Dear all,

Thank you for looking over what is clearly an extremely unfinished first draft of this chapter. This was a rough first run-up at trying to think through some of the ideas for what would be chapter one of my dissertation, tentatively entitled *Democracy’s children: education in the Britain and the empire, 1932-1955.* My project examines the politics of children’s education in the mid-century, exploring how and why education became so central to the late British imperial project, shaped by a growing sense of liberal democracy’s fragility and contingency. The Institute of Education in London is one of the main institutions I use in the dissertation to trace these transformations over time.

This is sort of a rump of what was one big, unwieldly chapter trying to narrate how the London Day Training College, a provincial college for teacher-training established in 1902, became the Institute of Education, the foremost center for educational thought in Britain and the empire by 1932, so the period before my dissertation narrative really begins. My aim for this chapter was to set up some important contexts for the rest of the dissertation, including the relationship between liberal and Idealist thought and education, the institutional dynamics at play within the college, and continuities and shifts in definitions of citizenship that is attentive to an imperial and colonial context. Trying to fit thirty years of political, intellectual, and institutional history together turned out to be somewhat unmanageable, and I decided to split the chapter up, with one chapter on the Edwardian/early interwar period up until 1925, and the second on the formative institutional transformations into an imperial education hub as the first Colonial Course in education is developed at the institute in the late 1920s.

Having pulled it apart, what now remains of this chapter addressing Edwardian and early interwar period is currently just me writing to make sense of an earlier period I’m much less familiar with, and to try and figure out what argument I want to make. You’ll notice many of the footnotes are placeholders, there are some underdeveloped sections and comments to myself throughout, and the second half of the chapter, addressing the period of 1918-1926, comes to a real halt (thanks to a poorly-timed bout of covid), and isn’t finished. I’ve put a short summary of where I wanted the chapter to go at the end of the document which I hope helps you see where the chapter *will* end up. I really apologise for how patchy the work is as a result. I appreciate your understanding about where it’s currently at, and really invite any suggestions about what I should do with it, to make it work better together as its own chapter and better serve the dissertation as a whole.

Best wishes,

Lynton

**The teacher, the child, and the citizen:**

**founding the London Day Training College, 1902-1926**

*‘*We confess we began our course here with feelings of hesitancy. Some of us thought the London Day was a kind of glorious machine which we entered a motley crowd of joyous spirits, only to leave in a file of individuals, stern of face, with the mantle of a sober profession wrapped tightly about us.’

*The Londinian* student magazine, Lent Term 1926[[1]](#footnote-1)

The London Day Training College began its institutional life in 1902 as a provincial college for teacher-training for the Greater London area. Founded by Sidney Webb, funded and overseen by the London County Council (LCC), the college’s early role was the important, but seemingly quotidian, task of staffing the city’s growing number of elementary and later secondary schools, one of many training colleges serving the city’s children.[[2]](#footnote-2) Three decades later, however, the college was an institution transformed. Under a new, grander title, the Institute of Education, the college’s leadership set its sights on loftier ambitions. To staff, students, and a chorus of admirers across government and British political life, this new Institute represented the “world clearing house of educational ideals… of historical importance”, a reflection of its rising stature in interwar British life.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The college’s formal transfer to the University of London in 1932 marked the culmination of a decades-long process earning recognition as the undisputed nerve-center for cutting-edge research in education, pedagogy, and child psychology, not just in London or in metropolitan Britain, but within a British imperial whole. This transition was not inevitable. The financial pressures of postwar austerity might well have dimmed these aspirations. As the boundaries between individual, state and society were redrawn, and questions of political belonging and the demands of modern society became more urgent, educationalists at the college convincingly positioned themselves as experts in the philosophy and science of making citizens fit for a society in flux. Professional pedagogues emerged as the constant, soothing voice of expertise, translating popular concepts of active citizenship as an antidote to societal fracture into practical programs of teacher training and social scientific research.

Chapters one and two of the dissertation chart this transition from the London Day Training College to the Institute of Education, moving from provincial teacher-training center to a leading intellectual powerhouse advising metropolitan imperial education reform. Though chapter two addresses the college’s formal transition to imperial educational center involved in colonial education after 1925, this first chapter sketches the political and intellectual currents that made that institutional transformation possible. It traces the college’s emergence from within the reformist politics of the Edwardian era, and its institutional transition navigating a changing political and economic landscape threatening both vocational and academic institutions. Under its first two principals, John Adams and Percy Nunn, the college’s lean staff pursued greater proximity and integration as a largely postgraduate center for the University’s graduates: a financially prudent decision by college leadership which also aligned with the worldview and longstanding intellectual vision for the educationalists at the helm.

Historians have long understood education’s centrality to Edwardian and interwar British politics. For decades, scholars narrated the significance of early twentieth century educational change within a domestic politics of class, social mobility, and the early welfare state.[[4]](#footnote-4) After an Edwardian era clamor for reform, twenties look from this perspective like an age of educational gloom and pessimism: shrinking budgets, declining attendance in elementary schools, and halting progress towards consensus about the how and why of reform.[[5]](#footnote-5) But in recent years, historians have examined those ways in which education flourished between the wars, albeit within a vastly unequal educational system. They have looked beyond questions of access to ask about education’s changing content in this period: what was taught, by whom, and why. This, as Laura Carter, Susannah Wright, Peter Yeandle and others have all suggested, offered a lens onto attempts to shape Britons’ political, cultural, gender, religious, and class identities between the wars.[[6]](#footnote-6) Scholars have also documented the growth of experimental progressive schools, which modeled a better world through creating alternative micro-societies in which to raise and school children.[[7]](#footnote-7) Beyond the schoolroom, historians have found interwar British life in particular to be full of broader attempts to educate both young people and the public at large, a way of managing a citizenry amid the transition to mass democracy after 1918. The creation of the BBC, experiments in radio broadcasting and educational film, anxieties over growing tabloid press influence, the flourishing of youth-focused citizenship and peacekeeping movements: all were instruments of education, sometimes elite and sometimes mass education, that drew on and furthered about education and citizenship prior to the First World War.[[8]](#footnote-8) Childhood, meanwhile, became only more imbued with political and cultural significance in this period.[[9]](#footnote-9) As Harry Hendrick has argued, this era saw a growing shift towards child’s minds as objects of intervention by reformers, and the popularization of an idea that children’s development was bound up with the health and wellbeing of wider society.[[10]](#footnote-10)

This chapter attempts to recover both political and intellectual currents that made education became as a tool of citizen-making possible, and the people whose professional lives were dedicated to this task: the educationalists, theorists and practitioners in pedagogy who occupied a strange position between jobbing political philosopher, social scientist, and education reformer. Scholars have tended to dismiss the influence of the professional educationalist, the teacher’s teacher, on interwar educational practice. Adrian Wooldridge has argued that British education is distinguished by an “aversion to educational theory”, a national tradition where education was “more as an art rather than a science” where teachers “[took] pride in their hostility to airy-fairy educational theory”.[[11]](#footnote-11) In her recent study of progressive education in English and Welsh schools, Laura Tisdall suggested that the lack of any sustained implementation of pedagogical theory in interwar classrooms, particularly progressive educational techniques, reflects their muted impact of the discipline’s practitioners on classroom teaching in this period.[[12]](#footnote-12) But educationalists did matter, if not always in the ways historians have expected them to. In the first decades of the twentieth century, there were increasingly seen as the experts upon whom policy-makers and lawmakers could rely to consult on education reform.[[13]](#footnote-13) They were the close interlocutors of those figures widely recognized as the intellectual architects of British educational transformation, including the likes of R. H. Tawney, Henry Hadow, and William Beveridge, and their professional and intellectual justification to couple the civic-minded efforts of popular liberalism into contemporary debates about high-political reform a need to inculcate the values of active citizenship.[[14]](#footnote-14) They were also the bridge between contemporary research in psychology, willing translators of theories of knowledge transmission and child development within a liberal intellectual tradition that had long positioned the child as a political subject in waiting.[[15]](#footnote-15) Moreover, educationalists emerged by the late interwar period as the crucial link between metropolitan and imperial educational contexts and transformations, because of their position both within liberal thought engaged in questions of empire and civilizational progress, and their connections to the University of London’s social sciences with their own colonial relationships. As Erik Linstrum has argued, Edwardian and interwar human and social sciences, particularly psychology, were bound up in an imperialist project of trying to understand and pathologize the colonial subject, but also emerged as important sites in which the contradictions and fragility of imperial expertise and racialized assumptions about the primitivity of indigenous and colonized subjects were found most wanting.[[16]](#footnote-16) Historians of education have not yet thoroughly grappled with the colonial origins and implications of educational thought in modern Britain. At best, they have seen expanding colonial educational work as incidental, divorced from the institute’s work in metropolitan education or from a wider liberal political and intellectual worldview that might encompass the two. At worst, historians of education have remained stubbornly loyal to paternalistic arguments of imperial educators’ contributions to educational ‘advance’ and ‘progress’ in colonial contexts.[[17]](#footnote-17)

The chapter draws on the day-to-day records and writings of the college’s staff and students, its prominent supporters in British public life, and the records of state, local government, and imperial administrations who strongly encouraged its development. These materials have been mined by historians of education, particularly staff and students at the present-day Institute of Education wanting to write institutional autobiography, but rarely placed in the kind of political, cultural, and intellectual contexts that allow this transition to be fully understood, nor grasp its implications.[[18]](#footnote-18) It argues that the college’s emergence both reflected, and contributed to, evolving ideas about what education was for in interwar Britain and the empire. British educationalists convincingly made the case that education, especially children’s schooling, was the ideal venue to imagine society’s improvement through a project of citizen-making. Ideas about education’s relationship to social progress was not a new idea in early-twentieth century Britain. But the ascent of education as an influential research field by the interwar period, closely related with emerging research in child psychology, gave scientific basis to the notion of children as future citizens which had long anchored liberal theories of the state.[[19]](#footnote-19) New ideas about the knowable mind of the child updated and amplified older liberal idealist languages of citizenship and progress, given fresh credence in the world-order-thinking of the twenties. Pedagogy, therefore, became a key vehicle for an outward-looking progressive individualism focused on the government and cultivation of the self, shaping how teachers were trained, but also a broader sense of education’s centrality to holding society together while containing the possibility of its improvement.

**I: Teaching the teacher**

“It must be remembered that neither the word *university* nor the word *college* fundamentally connotes a building,” mused principal John Adams at the college’s inauguration in 1902. This was meant to console staff and students, who were acutely aware that their new college didn’t have one.[[20]](#footnote-20) Part of the University of London system, but not yet a designated “school” of the university, the LDTC’s first students and its small staff crammed into rooms between Clare Market and Clement’s Inn on the Strand shared with the London School of Economics. This arrangement continued for the first five years of the institution’s life.[[21]](#footnote-21) When the college was finally given its own rooms in an extension on Southampton Row in 1907, the *Daily Graphic* politely dubbed the handsome new building a “college for the élite”. But the *Graphic* reminded readers of that the college still had a rather functional task of supplying teachers for a city that needed far more quality teachers than it had. “Every year the elementary schools of London require 1,450 new teachers,” the author wrote, “In London itself the ordinary training colleges of the County Council provide for 720… the London Day Training College… contributes 100 “degreed” teachers every year.”[[22]](#footnote-22)

The London Day Training College’s halting path to a building of its own lends itself to interpretations of early identity crisis, an unworkable position between two institutions with conflicting visions of its purpose. In his centenary reflections on the Institute, Richard Aldrich characterized these college’s early years as a difficult and protracted battle for “control and status” between London County Council and the University of London. Aldrich’s account implied disputes between competing visions of the college: either a professional factory for teaching staff to fill huge gaps in the number of teachers required in the schools for London’s poorest children, or as a university department of education providing instruction in pedagogy as part of an elite liberal education. In these first few years, the LCC’s Technical Education Board was certainly the senior partner in the arrangement between the council and the university, exercising direct control over the college, which had no local committee of its own. The Education Act of 1902 had dissolved school boards in England and Wales, placing control in the hands of local authorities (in this case the LCC), whose responsibility it was to produce good teachers for city schools. The pupil-teacher apprenticeship, where pupils undertook a five-year period of training at age thirteen within their own school, was still how most London elementary schools recruited new teaching staff by 1902, an arrangement many at the LCC feared lacked oversight and risked varying wildly in quality.[[23]](#footnote-23) To Robert Blair of the Technical Education Board, affiliation with the University of London was chiefly a way to access new Board of Education grant funding through a university institution, have students sit Board examinations, and therefore receive certifications of a teacher’s diploma, either as an add-on or instead of pupil-teachership, and administer degrees.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The university’s leadership, Aldrich argues, had other plans. They wanted the college to better serve the interests of the university community at large, the various departments making up the faculties of arts and sciences. The University’s Academic Council and Senate demanded greater say over the college’s programming and activities, better integration of teacher-training courses for students already matriculated at the university, residential accommodation so as to take part in the university’s corporate life, and for the college to be led by a professor of education. This would be the university’s first professor of education, who could also advise on pedagogy across all university schools. By the interwar period, the university had won these, on all counts.[[25]](#footnote-25)

The first five years of the college’s life were certainly, in the words of future professor of education and later principal, Percy Nunn, an “uneasy time of wandering”.[[26]](#footnote-26) The extent of these early clashes, while occasionally fraught, can be overstated if read solely from within the institutional record. What is obscured by this approach are the ways in which the college, the LCC, the university, as well as the Board of Education itself, were institutions operating within overlapping political and intellectual currents of reform in turn-of-the-century Britain, especially in London. Both the University of London and LDTC were the brainchildren of the same people, their mission statements a reflection of a shared political vocabulary and intellectual framework which straddled socialism and progressive liberalism. This was what Jose Harris famously called “an interlocking seamless web” of a movement for civic reform, which, in spite of the “stormy” relations often contained within it, reflected a powerful intellectual consensus far more than it did dissent.[[27]](#footnote-27) The London Day Training College contained within it many of the important concerns which preoccupied this Edwardian corporatist movement: social justice and welfarism, fears about national inefficiency, the institutionalization of social scientific methods, and anxieties about making citizens fit for a modern society, both as a matter of apparent economic but also political imperative.[[28]](#footnote-28)

What made the creation of the London Day Training College both possible, and brimming with promise, was precisely that it combined the intellectual and research resources of a university department of education with the vocational approach of the training college. In doing so, the college, by design, offered to prepare London’s schoolchildren for life in a modern metropolis, and in a modern, imperial Britain in two distinct but important ways. The first was a project, Fabian in inflection, of economic modernization through social justice. This demanded more quality teachers and therefore more quality education for London’s children to tackle a putative crisis of national inefficiency. The second was a liberal project of fashioning “good citizens”, both out of teachers, and out of the children taught by them.[[29]](#footnote-29)

When Sidney Webb laid out his manifesto for the University of London in 1902, he famously disdained the leisurely pace of the liberal education offered to students at Oxford and Cambridge as an impractical indulgence, at the expense of professional training and research needed for scientific and social progress. But he did not deny that London’s newly constituted university had a role in delivering some version of a liberal education alongside its expressly vocational aspirations and its ambitions as a center for social science. Rather, Webb conceived the University of London system as a driver of progress: social, economic, and civilizational. London’s new university system would lead in research and scientific discovery, and in professional and practical training, in such a way that would complement, but not completely override, a commitment to the enlightenment and improvement of liberal subjects, which remained imperative. “The London student”, Webb resolved, ought to be “equipped not only as a trained professional, but also as a cultivated citizen”. All students taking University of London degrees, including those at the LDTC, would gain both “the most practical professional training” and yet also the “genuine cultivation of the mind”. “Pedagogy” would sit alongside “law, medicine and theology… engineering and chemistry… banking and commerce and public administration” as the branch of the “brain worker” fashioned within the university’s sphere of influence, creating “out of new twentieth-century conditions new kinds of perfection”. [[30]](#footnote-30)

The metaphor of citizenship as organic matter, a young tree to be carefully pruned and tended to in order to flourish, reflected both the ascent of citizenship a powerful political category in Edwardian Britain, and education’s increasingly important role in its upkeep. Idealist conceptions of active citizenship as something to be nurtured and developed were, as Michael Freeden has described, the “dominant idiom” of this worldview. The writings of early Idealist philosophers, the likes of T. H. Green and subsequent disciples, were widely read, and intellectuals and reformers published dozens of books about the importance and practice of ‘good citizenship’ popular among Fabians and liberal intellectuals alike.[[31]](#footnote-31) Citizenship, in the Idealist sense, was not just a status of bearing rights. Rather, it saw citizenship as a diffuse, often ill-defined set of moral values, behaviors, and practices, a civic identity that needed to be encouraged and nurtured in individuals as a condition of societal harmony and progress. Interventions to promote ‘good citizenship’ by reformers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were anxious attempts to manage individuals’ membership of a society undergoing enormous transformation, including, but not limited to, the transition to mass democracy, the growth of the modern state, and a need to foster a sense of collective identity amid a crisis of modernity, threatening social fracture from within and amid competition and international rivalry from without. The relationship between individual and state was changing; interventions to promote citizenship, as a process of character formation, offered a way of mediating and mitigating the potential for societal fracture amid these shifts.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Learning how to be a good citizen meant knowing what it meant to be a part of a political community in a modern society, as a political and moral subject but also, at least for the Fabians, a worker. It meant grasping what demands on the individual that knowledge required. The suffragist, for instance, could appeal to this ideal to justify a woman’s right to vote, by claiming to have understood and to already fulfil the duties of good citizenship as proof of worthiness for political inclusion at the ballot box. Citizenship, as the demonstration of a certain kind of character, was a precondition of the franchise: the inclusion of more groups in the population engaged directly in the practice of self-government as voters therefore required such groups to demonstrate their own citizenship.[[33]](#footnote-33)

The fact that it was usually elite, well-connected suffrage campaigners who made such claims speaks to a broader phenomenon, which was that worrying about citizenship and the meaning of being a citizen in early twentieth century Britain was an elite preoccupation.[[34]](#footnote-34) Although calls made by the likes of Webb for more and better London teachers in the years before the First World War reflected welfarist concerns for the children of the working classes, making these calls did not require a belief in the equality of educational provision that ‘education for citizenship’ within a democracy seemed to imply. Rather, the value of teachers gaining both vocational training and a liberal education at the same time while students at the LDTC was that the lessons of good citizenship would reach London’s children as a trickle-down project within an existing educational system stratified by class. The teacher would serve as a foot-soldier in a broader battle to better prepare future generations for life in the demands of a modern, liberal society, a project of gradual social reform that occurred at a pace of generations, not abrupt rupture. In this sense, the Edwardian project of citizen-making in metropolitan Britain mirrored how liberal intellectuals tended to think about empire in this same period. The politics of citizenship, as a historically and culturally specific identity, was inevitably bound up in the politics of nation and empire, and of belonging and inclusion within a political community.[[35]](#footnote-35) The LDTC had little formal responsibility to education in an imperial context in these early years of its life, which remained, for the most part, the domain of missionary organizations who operated within their own pedagogical traditions and institutional apparatuses.[[36]](#footnote-36) But the LDTC’s founders and interlocutors operated in an intellectual context, which included late Idealist thought, which conceptualized ideas about societal growth, harmony, and the duties of citizenship in reference to empire and critiques of contemporary imperialism as stunting colonial society’s growth.[[37]](#footnote-37) Metropolitan and imperial conceptions of citizenship were in close dialogue, as Daniel Gorman has argued. Even when metropolitan educational thought and institutions were not directly engaged in imperial activities in this period, debates about empire’s pedagogical capacities, resembled much of the same debate about civilizational progress and societies’ growth within Edwardian Britain itself.

As apprentice teachers lined the corridors and filed into the lecture halls of Southampton Row after 1907, the activities and general goings-on at the college were overseen by principal and professor of education, Adams, and two vice-principals, Margaret Punnett and Percy Nunn. The professor-principal was an unusual, hybrid role reflecting the balance of liberal and vocational education envisaged by Webb. But this role also spoke to the curious figure of the educationalist, who had emerged by the late nineteenth century as a prominent intellectual theorizing the philosophy and science of learning. The principal held an academic position contributing to the intellectual life and mission of the wider university. But the principal also had to be an effective practical instructor, a teacher to apprentices, as comfortable holding forth at a lectern and publishing philosophical reflections on educational method as when teaching Latin cases or handing out logarithm books. The first professorships in education in Britain were in Adams’ native Scotland, at St Andrew’s and Edinburgh in 1876, a reflection of education’s early stature as both a philosophical and theological intellectual tradition in the country.[[38]](#footnote-38) Adams, though taught by figures within this tradition, had more humble professional origins. The third son of a blacksmith, he had received no secondary education. He worked first as a pupil-teacher before attending the Glasgow Free Church Training College, where he was later rector, and earning his degree at Glasgow University.[[39]](#footnote-39) Punnett and Nunn, too, had degrees, both from the London colleges. But both arrived at the LDTC from leadership positions in existing training colleges and secondary schools.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Unlike Nunn and Punnett, whose training had taken place exclusively in the metropole, Adams himself had enjoyed brief spells in university departments of education, including at McGill University, where he had conducted inspections of the Protestant schools of Quebec. The latter’s education department would later play host to another future head of the institute, Fred Clarke.[[41]](#footnote-41) The parallel development of both university departments of education in both Britain and in the white settler-colonies was, as chapter five discusses, a reflection of both the mobility of educationalists within the British settler-world. But it was also a further sign of a British educationalists’ engagement with the function not just of educational thought but of systems, and belief in the value of international observation at a time of a putative crisis of national inefficiency.[[42]](#footnote-42) The educationalist Michael Sadler, who by 1907 was professor of education at Manchester and close ties to London Day college staff, had pioneered comparative educational method as director of the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports beginning under the late Liberal government, authoring detailed reports on education systems of apparent rival states.[[43]](#footnote-43)

“Some teachers are inclined to maintain that, in their practical work, there is no need for a theory of education,” Adams reflected in his *The Evolution of Educational Theory,* in 1912. “But it is quite conceivable that education might be treated as a mere branch of theoretical philosophy, studied for its own sake, and of no practical value.”[[44]](#footnote-44) Adams understood his role as principal, at least in part, to unite the two approaches, an embodiment of the University of London’s ethos. In this sense, he gave a clear sense of the way in which the professional educationalist saw their intellectual and political duties. Adams hoped in his role to serve as an advocate for the value of gaining practical teaching experience to those interested in liberal philosophies of education, and as a conduit for educational theory and thought to London’s trainee teachers whom he feared understood their job as a neutral and obvious process of imparting information without much reflection. He quoted John Stuart Mill’s rectoral address at St Andrew’s 1867, in which Mill described education as “the culture which each generation gives to those who are to be its successors… to qualify them for at least keeping up, and if possible for raising, the level of improvement which has been attained.”[[45]](#footnote-45) The theory of education was an active, progressive field, Adams argued, constantly growing and expanding organically much like the life of a community it served. Educational philosophers were constantly advancing both in the science of knowledge transmission, but also better believed they were advancing a deeper understanding of education’s relationship to the life of the state, a mode of reflection on preparing for the good life in a society of harmony, prosperity, and good government. Educational practice in the schoolroom, therefore, was theory’s necessarily conservative counterpart. Here the fruits of theory were purposed in order to shape character. “Education as for its aim to modify the educand,” Adams reflected, “and not merely to supply a certain amount of knowledge.” A dialectical relationship between the two, then, was what led to society’s growth and improvement, the chief aim of any educationalist.[[46]](#footnote-46)

The idea that lecturing on the elementary principles of education to a new generation of London school teachers might somehow lead to society’s improvement was certainly high-minded. But educationalists, by professional outlook and often personal temperament, were inclined to see themselves as the quiet authorities on what society needed and how to achieve it.[[47]](#footnote-47) For all the LDTC’s creation owed much to Fabianism, Adams and his peers tended to offer gentle, but sincere, critiques of a Fabian emphasis on education as a tool to equip children for life in industrial society. “Compulsory free education”, Adams felt, ought not to be “education [paying] the state by improving the quality of its citizens”, making them “better fitted to enter to those special kinds of work that bring prosperity to the nation”. Instead, education needed to make young people “better human beings and therefore better citizens”.[[48]](#footnote-48) Educationalists were not alone in emphasizing this humanistic gospel of civic duty and civic identity as something to be honed and directed. Rather, their added value was their claim to both be able to contribute to a lively intellectual debate about citizenship and character formation, but then distil its findings and funnel them into the minds of the young by using teachers as middlemen.[[49]](#footnote-49)

For some of the college’s students in these early years, this emphasis on educational philosophy and theory – endless references to the liberal canon, discussions of Plato and Rousseau’s *Émile*, for instance–was an unwelcome addition to their training. There were many reasons people became teachers in the years before the First World War. But lawmakers and educationalists rarely thought to ask trainee teachers about them. Records of how early LDTC students’ felt about the college are few and far between.[[50]](#footnote-50) Student organizations, such as a union or internal college publications, had only emerged by the eve of the First World War. But it was broadly true that the majority of LDTC students in its early years were training to teach in London’s elementary, not secondary, schools, though this would reverse by the eve of the First World War.[[51]](#footnote-51) And it was the secondary school, of the kind modelled on the old boys’ public schools, that educationalists tended to imagine as the engines of liberal citizenship training, with all its class and gender implications.[[52]](#footnote-52) Calls for the expansion of secondary education getting louder by the late nineteenth century were usually expressed by social commentators who thought elementary schools were inadequate vehicles for good citizenship. An important way that educationalists revealed the elitism of their worldview was in their focus on teaching in secondary schools, sometimes explicit but usually implicit, in an age in which less than fifteen per cent of British children (and mostly boys) attended them.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Christina de Bellaigue has suggested that an emphasis on teachers delivering liberal education in the public-school model, and so needing a liberal education of their own, reflected teaching’s ascent to becoming a prestige ‘profession’ with profound implications for class and gender. This development, de Bellaigue argued, popularized an increasingly singular conception of teaching and pedagogy, in ways that erased alternative or experimental approaches, particularly the traditions of women teachers and schoolmistresses.[[54]](#footnote-54) More women than men enrolled at the LDTC in its early years, a reflection of far higher numbers of women elementary school teachers than men.[[55]](#footnote-55) The fact that an overwhelming majority failed their university exams in subjects traditionally taught in the secondary school (such as Greek) spoke to a gulf between the teacher their professors imagined, and the reality.[[56]](#footnote-56)

It is also not clear how many LDTC students entered teaching out of an ardent reformist desire to contribute to a great march towards societal improvement. As Chris Bischof has argued, many young people, both women and men, became teachers less excited about societal improvement than about their own social mobility - or, at least, security against downward mobility.[[57]](#footnote-57) Of the first crop of students, many were the children of skilled laborers. Very few had any experience of secondary education themselves, and most had spent time either as pupil-teachers and/or at pupil-training centers before arriving at the LDTC. [[58]](#footnote-58) They hoped, as did many previous generations of teachers, that teaching would provide a stable and respectable source of income. The opportunity to get a University of London degree, subsidized by Board of Education grant funding, was highly appealing: in the limited documentation of their feelings about their studies, classes in educational theory were, for the most part, viewed as a necessary evil to get a degree that would otherwise out of reach.[[59]](#footnote-59) Others found theory was prioritized at the expense of practical method, finding themselves “questioning [its] relevance for the practicing teacher”.[[60]](#footnote-60)

By the time the college celebrated its tenth anniversary in 1912, the three hundred-strong student body traipsed up and down the five-storey extension on Southampton Row. In the decade after its founding, the college had undergone a further set of transformations, the impact of which was staff and students feeling a greater sense both of their own corporate identity and of their work’s social importance. By 1909, the college was recognized as a “school” of the university, with its own local committee allowing staff more direct control over its curriculum and activities, at the expense of the LCC. Moreover, complaints of chronic overwork among students, as well as changes to the administration of Board of Education grants to incentivize teachers to better commit themselves to degree work, informed a restructuring of the course taken by most of the students of the college. The student body was increasingly made up of students on what became known as the “four-year course”. This meant the first three years of taking undergraduate classes, as members of a UoL college, with a half day a week for professional training specializing in a given subject, such as arithmetic, chemistry, or an ancient or modern language. The final, fourth year would be committed to professional training at London Day, where the value of a university education could be translated into practical use.[[61]](#footnote-61) Moreover, the number of LDTC students going on to employment in secondary schools, similarly, was increasing, even as other training colleges continued to produce elementary school teachers in greater numbers.[[62]](#footnote-62) It is difficult to know whether this was a product of a political climate increasingly emphasizing the value of secondary education or a sign of changing demographics among LDTC students who desired more advanced teaching in subject-specialist jobs. The precise effects on the backgrounds and desires of student teachers remain elusive, given the lack of data over students’ familial employment and income after 1904, and how little remains of application and interview records of admitted students, or of graduates. But, seen altogether, these changes seemed to engender a growing sense among many students of how important the role of the teacher was in making society better, and a feeling of pride as a cohort training for that endeavor. Writing in the new student magazine, *The* *Londinian,* in Lent term 1912, one trainee teacher reflected on their future profession. “Social reformers, and all statesmen worthy of the name,” they declared, “realize that ultimately it depends on the schoolmaster or schoolmistress whether or not the present confused and wasteful scramble of blighted individualists shall be transformed into a well ordered, harmoniously co-operating community of happy and healthy men and women.” The stakes of their work and training, the author wrote, were high. “The essential condition of any progress,” the author wrote, “is an improvement in the human manufactured article turned out by the schools.”[[63]](#footnote-63) Much like their mentors in this early period, London Day student teacher tended not to give thought to the empire. When students invoked the imperial community, it was usually to show off about a new-found sense of teachers’ purpose. “All the future lies in [the teacher’s] hands,” wrote one student, somewhat pompously, in 1915, “and to a great extent the sacred task of education and enlightenment must go on if the British empire wishes to maintain its position as the political exemplar of the world.”[[64]](#footnote-64)

**II: Teaching the child**

The education of citizens only grew as a cause of political and social importance after the First World War. In some sense, this development seems counter intuitive. Demand for elementary and particularly secondary education had certainly grown in the immediate aftermath of war, as did the number of young men and women wanting to become teachers. The Fisher Act of 1918 raised the school leaving age in England and Wales, at least in theory, to age fourteen. But economic down-turn and cuts to education funding and teacher-training grants by the Board and LCC after 1922 dampened much of this early post-war enthusiasm for educational expansion. Schooling, and with it training in education and pedagogy, seemed like declining political priorities in a time of national austerity.[[65]](#footnote-65)

Despite economic downturn, the London Day Training College only became more influential in the years after 1918. In part, this reflected a surge in concerns about a need to equip citizens for life in a mass democracy, an arena in which staff at the college had already staked a strong claim. The influence of Idealist thought, of which educationalists were some of the most vocal proponents, continued to knit together what might have been disparate politics among the intellectual architects of the welfare state in this period, though now containing new postwar update of an aggressive critique of the Hegelian state, apparently in the Prussian mold. Educationalists’ role as expert translators of Idealist thought into a practical program of citizen-making in the classroom made college staff, particularly the principal after 1922 Percy Nunn, especially influential within these circles. But what really confirmed the college’s rising stature was the way in which its leadership successfully branded the institution as an emerging research center in the social sciences of pedagogy and child psychology, a center, increasingly, for research degrees, visiting fellowships, progress in scientific knowledge. In a period in where ‘the self’ became a central object of research and intervention for progressive reformers, the psychology and inner mental workings of the child became an object of intense societal interest, the ultimate self-in-progress. This buttressed educationalists’ claims as navigators of the proper relationship between individual, civil society, and state, an interventionist desire to shape individual’s development.[[66]](#footnote-66) The college’s emergence under Nunn as an important center of progressive educational thought in Britain similarly reflected these shifting intellectual interests, bringing the college staff more closely into dialogue with continental developments in “child-centered” education.[[67]](#footnote-67) This was not an incidental development, but rather reflected an internationalism and hubristic belief in Britain’s position in interwar world-order thinking, among staff and students alike.

This was an intellectually robust re-invention, but it was also fiscally prudent. Transformation into a research center, where students increasingly could take M.A. and Ph.D degrees under supervision from leading lights in pedagogical research, brought the institution closer into the university system, able to profit from the resources from departments with overlapping intellectual interests, and making it less vulnerable (though not completely invulnerable) to cuts to teacher-training grants by the Board of Education, which were considerable.[[68]](#footnote-68) Operating in this way allowed the institution to maintain a remarkably lean staff. Nunn remained the only professor of education on staff; Punnett shouldered an enormous administrative burden, and the appointment of Cyril Burt to assist in the institution’s work in educational psychology was only in a part-time position.[[69]](#footnote-69) Under Nunn’s principalship, it was the college’s fortunes were not tied to the contested politics and uncertain fortunes of a new national system of education, but a broader project of educational influence as intellectual seed-sowing.

The enfranchisement of fourteen million additional voters, including women over the age of 30, after the Representation of the People Act of 1918, birthed a post-war political culture where grappling with questions of citizenship, political belonging, and the outlook and behavior of a broadly-defined public seemed more pressing than ever before.[[70]](#footnote-70) Anticipating the political behaviors of British politics’ newest stake-holders – namely, the working-classes and women – and imagining the social and cultural impact of this transition to mass democracy gave new urgency to the anxious elite pastime of worrying about the metropolitan citizenry.[[71]](#footnote-71) The Labour Party’s increased parliamentary representation gave it a far greater platform from which to advocate reform on social policy and welfare.[[72]](#footnote-72) Political parties of all stripes had to assemble new apparatuses in order to organize mass membership at the local and national level.[[73]](#footnote-73) An increasingly powerful mass press either played to or preyed upon a mass public, depending on who you asked.[[74]](#footnote-74) The flourishing vast array of new voluntary and civil society groups for ‘active citizenship’ with mass memberships, as Helen McCarthy as suggested, reflected the dawn of a new participatory democracy going beyond party-politics and a broad popular concern with the goings-on of a national and international politics of the day.[[75]](#footnote-75) These were the sort of developments that energized activities around the work and management of citizens’ identities and actions.[[76]](#footnote-76)

The role of the state, too, had changed, both as a function of wartime governance and by the rising specter of debates about democracy’s social, as well as its political, form. The expansion of social insurance on a breadwinner model, that process of gendering of social citizenship beginning in wartime, was just one way in which individuals’ contributions to society and relationship to the state transformed. Postwar social reform under Lloyd-George’s new government operated on a broader understanding that citizens could make material demands on the state, but only in exchange for the performance of certain social roles and duties.[[77]](#footnote-77) Calls for a national system of, including the expansion of secondary education in some form, became ever louder after 1918, updating an earlier language of national efficiency with a new language of social right. “In pressing for a general system of full-time education up, at least, to sixteen, Labour can claim with some confidence that it is both voicing the demands of nearly all enlightened educationalists,” complained R. H. Tawney, in his famous *Secondary Education for All* (1922), when it seemed government austerity in education funding threatened to stifle the promise for educational transformation with which post-war society once seemed to brim. “[Labour] is working for the only organization of education which will enable the community to make the best use of the most precious of its natural resources – the endowments of its children.”[[78]](#footnote-78)

Percy Nunn was one such ‘enlightened educationalist’ who had the ear of figures like Tawney. Having succeeded Adams as college principal after 1922, Nunn followed the movement for education reform with great interest, if not a great deal of direct public comment. Both he and Tawney sat on the Labour Party’s educational advisory committee in this period, and a typical LDTC student might well have had both Nunn and Tawney as lecturers, after Tawney began lecturing at the LSE in 1920.[[79]](#footnote-79) By professional and personal temperament, Nunn had little of Tawney’s campaigning instincts. It is difficult to establish whether Nunn’s involvement on the committee reflected his own politics – his in private reflections contained noticeably little mention of other Labour party platforms – or opportunism given a sensitivity to changing political winds. Elsewhere, he bemoaned a political state of affairs which seemed to offer a choice between “the tyranny of the few and the tyranny of the many”.[[80]](#footnote-80) From his position on the Education Reform Council of the Teacher’s Guild, the influential teachers’ professional body, Nunn suggested the ends of any education reform should be to “widen educational opportunity”, in a deliberately vague sense, to “train all for work and leisure; to utilize more effectively national resources, human and material; to fit the growing generation for the service of the home, society, and the State; to admit all to the quest of goodness, truth, and beauty; to make better citizens.” In practice, Nunn and Guild made clear, this meant raising the school leaving age to seventeen, making more free places at secondary schools available to children at elementary or preparatory schools based on assessments of ability, and the separation of continuation schools into academic and vocational.[[81]](#footnote-81) At the level of provision, this was hardly a radical platform, but rather one imagined by those who worked closely within an existing system and unwilling to wait for radical change to imagine better conditions in which “better citizens” might be made.
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Throughout his tenure as principal, Nunn seemed to prefer a role as an educational expert advising on, but not campaigning for, policy change, in part because it suited his ranking of his own professional duties. Nunn was very clear that he saw himself, first and foremost, as a teacher. The son of teachers, he served first as a pupil teacher at his father’s school in Bristol before taking his degree and gaining a doctorate in mathematics and logic.[[82]](#footnote-82) While theoretically rigorous, this work, later published as *The Aim and Achievements of Scientific Method* (1907), emerged from “a study of the problems of Science teaching in schools”, and he intended it to offer “very definite pedagogical applications” he could take into a career in teaching.[[83]](#footnote-83) From the point of his arrival, and appointment to a professorship in 1917, Nunn seemed to imagine the LDTC as something like a public school in its own right. His demeanor, according to many accounts, was not that of a particularly party-political reformer on the left, or someone who aspired to a life as a public intellectual, but rather that of a kindly headmaster. He was heavily involved in the associational and corporate life of the college, known for his cheeky poetic contributions to the student magazine, his Text, letter

Description automatically generatedgood cheer at college dances, and for his nickname, ‘Nursery Pun’.[[84]](#footnote-84)

A poem by a student contributor to *The Londinian* (June 1924), in which the author quotes (and gently mocks) several of Nunn’s central concepts in *Education*: *Its First Data and Principles,* including the emphasis on ‘horme’ and ‘mneme’.IE/PUB/3/23, 34.

The book that made Nunn’s name, certainly among education reformers and his peers in pedagogical research, was his *Education: Its Data and First Principles,* published in 1920. *Education…,* and Nunn’s intellectual output in general, has tended to be dismissed by the few historians who have engaged with it. In seeking to establish the gulf between interwar elite conversations about child-centered education and the practice of progressive education in the classroom, Laura Tisdall found that the book’s influence was minimal.[[85]](#footnote-85) But *Education’s…* core aims was as a reflection on how professional educationalists were coming to think about what education was for in the interwar years. The idea that Nunn had intended the book as a practical handbook for the application of progressive educational methods in some sense misses how the author thought of his own role and influence. The text examines contemporary ideas about the education of children as a rumination on human knowledge and liberal subjecthood in a broader sense. ““Every art, said Aristotle in his famous exordium, “is thought to aim at some good.”,” Nunn quoted in the text’s opening paragraph. “Education…. is certainly an art. It is reasonable… [to ask] at what good it aims.”[[86]](#footnote-86)

The bookwas, certainly by the standards of books on pedagogy, very successful, reissued thirteen times, and widely read and reviewed.[[87]](#footnote-87) Nunn certainly intended the book to be read widely by apprentice teachers. All LDTC students would undertake the college’s four-part series on ‘principles of education’, for which the book was designed as a kind of textbook, around which Nunn’s lectures were structured. But the point of the text was to further and shape a broader discourse, part of the trickle-down approach of education’s preparation for life in a society that had long underpinned the college and educationalists’ mission. As the series’ editor, Albert Cock, made clear, the book’s chief appeal is that it spoke to an audience beyond the “professional schoolmaster”, including “educators in general”. “And which of us,” Cock wondered, “is not in some sense or other an educator?”[[88]](#footnote-88)

What *Education*… offers is a revealing insight into the worldview and intended influence of the professional educationalist. As a treatise on education’s role in fostering a kind of progressive individualism centered on the cultivation of the self - an idea that Nunn felt might have positive societal influence – *Education* was powerful and lucid expression of changing currents in contemporary social thought. “My purpose,” Nunn argued, “is to reassert the claim of Individuality to be regarded as the supreme educational ideal, and to protect that ideal against both the misprison of its critics and the incautious advocacy of some of its friends.”[[89]](#footnote-89) The expression of individuality, of the individual’s unique personality, and of a will and capacity for self-determination: these were the “[ideals] of Life”, “once a goal of effort… a standard by which the success of the effort may be judged; also that is something that may be approached indefinitely yet never reached”.[[90]](#footnote-90) John Adams had once reflected that “all education is self-education”. Nunn suggested a modification – that all education ought to be the education of the self.[[91]](#footnote-91)

In his understanding of theories of the state, Nunn’s work owed a great deal to the postwar shifts in liberal thought, grappling with the early influence of Hegel on Idealist conceptions of citizenship.[[92]](#footnote-92) Heavily influenced by L. T. Hobhouse’s eviscerating critique of the Hegelian ‘god-state’, Nunn argued that educators, and liberal intellectuals had large, had overstated the extent to which the State – “the hardened form” of society – was “the parent of man’s spiritual being”. The idea that the State could ever represent “an age-old spiritual life from which the individual spirit… [drew] whatever measure of reality it possesses” was not deeply misplaced, but highly dangerous, a dramatic over-correction from a Hobbesian “exaggerated individualism”. Although “philosophers… only give definite form and direction to movements which are stirring vaguely and irresistibly around them”, Nunn conceded, the “Prussian mind derived its fanatical belief in the absolute value of the State”.[[93]](#footnote-93) British Idealists, too, had made the mistake of seeing the state as primary. “The only means by which real value can enter the world,” Nunn argued, was if education “[strengthened] men’s sense of the worth of individuality – their own and others.’”[[94]](#footnote-94) Nunn did not deny the significance of the social, and he sort to explore the ways in which the individual was shaped by the life of the community in meaningful ways (“individuality develops only in a social atmosphere where it can feed on common interests and common activities”). But he was absolute in his belief that the source of any growth and progress in a society stemmed from the exercise of individual will, creativity and spirit. “Social organization, laws and government, the arts and sciences,” he argued, “have all sprung from a restless creative power which, even in the dullest of mankind, adds to the world something that would not be there if that power had not been exercised.” Education was the process “in which this creative power is to be given the best possible chances of developing and expressing itself.”[[95]](#footnote-95)

Nunn did not originate ideas about a need to re-assert the importance of the individual as the primary unit of society after the First World War. What was novel about Nunn’s contribution is that he saw that pedagogy could serve as a conduit for this kind of progressive individualism that might under pin emerging ideas about the practice of citizenship. It was Nunn’s particular insight to look to the emerging field of child psychology to add attempt to add scientific basis to a philosophical tradition that had long conceptualized children as the archetype of the pre-political individual. The child seemed to become both increasingly visible and knowable in the years after the First World War, in ways that could be productively fashioned towards a liberal project of citizen-making.

The remaining section of this chapter would discuss the following:

- A fuller discussion of educational psychology’s emergence as a discipline in the late 19c and its updated interwar incarnation, attentive to emerging work in children’s psychology and development.

- A discussion of the institution’s pivot to hiring educational psychologists at the college in the form of Burt and Isaacs, on a part-time basis

- Nunn’s subsequent involvement in progressive education and the New Education Fellowship

- The colonial influence on Nunn’s educational psychology (the work of Stanley Hall on the ‘history of race’; Rivers on colonial anthropology), informing analogies of childhood and primitivity in Nunn’s writing and teaching
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