourth school which opened in 1902. However this was only undertaken after considerable local public demand, pressure from the Bath Emergency Education Committee and discreet advice by the Education Department.

The T.E.C. began its work in 1890 and not only was it influential during the last decade of the twentieth century but the influence of technical education was to remain until the 1960s. The reason is the very practical and vocational aspect of technical education. The classes of the T.E.C. stood in stark contrast to those of the School Board for they offered to pupils either a higher elementary education or subjects which were associated with trades. The T.E.C. decided that day classes would probably be attended by those who could afford not to work and so

1. J.Stuart Maclure, "The Control of Education" in Studies in the Government and Control of Education since 1860 (1970) p.4.

higher fees were charged whereas evening classes were for those who had to do a days work and so lower fees were charged. Some Councillors made mild complaint that the former should not be subsidised by ratepayers but otherwise there was general agreement about the validity of technical classes. Whatever the T.E.C. provided was well supported, only rarely did a class close because of lack of interest. The Committee was happy to abrogate to itself duties which the School Board had not carried out. The Council allowed the T.E.C. to take over a wing of the new Guildhall for its various classes and did not block the T.E.C.'s work. However after 1902 the Council did refuse to allow the L.E.A. to carry out its work and allowed only the most meagre expenditure. It would have been reasonable to assume that the Council's generally encouraging attitude towards the T.E.C. would have continued with the L.E.A. However this latter had a much wider remit than the T.E.C. The L.E.A. not only had a duty to provide an elementary school system but it had the option of providing a secondary system, and few Councillors were persuaded of the value of secondary schools. They could understand that working class children had to be literate and numerate which they assumed to be the task of the elementary schools, and they could see the value of technical classes since the skills taught would make local industry more efficient, but few could see why working class children would need to attend a secondary school.

The situation was further complicated by the classes of the old T.E.C. running in the Guildhall. These had been expensive to establish and occupied valuable space. Councillors argued that these classes were Bath's secondary school, if they had not been there then possibly Bush and the L.E.A. might have been able to persuade the Council that some secondary provision was necessary. However the struggle for adequate secondary school buildings took so long because various Councillors could not see what was wrong with the Guildhall school. The attitude of the Council was well illustrated by their refusal to appoint a Director of Education. Many believed that the provided education should be small and run by an able chairman of the sub-committee and possibly one or two full time clerks in the education office. Also education appeared to be a service capable of making infinite demands on the ratepayers purse, whereas paving,

lighting, water and the other municipal services whilst not finite were at least susceptible to controlled demands and expenditure. The difficulties encountered by Bush, King and Hoyle were created in part by the fear of the costs involved, in part by a failure to appreciate what was wrong with the existing provision, and a disbelief in the need or efficacy of secondary schools for working class children.

This attitude changed towards the end of the 1930s and during the years of the second world war. The reasons for the change of spirit are difficult to explain, beyond the obvious one associated with the common suffering of everyone during the war years and a desire to create a better world. Possibly there was an appreciation that working class children were capable of benefitting by a more purely academic, as opposed to technical and vocational education, and that by denying such education not only did the children suffer but the country lost a valuable human resource. Whatever the reason the Bath L.E.A. led by an able Director and encouraged by a Council prepared to countenance high expenditure created an efficient system of maintained schools between 1945-63. There was a concensus of opinion between the parties on education and the opportunities afforded by the 1944 Act were seized upon. The desire of the L.E.A. was to provide a system of schools wherein children could by their own efforts ascend to the various elites - be they managerial, intellectual, or skilled manual. Consequently the modern schools ran G.C.E. courses, as well as trade courses. There was a small Art Secondary School and a technical school with a sixth form and grammar school status. Bath children remained at school longer than the national average¹ and the L.E.A.'s awards for Further and Higher Education were higher than the national average.²

The Council was dominated by Conservatives at this time, and the Chairman

-
1. In 1963 20.2 per cent of Bath girls aged sixteen (as a percentage of those aged thirteen three years earlier) and 10.9 per cent of Bath boys were at school against a national average of 10.6 and 8.0 per cent respectively. List 71 (1964) H.M.S.O.
 2. Bath's awards for university places in 1963 were 62.8 per 1,000 whereas nationally the awards were 32.6 per 1,000. Further Education awards were 46.9 per 1,000 against 27.1 nationally and for students at Training College 46.0 per 1,000 against 32.1 nationally. List 71 op.cit.

of the Education Committee was a Conservative. It would be interesting to compare the radical Conservative approach of the Bath Council with the Conservative central government. However whilst two studies have been produced about the Labour Party and education¹ there is not a study of Conservative education policy. In consequence Parkinson is able to write "In view of [the Conservative Party's] ideas about the nature and role of the secondary education system in the pre 1944 period it is likely that the implementation of universal secondary education would have been delayed beyond 1944."² This view is questionable and certainly not true with regard to Bath Conservatives since they seized the opportunities afforded by the 1944 Act to provide an effective secondary school system.

However the concensus which had obtained in Bath between the political parties was to break down after 1963. The Labour Party began to press for comprehensive schools, whereas those who were satisfied with the status quo simply could not understand what a comprehensive school could do that the Bath tripartite system was not already doing. They simply did not grasp the fact that from the late 1960s academic criteria would not be the ones by which schools would be judged. Henceforth a school's ability to overcome social divisions between children was to be of paramount importance. The traditionalists countered by arguing that the Bath tripartite system allowed a child to overcome social handicaps by his own efforts and thus ascend to the elite. The progressives' reply was that it was necessary to abolish the elites. The progressives wanted to abolish the eleven plus examination because it appeared that children passed or failed depending upon their class background. The traditionalists felt that the examination was sound but acknowledged that there was imprecision at the margin which could be overcome by a system of transfers between schools after the age of eleven. The counter argument was that once a child entered a school he would approximate to that school's standards, raising himself in the grammar school or accepting the lower standards of the modern school. In his very first report on

1. R.Barker, op.cit., and M. Parkinson The Labour Party and the Organisation of Secondary Education 1918-65 (1970).
2. M.Parkinson, op.cite., p.120.

the issue Brand offered to abolish the eleven plus¹ and in a subsequent newspaper article he acknowledged the problems of the test.² Once that point was conceded comprehensive schools were inevitable. If children were not to be selected then they had to attend a common school. Parents and Councillors could countenance the abolition of the selection test but not the abolition of selection. In Bath the debate and subsequent re-organisation lasted for a decade. Profound differences of opinion were voiced. The comprehensive lobby argued for equality, those against called for equality of opportunity. This latter notion is a conservative one seeking to distribute the benefits of the existing social order, and creating mobility within the status quo, whereas this is seen by the left as "a basic part of the process that socialises young people to work for external rewards and encourages them to develop motivational structures fit for the alienating work of the capitalist economy."³ The underlying suggestion is that capitalists control the educational system and use it to produce drones who man the technological society. The lengths to which this view can be taken is illustrated by Brian Simon when he commented that "the deschooling/anarchist literature which burst on the British scene in a co-ordinated and massively popular form a few years ago was largely produced by Penguin Education, a subsidiary of Pearson/IPC with an ex-Tory Minister of Education (Boyle) as a member of the Editorial Board. This prompts the thought that whereas universal compulsory education was finally accepted as being in the interests of the ruling class in the late nineteenth century, we may now be entering a phase where it is no longer so evidently so, so that attempts to destroy, or, better, perhaps, to amasculate the system may now have high-level support."⁴ More probably Bush, Hoyle, Brand and Lock far from operating an esoteric social control felt that the eleven plus or scholarships to higher education simply promoted wider social justice.

-
1. Secondary Re-organisation, 16 September 1963. Document 1, Box 1.
 2. B.C. 17 September 1963.
 3. Samuel Boules, "Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labour." in Schooling and Capitalism, (1976) p.38.
 4. B.Simon, Intelligence Psychology and Education, (second edition 1978) p.274.

It is entirely possible that if there had not been a Labour Government from 1964-70 relentlessly requiring local authorities to change to a comprehensive system Bath would have kept a tripartite system. However the impasse reached in the Council over secondary re-organisation created problems over forward planning, school building, staffing and general expenditure until ultimately a plan acceptable to all was approved and implemented. In 1974 when Bath County Borough became part of the new Avon County Council five comprehensive schools were handed over. However the plan accepted was the lowest common denominator and as such created further problems for the Avon Education Authority as the 1980s approached. All five schools were single sex schools, their sixth forms were often rather small and uneconomic, and three of the five schools were on split sites with the lower schools in each instance being in old and cramped premises. In 1973 selection was abolished and the schools then needed a decade or more to develop and establish themselves. Instead in 1979 the five were faced with a further upheaval when Avon Education Committee discussed amalgamations of schools to create coeducation, a rationalisation of the sixth forms as well as possible closures because of falling pupil numbers. The compromise secondary re-development plan that was finally accepted was little more than a temporary expedient which barely satisfied weary Councillors, public, and D.E.S. officials. It was not a basis for possible future developments.

This work has been concerned with the development of a maintained system of education. But that cannot be understood unless account is taken of the profound influence of the independent sector. Not only were there many public and private schools in the county borough, there were also many independent schools in nearby Bristol as well as Wiltshire and Somerset. These schools continually, though unwittingly, distorted the pattern of maintained provision. Children at independent schools were middle class, wealthy, better dressed, better behaved, more able and thus deprived the nascent state secondary schools of their patronage. However it was the many private schools, not the public schools, which siphoned off children from the state schools. The public schools catered mainly for specific categories of boarders and took few local pupils, whereas the private

schools, primarily day schools, attracted the children of the middle class. Between 1945-63 maintained schools were a force to challenge the independent schools, but after 1963 the fear of the comprehensive schools caused many parents, to their undoubted surprise, to look to the public and private schools, which appeared to offer continuity of an older, more stable, academic tradition. For parents, education still seems to be a major factor in distributing life's opportunities. For politicians of left and right education is fundamental to their view of the collectivist or individualist development of society. Only the most patrician can look on and observe with Selby-Bigge that "the value of education is often over estimated by those who have had little of it and underestimated by those who have had much of it."¹

1. L.A.Selby-Bigge, The Board of Education, (1927) p.66.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Minutes

Bath School Board May 1882-March 1897. (Guildhall). Only one volume of School Board Minutes is extant.

Technical Education Committee Minutes March 1891-May 1903. (Guildhall).

Bath Education Committee Minutes April 1903-March 1974. (Guildhall).

Bath County Borough Council Minutes January 1902-December 1974. (Guildhall).

Between 1963-72 all minutes of the sub-committees dealing with secondary re-organisation, plus letters, memoranda, and manuscript notes from and to H.W.Brand Director of Education were filed under the reference Px2c. In April 1974 these files were transferred to Avon County Council and are housed in four boxes. Reference to these unpublished sources in this work is indicated by the general reference Px2c and a figure in brackets indicates which file according to the following:

Comprehensive Education Box 1.	
July 1963 to June 1964	(1)
July 1964 to December 1965	(2)
Comprehensive Education Box 2.	
January 1966 to July 1966	(3)
August 1966 to April 1967	(4)
Comprehensive Education Box 3.	
May 1967 to December 1967	(5)
January 1968 to October 1968	(6)
Secondary Re-organisation Box 5.	
September 1970 to July 1971	(7)
August 1971 to February 1972	(8)

The files for the period November 1968 to August 1970 are missing.

In addition there are two boxes of numbered documents mainly comprising the Directors Reports between 1963-71. Reference to these is by document number, box number, and date of document. Finally there is one box containing the Technical School Petition and assorted reports and literature from other authorities.

A.M.King was Chairman of the Secondary Schools Sub-Committee from 1905-41. In his firm's offices are to be found two boxes randomly labelled 25 and 356. These contain many interesting items, especially about educational provision during the Second World War. Reference to items in these boxes at the offices of Stone, King and Wardle is by the initials S.T.K. 24 and S.T.K. 356.

Public Records Office.

Generally P.R.O. files are opened after thirty years, whereas the Reports of the Inspectorate are closed for fifty years. However the Department of Education and Science Librarian will open some Reports on request.

Administration.

- Ed. 7/106 General information about erection and tenure of charity school buildings.
- Ed. 16/259 County Borough of Bath 1870-1921.
- Ed. 16/260 Parish of Twerton 1872-1908. General correspondence about the commencement and work of the School Boards.
- Ed. 18/205 Attendance Files 1871-1925.
- Ed. 19/218 Local Authority Code Files 1907-20.
- Ed. 53/285 General Secondary Education Files 1904-07.
- Ed. 53/286 General Secondary Education Files 1907-21.
- Ed. 59/88 Bath County Borough Grant Files 1921.
- Ed. 110/53 Free Place System.
- Ed. 111/184 Appointment of a Director of Education.
- Ed. 120/144 Proposals of Bath L.E.A. following the 1918 Education Act.
- Ed. 123/208 School Meals Service 1934-45. (This file also contains information about the School Health Service).
- Ed. 139/334 Establishing the Bath L.E.A. following the 1902 Education Act.
- Ed. 139/503 Alteration to structure of the Bath L.E.A. following the 1944 Education Act.

Individual Files on Elementary Schools in Bath 1870 to early twentieth century.

Ed. 21/15550	Bathforum School.
Ed. 21/15551	Bathwick National School.
Ed. 21/15552	Victoria Infant School.
Ed. 21/15553	Christ Church Infants School.
Ed. 21/15554	Kingsmead Board School.
Ed. 21/15555	Lyncombe Board School.
Ed. 21/15556	Lyncombe St. Lukes School.
Ed. 21/15557	Lyncombe St. Marks School.
Ed. 21/15558	Oak Street Board School.
Ed. 21/15559	St. Johns School.
Ed. 21/15560	Weston St. Johns School.
Ed. 21/15561	St. Marys School.
Ed. 21/15562	St. Michaels School.
Ed. 21/15563	St. Pauls School.
Ed. 21/15564	St. Saviours School.
Ed. 21/15565	St. Stephens School.
Ed. 21/15566	Trinity School.
Ed. 21/15567	Twerton Parochial School.
Ed. 21/15568	East Twerton Board School.
Ed. 21/15569	South Twerton Board School.
Ed. 21/15570	West Twerton Board School.
Ed. 21/15571	Bath Walcot Parochial School.
Ed. 21/15572	Walcot Board School.
Ed. 21/15573	Walcot St. Swithens School.
Ed. 21/15574	Harley St. School.
Ed. 21/15575	Weymouth House School.
Ed. 21/15576	Widcombe Parochial School.

Public Elementary Schools in Bath before 1944.

Ed. 19/218	H.M.I. Curry's Report on the Bath Elementary Schools 1907.
Ed. 97/592	Re-organisation following the Hadow Recommendations.
Ed. 21/39085	Bathforum Council School former Bathforum School 1919-26)
Ed. 21/39086	Bathwick C of E School (and with Bathwick Victoria Infants School) 1922-33.
Ed. 21/39087	Christ Church Infants School 1920-33.
Ed. 21/39088	Kingsmead Council School 1922-35.
Ed. 21/39089	Lyncombe Council School 1922-33.
Ed. 21/39090	Lyncombe St. Lukes School 1919-35.
Ed. 21/39091	Lyncombe St. Marks School 1923-32.
Ed. 21/39092	Oldfield Council School 1922-35.
Ed. 21/39093	St. Johns School 1921-35.
Ed. 21/39094	St. Johns (Weston) School 1922-31
Ed. 21/39095	St. Marys School 1922-33.
Ed. 21/39096	St. Pauls School 1922-33.
Ed. 21/39097	St. Saviours School 1919-33.
Ed. 21/39098	St. Stephens (Beacon Hill) School 1922-32.
Ed. 21/39099	Southdown proposed Infants School 1929-35.
Ed. 21/39100	Trinity School 1923.
Ed. 21/39101	Twerton School 1923.
Ed. 21/39102	Twerton East School 1922-33.
Ed. 21/39103	Twerton South School 1919-35.
Ed. 21/39104	Twerton West School 1935. (see also Ed. 20/121 Twerton Higher Elementary School 1907-20 which becomes Twerton West School).
Ed. 21/39105	Walcot Council School 1920-33.
Ed. 21/39106	Walcot East, Walcot St. Swithens Girls and Infants School 1922-32
Ed. 21/39107	Walcot Harley St. Parochial School 1923-35.
Ed. 21/39108	Walcot Parochial Senior School 1922-33.

Ed. 21/39109 West Central Council School 1922-27.
Ed. 21/39110 Weymouth House School 1919-35.
Ed. 21/39111 Widcombe Parochial School 1923-35.
Ed. 21/60475 Bathwick School 1936-37.
Ed. 21/60476 Christ Church School 1936-39.
Ed. 21/60477 Kingsmead School 1938-44.
Ed. 21/60478 Lyncombe School 1939.
Ed. 21/60479 Lyncombe St. Lukes School 1938-44.
Ed. 21/60480 Lyncombe St. Marks School 1936.
Ed. 21/60481 Moorlands Estate proposed Council School 1944.
Ed. 21/60482 Oldfield Council School 1936-43.
Ed. 21/60483 St. Johns School 1936.
Ed. 21/60484 St. Johns Weston School 1936-44.
Ed. 21/60485 St. Marys School 1937.
Ed. 21/60486 St. Pauls School 1938.
Ed. 21/60487 St. Saviours School 1936-39.
Ed. 21/60488 St. Stephens School 1936-38.
Ed. 21/60489 Southdown Proposed Infants School 1936-38.
Ed. 21/60490 Twerton School 1936-44.
Ed. 21/60491 Twerton West School 1936-44.
Ed. 21/60492 Walcot Council School 1936.
Ed. 21/60493 Walcot East Walcot St. Swithin School 1936-37.
Ed. 21/60494 Walcot Harley Street School 1938-44.
Ed. 21/60495 Walcot Parochial School 1937-40.
Ed. 21/60496 West Central School 1936.
Ed. 21/60497 Weymouth House School 1940-44.
Ed. 21/60498 Widcombe School 1937-41.

Secondary Education in Bath before 1944.

- Ed. 35/2158 Bath City Secondary School 1895-1920 (see also Ed. 29/126 Bath School of Science and Art mid 1860s-1892).
- Ed. 35/5801 City of Bath Boys' School 1922-32.
- Ed. 35/5802 City of Bath Boys' School 1943.
- Ed. 109/5051 Inspection Report on Bath City Secondary School 1904.
- Ed. 109/5054 Inspection Report on City of Bath Boys' School 1923.
- Ed. 109/5055 Inspection Report on City of Bath Boys' School 1928.
- Ed. 109/5056 Inspection Report on City of Bath Boys' School 1937.
- Ed. 35/5799 City of Bath Girls' School 1922-35.
- Ed. 35/5800 City of Bath Girls' School 1939.
- Ed. 109/5057 Inspection Report on City of Bath Girls' School 1928.
- Ed. 109/5058 Inspection Report on City of Bath Girls' School 1938.

Technical Education, Further Education and Higher Education in Bath before 1944.

- Ed. 51/88 Further and Technical Education in Bath 1921-31.
- Ed. 70/2793 High Street Institute 1907-21.
- Ed. 70/2794 Longacre Institute 1909-22.
- Ed. 70/2795 Municipal Technical College.
- Ed. 70/2796 Raglan Villa 1931.
- Ed. 70/2797 Twerton Technical Institute 1913.
- Ed. 70/2798 Walcot Institute 1933.
- Ed. 90/207 Bath Technical College 1921-33.
- Ed. 90/208 Bath Technical College 1929-33.
- Ed. 98/126 Bath Technical College 1934-35.
- Ed. 114/783 Inspection Report on Bath School of Art 1920.
- Ed. 114/784 Inspection Report on Bath School of Art 1926.
- Ed. 114/785 Inspection Report on Bath School of Art 1939.
- Ed. 114/786 Inspection Report on Bath Technical School 1912.

- Ed. 114/787 Inspection Report on Bath Technical College 1921.
- Ed. 114/788 Inspection Report on the Junior Technical School, the Junior School of Homecrafts, the Junior Commercial School 1934.
- Ed. 114/789 Inspection Report on Bath Technical College 1939.
- Ed. 67/60 Teacher Training 1926-33.
- Ed. 115/74 Inspection Report on Training College of Domestic Science 1913.
- Ed. 115/75 Training College of Domestic Science 1925.
- Independent Schools in Bath before 1944.**
- Ed. 35/2164 Kingswood School c.1914.
- Ed. 35/2165 Kingswood School (An administrative file which also contains the Inspection Report of 1920).
- Ed. 109/5072 Inspection Report on Kingswood School 1920.
- Ed. 109/5073 Inspection Report on Kingswood School 1930.
- Ed. 109/5074 Inspection Report on Kingswood School 1939.
- Ed. 27/8374 Monkton Combe 1927-35.
- Ed. 27/9659 Monkton Combe 1936-39.
- Ed. 109/5135 Inspection Report on Monkton Combe 1925.
- Ed. 35/5811 Royal School 1923-33.
- Ed. 109/5077 Inspection Report on the Royal School 1910.
- Ed. 109/5078 Inspection Report on the Royal School 1926.
- Ed. 109/5075 Inspection Report on Prior Park College 1926.
- Ed. 109/5076 Inspection Report on Prior Park College 1936.
- Ed. 27/9648 Convent of the Holy Union 1936.
- Ed. 35/2161 King Edwards School (An administrative file which also contains the Inspection Report of 1904.)
- Ed. 35/2162 King Edwards School c.1914.
- Ed. 35/5806 King Edwards School c.1920.

Ed. 109/5070 Inspection Report on King Edwards School 1927.
Ed. 109/5071 Inspection Report on King Edwards School 1939.
Ed. 35/2160 Bath High School for Girls 1901-21 (An administrative file
which also contains the Inspection Reports for 1901, 1909,
1914).
Ed. 35/5804 Bath High School for Girls 1924-35.
Ed. 35/5805 Bath High School for Girls 1943.
Ed. 109/5064 Inspection Report on Bath High School for Girls 1925.
Ed. 109/5065 Inspection Report on Bath High School for Girls 1931.
Ed. 109/5066 Inspection Report on Bath High School for Girls 1934.
Ed. 35/2159 Bath College 1903-08.
Ed. 109/5050 Inspection Report on Bath College 1908.
Ed. 35/5803 Duke Street School 1927-36.
Ed. 109/5059 Inspection Report on Duke Street School 1920.
Ed. 109/5059 Inspection Report on Duke Street School 1926.
Ed. 109/5080 Inspection Report on St. Christophers School 1931.
Ed. 109/5081 Inspection Report on Victoria College 1925.

Second World War 1939-46

Ed. 134/141 Evacuation 1940.
Ed. 134/235 Damage to Bath Schools 1942.
Ed. 134/348 Evacuation 1939.

Newspapers

Bath Journal 1900-1916.

Bath Weekly Chronicle 1870-1974.

In the Guildhall archives can be found complete volumes of cuttings dealing specifically with Council debates and taken primarily from the Bath Chronicle.

These volumes cover the period 1870-1974.

Miscellaneous Pamphlets in the Local Collection of Bath Reference Library.

Clarendon School Memories 1894-1919.

City of Bath Girls' School Magazines 1936-39.

Bath City Secondary School Prospectus 1915.

Bath College School Magazines to 1909.

Kingswood School Prospectus 1933.

History and Chronicle of Fifty Years by E.H.Bence (first Head of Oldfield Boys)
1953.

The Link Vol. I Nos 4, 5, 6 The Magazine of Cannings Colleges.

Manifesto of the Passive Resistance League of Bath and District (c.1903).

Oldfield Boys' School Magazine 1949.

Portway High School Prospectus 1902.

Miscellaneous Reports in the Local Collection of Bath Reference Library.

Triennial Report of the Bath School Board 1877-79.

Triennial Report of the Bath School Board 1889-91.

Triennial Report of the Bath School Board 1895-97.

Report of the Technical Education Committee 1898.

Report of the Technical Education Committee 1899.

Draft Scheme Under the Education Act 1918.

Bath Education Committee Development Plan 1946.

The Guildhall archives also contain a considerable amount of material, in some instances duplicating the material in the Local Collection of the Bath Reference Library, but the majority of the material is unique. An exhaustive list is not offered here because it has been well catalogued by the archivist Mr. Robert Bryant, and because not all of the available material is relevant to the subject of this work. However where material from the Guildhall Archives has been incorporated into the text there is an acknowledgement in the footnotes.

Articles

- S. Bowles "Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labour" Schooling and Capitalism. (1976).
- C. Burt "The Examination at Eleven Plus" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. VII (May 1959).
- C. Cannon "The Influence of Religion on Educational Policy 1902-44" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XII (May 1959).
- D. J. Chapman "Bath" G.P.D.S.T. A Centenary Review 1872-1972 (1972).
- A. B. Clegg "Presidential Address to the Association of Chief Education Officers, 1965" Education (1965).
- D. W. Dean "Difficulties of a Labour Education Policy: The Failure of the Trevelyan Bill 1929-31" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XVII (October 1969).
- E. Eaglesham "Controlling Educational Expenditure Eighty Years Ago" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol.V (May 1957).
- _____ "Implementing the Education Act of 1902" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. X (May 1962).
- P. H. J. H. Gosden "Board of Education Act 1899" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XI (November 1962).
- _____ "Technical Instruction Committees" Studies in the Government and Control of Education Since 1860. History of Education Society (1970).
- J. H. Higginson "The Evolution of Secondary Education" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XX (June 1972).
- A. J. Peters "The Changing Idea of Technical Education" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XI (May 1963).
- N. J. Richards "Religious Controversy and the School Boards" British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. XVIII (June 1970).
- D. Rubinstein "Socialisation and the London School Board 1870-1904: aims, methods and public opinion" Popular Education and Socialisation in the Nineteenth Century (1977).

P. R. Sharp "Whiskey Money and the Development of Technical and Secondary Education in the 1890s" Journal of Educational Administration and History Vol. IV (December 1971).

Education "Alderman S. W. Bush". 22 March 1935 p.344.

D. W. Humphreys "Education in 1870" Lecture Commemorating the Centenary of Forster's Education Act given by D. W. Humphreys at the Bath Guildhall 12 May 1970. Copy in Bath Reference Library.

Theses

- H. W. Brand "West Ham: its educational problems and facilities". University of London M.A. Thesis 1935.
- J. R. Fairhurst "Some Aspects of the Relationship between Politics and Religion 1895-1906". University of Oxford D.Phil. Thesis 1974.
- B. S. R. Green "Community Decision Making in Georgian City". University of Bath Ph.D. Thesis 1968.
- V. C. Greenhalgh "Local Educational Administrators 1870-1974: The Emergence and Growth of a Profession". University of Leeds Ph.D. Thesis 1974.
- R. B. Hope "Educational Development in the City of Bath 1830-1902 with special reference to its inter-relations with social and economic change". University of Bristol Ph.D. Thesis 1970.
- P. Keane "The Evolution of Technical Education in Nineteenth Century England". University of Bath Ph.D. Thesis 1970.
- J. Mander "Freedom and Constraint in a Local Education Authority 1944-74" University of Leicester Ph.D. Thesis 1975.
- J. E. E. Munson "A Study of Nonconformity in Edwardian England as revealed by the Passive Resistance Movement against the 1902 Education Act". University of Oxford D.Phil. Thesis 1973.
- J. A. Purton "The Influence of Industry and Commerce on the Development of Educational Facilities in England and Wales 1830-70". University of London M.Sc. Thesis 1958.

- J. Riddell "A Study of the History and Development of the School Medical Service in Liverpool from 1908 to 1939 and an attempt to assess its consequences on the health of the Liverpool school child." University of Liverpool M.A. Thesis 1946.
- N. P. Simpson "The Development of Secondary Education in the County Borough of Bath 1944-74, with particular reference to the period of comprehensive re-organisation 1963-73." University of Hull M.Ed. Thesis 1977.
- T. A. Smith "Some Aspects of the Development of Technical Education in Lancashire 1825-89" University of Leeds Ph.D. Thesis 1975.
- P. F. Speed "The Elementary Schools of Bath 1862-1902" University of Bristol M.A. Thesis 1958.
- P. T. White "The Re-organisation of Secondary Education in Bath and Southampton" University of Southampton M.Phil. Thesis 1974.

Books

- B. W. E. Alford. Depression and Recovery? British Economic Growth 1918-1939 (1972)
- L. Andrews The Education Act 1918 (1976).
- N. Argles South Kensington to Robbins (1964).
- G. Balfour Educational Systems of Great Britain (1903).
- T. W. Bamford The Rise of the Public Schools (1967)
- O. Banks Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education (1955).
- R. Barker Education and Politics 1900-1951 (1972).
- C. Barnett The Collapse of British Power (1972).
- R. Batley, O.O'Brien, H.Parris Going Comprehensive (1970).
- G. Bernbaum Social Change and the Schools 1918-1944 (1967).
- G. Birchenough History of Elementary Education in England and Wales (1925).
- D. Birley The Education Officer and His World (1970).
- J. Blackie Inspecting and the Inspectorate (1970).
- S. F. Cotgrove Technical Education and Social Change (1958).
- M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (1963).

- H. C. Dent Education in Transition 1939-43 (1944).
- E. Eaglesham From School Board to Local Authority (1956).
- The Foundations of Twentieth Century Education in England (1967).
- F. M. Earle Reconstruction in the Secondary School (1944).
- H. Entwistle Class Culture and Education (1978).
- J. M. Falkner Bath in History and Social Tradition (1918).
- I. G.K. Fenwick The Comprehensive School 1944-70 (1976).
- J. Ford Social Class and the Comprehensive School (1969).
- B. Gardner The Public Schools (1973).
- P. Gordon and D. Lawton Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (1978).
- P. H. J.H. Gosden Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales (1966).
- P. H. J. H. Gosden and P. R. Sharp The Development of an Education Service: The West Riding 1889-1974 (1978).
- J. Graves Policy and Progress in Secondary Education 1902-42 (1943).
- A. Griffiths Secondary School Re-organisation in England and Wales (1971).
- D. Holly Education or Domination (1974).
- A. G. Ives Kingswood School in Wesley's Day and Since (1970).
- B. King Schools of To-day: Present Problems in English Education (1929).
- M. Kogan The Politics of Education (1971).
- County Hall L.E.A. (1973).
- The Politics of Educational Change. (1978).
- A. F. Lace A Goodly Heritage: A History of Monkton Combe School (1968).
- R. Layard, J. King, C. Moser The Impact of Robbins (1969).
- G. A. N. Lowndes The Silent Social Revolution (Second Edition 1969).
- A. T. Martin The Story of Bath (c.1920).
- P. L. Masters Preparatory Schools To-day (1966).
- C. L. Mowat Britain Between the Wars 1918-1940 (1955).

- J. Murphy Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1870-1970 (1971).
- The Education Act 1870 (1972).
- P. W. Musgrave Sociology History and Education (1970).
- H. Osbourne and P. Manistry A History of the Royal School for Daughters of the Royal School for Daughters of Officers of the Army 1864-1965 (1966).
- M. Parkinson The Labour Party and the Organisation of Secondary Education 1918-65 (1970).
- A. C. Percival The Origins of the Headmasters' Conference (1969).
- E. R. Rich The Education Act 1870 (1970).
- W. K. Richmond Education in Britain Since 1944 (1978).
- R. Roberts A Ragged Schooling (1976).
- Rev. Br. J. S. Roche A History of Prior Park College and its Founder Bishop Barnes (1931).
- G. W. Roderick and M.D. Stephens Scientific and Technical Education in Nineteenth Century England (1972).
- D. Rubinstein and B. Simon The Evolution of the Comprehensive School 1926-1972 (1969).
- L. A. Selby-Bigge The Board of Education (1927).
- H. Sillitoe A History of the Teaching of Domestic Subjects (1933).
- B. Simon The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870 (1960).
- Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920 (1965).
- The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-1940 (1974).
- Intelligence Psychology Education (Second Edition 1978).
- J. Stevenson Social Conditions in Britain Between the Wars (1977).
- G. Sutherland Policy Making in Elementary Education 1870-95 (1973).
- K. E. Symons The Grammar School of King Edward VI Bath (1921).
- R. H. Tawney Secondary Education for All (1922).
- W. Taylor Secondary Modern School (1963).
- A. Tropp The School Teachers (1957).

B. Turner Equality for Some (1974).

J. H. C. Walker Three Score Years and Ten: A Short History of Monkton Combe
Junior School (1956).