British communism, periodicals and comprehensive education: 1920-56

Matthew Kavanagh

Introduction

In his essays on the inner culture of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), the historian Raphael Samuel remarked that 'education was a universal idiom' in the party.[1] Unsurprisingly, an organisation so concerned with learning attracted many schoolteachers and educationalists. A significant number were present at the CPGB's foundation in 1920,[2] and the party schoolteachers' group numbered somewhere between one and three hundred for the next decade.[3] Communists who were professionally engaged with the education of children were also relatively untouched by the schism between British communism and the labour movement's institutions of adult education, which was the result of the Communist International (Comintern) in December 1922 specifying that the Plebs League and National Council of Labour Colleges should be brought under party control.[4] And when the CPGB first made serious attempts to attract professional workers in the second half of the 1930s, the party's official historian noted that schoolteachers were represented 'above all' among these recruits.[5] They retained this presence into the post-war period. Between 1944 and the mid-1960s the around 2000 party schoolteachers were by far the largest 'white collar' profession represented at CPGB national congress; indeed they made up the third largest of all occupational groups inside the party.[6] But it is not just the numerical force of British communists concerned with children's education which makes them an interesting group to analyse. Prominent CPGB schoolteachers and educationalists also took up senior positions inside their party. Once their occupational group was formally established inside the CPGB machinery as the

National Education Advisory Committee (NEAC) during the early 1940s, leading figures from within sat on the party's executive committee until the mid-1970s. Furthermore, during the mid-to-late 1960s, the CPGB's ideological response to the cultural and intellectual challenges posed by the New Left was shaped to a significant extent by former schoolteacher become academic educationalist Brian Simon, through his prominent role in the party's cultural work.[7] His wife and close collaborator Joan was also in charge of study into the history of education for the renowned CPGB Historians' Group.[8]

The Simons are widely regarded as being key intellectual influences on the investigation of mental testing and the movement for comprehensive education,[9] and it is the wider communist contribution to the latter that the present study seeks to illuminate. For academic interest in the CPGB endures not just in relation to its internal workings, but also because of its significant contribution to British cultural life, one which eclipsed its numerical size and electoral success.[10] Education in schools is a major site for both the transmission and contestation of culture,[11] and there can be few changes to the nature of education in British schools as seismic as comprehensivisation.[12] And the Simons were far from the only British communists to make a noteworthy contribution to the campaign for non-selective education. Indeed, it will be shown here that CPGB schoolteachers, alongside communist academic educationalists, were a vital driving force behind the promotion of the comprehensive principle.

This far-reaching communist input has been largely overlooked in the literature on the party's cultural history, which has focused upon artists, academics, literary figures and scientists. Similarly, where historians of education have discussed the CPGB, it has generally been in relation to adult education.[13] This even extends to Brian Simon himself, whose four volume *Studies in the History of Education* is widely regarded as the standard work on the subject in England and Wales, yet makes few references to the CPGB's role in the politics of education in schools, despite Simon's private acknowledgement of the need for more scholarly attention to be paid to it.[14] This piece is an attempt to fill this gap, drawing extensively from the CPGB's teachers' periodical (which maintained uninterrupted publication from 1948 until the party's collapse in 1991) and from schoolteacher and educationalists' contributions to the CPGB's

more well-known journals. For communist teachers in Britain were particularly committed to the periodical form, and a closer reading of such sources, alongside unpublished archival material, complicates existing conclusions about the extent to which party teachers and educationalists eschewed questions of educational content, method and theory in their campaign for comprehensive education. Party members concerned professionally with the education of children framed and debated their challenge to selective secondary education in ways which devoted more attention to theoretical and philosophical concerns than has previously been acknowledged, and did not merely parrot the party line. In addition, the effect of the CPGB's line in the early cold war years on its educational cadres, leading up to the traumas of 1956, will be investigated. This reveals the development of tension between academic educationalists on the one hand, and schoolteachers active at the 'chalk face' and in the National Union of Teachers (NUT) on the other. Such tension played itself out amongst the pages of journals and was suggestive of a wider schism between labourist and humanist interpretations of socialism which was developing in the CPGB by the later 1950s, and would surface in the decade which followed.

At the margins, 1920-1941

When the CPGB was formed in 1920, there existed a parallel system of state schooling in England. The vast majority of children attended non-fee paying, all-age elementary schools, which educated pupils from the age of five, until the statutory leaving age, which was raised to fourteen in 1921 (though a substantial number only attended full-time until twelve years, from which age elementary pupils were permitted to attend work part-time). Elementary schools offered a curriculum restricted mainly to the 'three Rs', and did not offer the education necessary to enter the universities or the black-coated professions. For that, students needed to attend one of the nation's secondary schools. These were fee-paying institutions, either old endowed grammar schools which received grants of public money, or newer grammar schools established and maintained by local education authorities (LEAs). Grammar schools also enjoyed superior physical conditions in terms of buildings, equip-

ment and the number and qualifications of teaching staff. They recruited pupils at the age of seven or eight and kept the majority of them until the age of sixteen or over. Despite the existence of a limited scholarship system for exceptionally able elementary schoolchildren to transfer to grammar schools at age eleven, and the stipulation that as a condition of receiving public money grammar schools were required to set aside a quarter of their places free of charge for elementary pupils, in practice elementary schools were the domain of the working class, and a full secondary education was by and large restricted to the children of the middle and upper classes.[15]

R.H. Tawney's *Secondary Education for All* (1922) and *Education: The Labour Policy* (1924), produced for the Labour Party, proposed an end to the elementary/secondary divide. Instead Labour policy prescribed a free, unified, continuous system of education, split into distinct primary and secondary schools, with all children transferring from one to the other at the age of eleven and remaining until sixteen. Yet this was very much a long term goal. During Labour's nine months in government in 1924 the percentage of free secondary places was increased and LEAs empowered to raise the leaving age to fifteen. Few did however, and the Conservatives, hostile to the idea of secondary education for all, reversed the increase in free secondary school places when they returned to office later that year.[16] Yet the Consultative Committee for Education (chaired by Henry Hadow, vice-chancellor of Sheffield University) which had in 1923 been charged by the Conservative government with investigating suitable courses of study for children up to the age of fifteen in elementary schools, reported back in 1926. *The Education of the Adolescent*, or the 'Hadow Report', made no recommendations regarding the existing grammar schools, as they had been excluded from its remit. But Hadow did propose, along with raising the school leaving age to fifteen, that other schools should be divided into primary schools on the one hand, and secondary schools on the other, with transfer at age eleven. Thus Hadow accepted the premise of a secondary education for all. Nonetheless, Hadow, and indeed the Labour Party, envisaged a variety of secondary schools for different 'types' of children. Central or secondary modern schools would offer a 'realistic or practical' curriculum, technical or trade schools a curriculum 'developed … in accordance with the needs and

requirements of … local industries', whilst the grammar schools would continue to offer a 'literary or scientific' curriculum.[17] And Hadow also proposed that, as it would take some time to establish a nationwide system of secondary education, as an interim measure elementary schools should be reorganised into junior and senior elementary divisions. The Labour Party, the Trade Union Congress (TUC) and most educationalists welcomed the Hadow Report as a step forward. The Conservative government claimed to accept its principles, but postponed action on any of them in favour of the interim reorganisation of elementary schools.

British communists were at the margins of this debate on the organisation of secondary education. By the end of 1926, CPGB schoolteachers were engaged in a power struggle with Labour Party moderates over control of the executive committee of the pressure group through which they organised, the Teachers' Labour League (TLL). The TLL was disaffiliated by the Labour Party the following year, and, before long, any remnants of the united front with social democrats had disappeared as the League's leading communist teachers became enthusiastic advocates of the new line which had emerged from the Comintern in the summer of 1928. Under the influence of Stalin's consolidation of power in the USSR, the Comintern's Sixth World Congress announced that capitalism had entered its 'third period' of terminal decline and that revolution was thus imminent. Cooperation between communists and left wing social democrats was thus no longer regarded as a way of winning the working class for communism, but instead viewed as collaboration with 'social fascists' who were attempting to hoodwink the workers into propping up a collapsing capitalism. The sectarian nature of this position encouraged some communists in the TLL to dismiss the idea that meaningful reforms could be made to English schools in the absence of a socialist revolution.[18] Although this line was by no means ubiquitous, as has sometimes been suggested,[19] the TLL – rechristened the Educational Workers' League (EWL) in 1930 to eschew the 'bourgeois' sounding 'Labour' and 'Teacher' – did oppose the Conservative reorganisation of elementary schools on the grounds that it was the educational manifestation of capitalist 'rationalisation' in industry, aimed at reducing pay and conditions.[20] Others in the labour movement also lobbied for the full imposition of Hadow's recommendations rather than

the Conservative government's compromise, but to actively oppose any reorganisation of all age elementary schools placed communists at the very margins of the debate. Moreover, it also meant that communist schoolteachers lagged behind their Labour Party counterparts who, upon seceding from the TLL in December 1926, had formed the National Association of Labour Teachers (NALT), affiliated to their party. By 1930, with Labour back in government again committed to full Hadow reorganisation, NALT produced *Education: A Policy*, which advocated not only extending secondary education, but also called for a new, single, type of secondary school: the 'multilateral' school.[21]

As opposed to Hadow's call for distinct grammar, modern or technical secondary schools, the multilateral school would follow the American, French and German example of providing these varied curriculums under one roof to aid ease of transfer between them, and promote social cohesion. The London Labour Party came out in favour of the multilateral school in 1932, and the Labour-controlled London County Council (LCC) also became an advocate. The TUC followed by calling for the multilateral school by 1934, and a year later the NUT also suggested that it would be the ideal arrangement where size permitted.[22] The EWL, however, remained quiet on the issue, influenced by third period scepticism about the viability of meaningful educational reform under capitalism, and sectarian hostility towards the Labour Party, TUC and the NUT. Even though by 1933 CPGB schoolteachers in the EWL were among the first in the party to peel away from the third period line in favour of constructing a broad progressive alliance against the threat of fascism and war (foreshadowing the Comintern's official switch to the 'popular front' in 1935) this did not mean they engaged wholeheartedly with the debate on the organisation of secondary education. According to CPGB teacher Edward Upward's semi-autobiographical novel set in the period, since the 'overriding aim was to obtain unity between communist and non-communist teachers', there was an incentive not to 'raise controversial matters of secondary importance which might make unity harder to get'.[23] The dissolution of the EWL in favour of the broad-based Teachers' Anti-War Movement, coupled with the fact that party teacher Max Morris', *The People's Schools* (published through the Left Book Club in February 1939) demanded only limited experiments

with multilateral schools, backs up Upward's depiction.[24] The Nazi-Soviet Pact's crushing of the popular front by summer 1939 and the chaos that war and evacuation plunged the country's education system into from that September only pushed discussions on the future of secondary education further down the communists' list of priorities.

Discussing the future of Britain after the war remained a low priority among communists even after the Soviet entry into the conflict against Germany in summer 1941. Keen to pressure the government to open up a second front in Europe, the CPGB leadership discouraged discussion of the world to come after as 'a dangerous political diversion … used to perpetuate the illusion that we can leave the main brunt of the fighting and dying in Europe to the Russians'.[25] A 'Schools for Victory' campaign, conducted by the newly formed CPGB Teachers' Bureau throughout late 1941 and early 1942, was fixed firmly upon the role schools and teachers had to play in 'building now a solid, unshakeable Anglo-Soviet front'.[26] It gave no consideration to educational reconstruction in peacetime, despite the flood of press commentary, pamphlets and policy statements on the subject as a consequence of the deleterious effects wartime conditions had on schooling, and the enhanced public awareness of the deprived educational standards of many urban schoolchildren as a consequence of evacuation.[27] Thus there was initially no communist response to the government's 'Green Book' which in summer 1941 outlined the Board of Education's plans for educational reconstruction.[28] Party leader Harry Pollitt, chief theorist Rajani Palme Dutt and industrial organiser Peter Kerrigan had involved themselves in the teachers' work by this point,[29] and it seems likely the communist silence on the issue of educational reform was at their insistence. For a CPGB teachers' conference held in November 1941 had recognised that 'the world of education has been more deeply stirred than ever by the impact of the war on schools' and consequently there was a need to 'counter the tendency to dismiss the plans for post-war reconstruction as mere utopianism'.[30]

Pioneering the Common School: 1942-1944

In June 1942, a year after the Green Book, the CPGB political bureau finally informed its teachers that there must be a clear statement of party

policy on educational reconstruction.[31] By that December, in response to the Beveridge Report, the central committee issued a memorandum setting up committees to examine specific areas of policy in post-war reconstruction, one of which was education.[32] The teachers' bureau thus became the NEAC, formulating education policy for the central committee. At the CPGB's 1943 Congress, the central committee was renamed as the executive committee, and newly elected to it was GCT Giles,[33] who had been a stalwart of the TLL/EWL and had also recently been elected vice president of the NUT to a 'great burst of cheering'.[34] Four other communists were also successful in gaining election to the union's executive committee that year.[35] This reflected a growing prominence and confidence of CPGB teachers both inside and outside their party, which itself had reached a hitherto unseen popularity, with a membership of 56,000 in December 1942.[36] It was in this month that the NEAC published their first serious contribution to the debate on educational reconstruction in the shape of a pamphlet titled *Britain's Schools*.[37] It was given a full page spread in the NUT journal,[38] a publication which had been uniformly hostile to communist teachers for the duration of the Nazi-Soviet Pact.[39] *Britain's Schools* generally accorded with the growing consensus around post-war education policy illustrated by the Council for Educational Advance (CEA), which consisted of the TUC, Co-operative Union Education Committee, the NUT and the Workers' Education Association, and demanded a single, national system of education with a common code for the regulation of secondary schools, and a school leaving age of sixteen.[40] But on the organisation of secondary education, *Britain's Schools* advocated an agenda-setting position: a common secondary education for all.

Britain's Schools had been influenced by NALT's *Reconstruction of Education*, published in late 1941, but went further. NALT had been more radical than their own party's policy and the CEA by proposing that the multilateral school should be the single type of secondary school provided for in any new education bill.[41] NALT suggested that the multilateral school would follow a common curriculum from the age of eleven to thirteen, and then differentiate according to ability, albeit within the same institution. Thus, whether they wished for multilateral schools to be set up alongside the tripartite system of grammar, technical and

secondary modern schools, or to replace them, for the majority of the labour movement the multilateral school was not seem primarily as a device for providing a common education. Rather, multilateralism was a more effective and less socially divisive process of selection. For the CPGB however, secondary schools should have no differentiation in the curriculum until the age of fifteen at the earliest, and preferably not until sixteen.[42] This position was retained in *Communism and the Schools*,[43] a response to the government's White Paper *Educational Reconstruction*, and the report of a committee set up to make recommendations on the curriculum and examinations in secondary school (the Norwood Report), both of which were published in July 1943, and suggested selective secondary education along tripartite lines.[44] The 1944 Education Act, whilst finally consigning to history the elementary school by obligating LEAs to provide free secondary education for all under a common code, in the end did not prescribe how this was to be organised. But the new Ministry of Education soon issued various memorandums giving LEAs a firm steer in the tripartite direction.[45] Nevertheless, like the rest of the educational world and the labour movement, the CPGB welcomed the Act as a firm step forward after the stasis of the 1920s and 1930s. Also, having been elected NUT President in April 1944, GCT Giles had played a key role in the negotiations which shaped the Act, even receiving personal thanks for his help from Conservative minister RA Butler, President of the Board (now Minister) of Education.[46]

Yet the warm welcome did not mean that the CPGB had given up its enthusiasm for ending the tripartite system. Just two months after the Education Act received royal assent, the NEAC issued a memorandum, *The Multilateral (or Common) School*, which argued that the secondary education for all provided for in the Act could only truly be delivered in a non-selective school where students studied a common curriculum until age fifteen.[47] From this point on, communists used the word 'common' or 'comprehensive' instead of multilateral in relation to secondary education, to move away from any association with retaining tripartism inside the same school. They were not the first to use the term – it had already been used in Britain 1929 by educational psychologist Godfrey Thomson.[48] But communists were certainly among the first to champion the truly comprehensive school. In turn, the communist position seems to have

influenced NALT, who soon also broke definitively with the conception of the multilateral school as three separate streams under one roof.[49] In 1948, the Labour Party would drop the term multilateral.[50]

Comprehensive education and the transition to socialism: 1945-47

The communist enthusiasm for the comprehensive school has been explained as deriving primarily from developments in the USSR, the result of British communists' rediscovery of a 1936 Soviet decree condemning the practice of mental measurement, then the instrument used in England to decide which students were eligible for the grammar school at age eleven.[51] Soviet practice no doubt played its part in CPGB teachers later framing the struggle for the common secondary school around a campaign against intelligence testing, which will be dealt with later in this study. But it is important not to let that obscure the fact that the backing of the comprehensive school also had its roots in domestic political developments. The seventeenth CPGB congress in October 1944 outlined a new programme which, for the first time the party's history, held that a reformed parliament under a progressive administration of state planning was capable of beginning the transition to socialism in Britain.[52] The landslide victory of the Labour Party in 1945 on a manifesto committed to the establishment of a welfare state and a vast programme of nationalisation seemed to be moving Britain in this direction. In his 1946 book *The New School Tie*, GCT Giles outlined how the comprehensive school would play a vital role in these new circumstances, where 'government is in the hands of a [Labour] party pledged to build a real democracy in education as well as in other national affairs'. For Giles, the tripartite system was based 'on an economic and social system which is already obsolete and dying' in which '[f]or the great majority … working long hours for low wages, there has been no need for knowledge or culture'. In such a system, posited Giles 'there could be no general demand for a high standard of education'. However, in the 'age of technical triumph, an age of plenty' that the coming 'planned democracy' would bring, a higher level of general education for all would be required, hence a common secondary education was a necessity, not only to make economic progress, but also to prepare the population for a new kind of

citizenship. In short, the comprehensive school 'must become, not merely a place of instruction, but more and more the training ground for … social life in a democratic community'.[53]

Just as Harry Pollitt had argued in 1945's *Answers to Questions* that the quicker the influence of a united working class movement could 'purge the State apparatus of … reactionaries', and ensure a 'new type of government and parliament, new types of local and county councils … the quicker we shall advance to socialism',[54] so too a new type of school could also assist in this process. In this way, communists saw the common secondary school as not just about widening access to secondary education of the existing type, but as a method of creating a curriculum of an entirely new character. Brian Simon, who between 1945 and 1950 taught in Manchester and Salford in an un-reorganised senior elementary school, a secondary modern and a grammar school, reflected that for communists at the time, the creation of the comprehensive school was just the first step towards 'transformation of the content of education … the single school seemed to be in sight … but more was needed – an overall reconstruction of educational practice using modern methods and techniques'.[55] And by 1947 party teachers developed a substantial draft policy offering their most sophisticated interpretation to date of the development of English education and the prospects for progressive change in its methods and content.[56] It is thus worth considering in some detail.

The 'Content of Education' surmised that the historical development of schools in England and Wales reflected not a munificent mission on the part of individuals or the state, but rather the economic and political struggle of classes. But the document also posited that in the British historical context, the schools also contained within them an internal development which sometimes counteracted economic and political developments, caused in large degree by the failure to ever definitively rupture organised religion from the provision of education. Hence the original grammar schools, though born out of bourgeois challenge to the power of the church and the aristocracy from the fifteenth century onwards, remained dominated by a classical humanist tradition of Platonic philosophic idealism 'existing in uncomfortable proximity … and often at open war' with the scientific culture often associated with the

rising middle class. Even the economic pressures exerted by the Industrial Revolution – which necessitated that the working class receive some form of basic, and then vocational, education and led to the establishment of state elementary schools, and eventually secondary schools – were not enough to shake off the domination of the classical tradition. There was a certain degree of reconciliation between the Platonic and utilitarian educational traditions, true, but essentially the former won out.

However, 'The Content of Education' espoused hope for a fundamental shift in educational content in what is described as 'the recently developed senior school', a reference to the secondary modern. Since this type of school was 'relatively free of the academic bonds that constrict the rest of the system', and educated chiefly the children of the working class, 'the immediate producers who are in constant touch in their daily life with material reality', it was able to base the curriculum on children's direct experience and test theory in practice. The development was also beginning to trickle down to the primary schools. Nonetheless, the ruling class were wise to this fact, and thus the maintenance of the grammar school advocated in the Norwood Report, and in Tory education policy after the passage of the 1944 Education Act, was an attempt by capitalist class to ensure that the elitist classical tradition survived. In this way the status of the ruling class would endure despite the statutory provision of secondary education for all. So although the state system of schools could still therefore be categorised as a system provided for the working class by the bourgeoisie, and thus the content of the education delivered in them was ultimately reflective of bourgeois thought and method, progressive influences were beginning to appear. Consequently:

> … the primary task is the establishment of a common secondary school within which new forms of education could be developed in accordance with the progressive force in society, the working class, and so of their children … a form of education that will fit the people for the sharpening struggle ahead … [T]he schools today can in some measure extend their function to perform tasks which a socialist society to a very great extent performs for its members … i.e. they can make it a major task to clarify existing social practice, and to destroy the basis of myths, dogma and confusion.[57]

The comprehensive school, new humanism and the battle of ideas: 1947-1956

The evidence outlined above thus complicates Ken Jones' argument that post-war British communists' focus on widening access to state provision of education meant that they 'adopted positions that responded to the prospect of expanded state education in a one-sided over welcoming way' or had 'no serious concern for matters of educational content'.[58] Further evidence which contrasts with Jones' account is shown by CPGB teachers' reaction to a change in the party line to one of disillusionment with the nature of the Labour administration by late 1947. In August that year a Harry Pollitt-authored pamphlet, *Looking Ahead*, optimistically argued that 'I have no hesitation in declaring that the essence of the period we are now in is that of a transition stage towards socialism'.[59] But almost as soon as *Looking Ahead* was published, developments in international communism undermined it. In September 1947 the newly-established Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) decreed that the world was divided indisputably into two camps, and that the British Labour government was firmly inside the camp of reactionary American imperialism. Accordingly, at its Twentieth Congress in February 1948, the Party agreed a new attitude towards the Labour Government.[60] In contrast to his dented, but intact, faith in Labour's socialist credentials in *Looking Ahead*, a year on Pollitt wrote that 'there is nothing common with socialism in what the Labour Government is doing'.[61] This shift in line seemed to accord with the NEAC's actual experience of Labour education policy in government, which had not seriously challenged tripartism. This caused a growing concern with the formulation of a distinct communist attitude to educational theory and practice, and its relationship to economic, social and political change which continued into 1948 as the schism between the Labour Government and the CPGB grew wider. Several articles appeared in *Modern Quarterly*, the CPGB's theoretical journal, on the historical development of schooling in England since the bourgeois revolution, on the place of a 'new humanism' in school-based education, and on theory and practice in the education of children.[62] The latter piece was written by Joan Simon and directly lifted and developed upon passages from 'The

Content of Education'. Why the latter draft was never published in full is unknown, but Joan Simon's adaptation and extension of its ideas reiterated apprehension about the growing influence of those who sought to reassert the classical humanist approach to education in schools through the maintenance of tripartism, by preserving a secondary school curriculum which was 'devitalised, abstract … anything but the source of instruments of positive social action'.[63] In other words, Joan Simon was explicitly relating arguments about the content of education to the struggle between capitalism and progress towards socialism which was inherent in the CPGB's post-twentieth Congress political line:

> What are the real issues underlying educational controversy? They are, of course, the same as those in every field of social life. Are we to advance or return to barbarism? The present educational system is a capitalist agency in a capitalist society … [it] continuously transmit[s] the ideas and values of the ruling order … it works to stabilise social relations … But by its very existence it puts new weapons in the hands of the people which they can use to transform social relations. It is therefore a focal point in the struggle for social advance … The attempts to maintain divisions and differences of subject matter as between the curricula of different schools is in effect an attempt to counteract the effects of the increased dose of enlightenment.[64]

Again, Joan Simon was keen to distance communist prescriptions for educational content from social democratic or 'progressive' ones. Despite offering praise for the work of the Central Advisory Council of England and Wales', *School and Life* and Sir Fred Clarke's *Education and Social Change* – both of which argued for closer interrelation between the curriculum and the child's experience and social relations[65] – Simon also emphasised that 'those who accept the divisions of capitalist society as final and absolute must search in vain for a final 'integration' of the various aspects of human knowledge, experience and emotion'.[66] She also criticised Labour policy on education for being confined to organisational questions and neglecting theory.[67] That the CPGB had been guilty of the same between 1935 and 1945 was not mentioned, presumably

because a quantitative focus was deemed appropriate then, when the priority was the defeat of fascism. Whereas, in 1948:

> [t]he present time is a period of transition, a moment in the development of our culture when capitalism is in a final stage of decline and the transition to Socialism is imminent. Educational issues therefore reflect both the manifestations of social collapse and of immense new social opportunity … Teachers therefore have great opportunities. In spite of inevitable limitations they have the perspective of teaching the right thing, of enabling children to understand what science offers, how society develops, what human culture consists in. This is not utopianism. This is not merely the end of a dying age; it is also the threshold of the new.[68]

In this way, schoolteachers were expressing the logic of the CPGB's wider political line: that the conditions for a gradual transformation to socialism in Britain were in place, if only the forces of progression, and not reaction, could steer the institutions of the state in that direction: whether that institution was Parliament or the school. It was for this reason that the party leadership had advanced the argument that there was a definite need for communist professionals to develop a marxist approach to their own fields.[69] One of the most successful and influential examples of this was the NEAC's campaign against intelligence testing.

Brian and Joan Simon first took members of the CPGB Psychologists' Group to task in *Modern Quarterly* and another party periodical, *Communist Review,* in the late 1940s. They challenged members of the Psychologists Group's view that intelligence testing should be developed so that measures could be devised that would make the most of everyone's individual abilities, not just an elite. Emboldened by the recent 'rediscovery' of the 1936 Soviet decree condemning 'pedology' (mental measurement), and the obvious use of intelligence testing in Britain as a justification for resisting the comprehensive school which was seen as an important feature of the transition to socialism,[70] Party teachers, in collaboration with Brian and Joan Simon, played a leading role in questioning the validity of the eleven-plus exam along marxist lines, emphasising the malleability of human capacity in the interaction with

his/her environment and social relations.[71] The CPGB held an open meeting on 'Intelligence Testing and the Class System of Education' in October 1950, attended by 300 people, including many non-party teachers.[72] Developing out of such work and intensive further statistical research which he had begun on a small scale as a classroom teacher in Salford and when studying part-time for an M.Ed. course at Manchester University,[73] Brian Simon's book *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School* (1953) spelled out clearly and scientifically how the construction and validation of tests were prone to subjective social calculations which discriminated against the often culturally deprived children of the working class. He thus was significant in discrediting the concept of fixed genetic intelligence which restricted opportunity not just in secondary education, but also in the primary school through the distorting and self-selecting effects of streaming and coaching for the eleven-plus.[74] According to the *Times Educational Supplement*, Simon had delivered 'a formidable indictment of the theory and practice of intelligence testing … the case stands up'.[75] Indeed *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School* rapidly became what one historian has described as 'the theoretical and practical manual for opponents of selection'.[76] It has also been suggested by the biographer of leading educational psychologist Professor Cyril Burt, the foremost advocate of testable innate genetic intelligence in the period, that *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School* played a major part in Burt later using fraudulent data in order to substantiate his theories.[77] In 1955 Simon contributed another book called *The Common Secondary School*, which developed his arguments by using data from working-class secondary modern school pupils who had been entered for the GCE 'O' Level and achieved passes, something which their IQ score suggested they were incapable of. It also used observations from visits to almost all of the then few fully comprehensive schools in England and Wales to illustrate that they were bringing about a general improvement in standards, contrary to the fears expressed by advocates of the grammar school.[78]

A supposedly nationally grounded CPGB strategy built on awakening a socialist consciousness amongst the mass of the people required a greater emphasis to be placed on cultural and ideological struggle. This is turn necessitated a re-energising of the party's attempts to reach out to

professional workers and intellectuals. During 1947 the party established a National Cultural Committee (NCC) to co-ordinate cultural activity, involving sub-groups of historians, scientists, musicians, film-makers, artists and writers.[79] The head of the NCC Emile Burns pointed out its relevance to teachers, an indication that they too could take their place in 'the united movement … that can make democracy a reality'.[80] This was not surprising, given that there were 2000 schoolteachers in the CPGB by 1949,[81] making them by far the largest group of professional workers inside the party,[82] at a time when the CPGB more widely was losing members.[83] Although the NEAC was a branch of the party's industrial department, Burns felt it opportune to point out that teachers and educationalists had an important part to play in the party's cultural work. Reflecting this, GCT Giles was given a place on the NCC when it was launched,[84] and the October 1950 meeting on intelligence testing mentioned earlier was a joint venture between the NCC and the NEAC. Following the formal adoption of a parliamentary route to socialism outlined in *The British Road to Socialism* in 1951, the CPGB executive committee adopted a resolution on cultural work calling for '[a] deeper study' of it and 'continuous efforts to make it well known among … professional colleagues'.[85] The idea was to counter American capitalist cultural domination as energetically as its economic and military hegemony. But at times this 'Battle of Ideas' – a term coined by communist historian (and former party teacher) AL Morton in 1948 to describe the struggle on the cultural front[86] – was characterised by an 'increasingly one-eyed application' under which 'there was pressure to conform to Soviet endorsed models' highlighted by Lysenkoism among scientists and 'socialist realism' among writers.[87] It also found expression on the NEAC's attitudes to new western progressive educational theories.

Despite the radical visions for the 'new humanist' transformation of educational content and methods during the mid-to-late 1940s, and the valuable theoretical critique of intelligence testing, a rather more conservative attitude began to prevail among the NEAC leadership as the cold war progressed. Communist teachers became more isolated from domestic currents and less inclined to flesh out 'new humanism' and apply it to social conditions as they existed in England. Rather, as during the third period, they sought to investigate and promote Soviet or Soviet

bloc educational trends. Here education, like Soviet culture generally, was influenced by a strict Stalinist purging of 'bourgeois influences'. A teacher-led pedagogy had been returned to the USSR during the 1930s after Stalin had brought the radical student-centred bolshevist teaching methods of the 1920s to an end, but under 'High Stalinism' after World War Two authoritarian teaching was in the ascendant, since the development of pupils' initiative and self-discovery was not to be encouraged. Instead 'the school … was seen as a place of unflinching respect for the teacher … a place in which unsanctioned and independent actions were usually inappropriate'.[88] Visits by British communist teachers to schools in the Soviet Union remarked with pride on the 'very strict' discipline and the 'high standard' attained by using teaching methods 'like those in our grammar schools', rather than the 'freer' methods that had developed in non-selective schools, and had previously been presented as the hope for the 'new humanist' education of the comprehensive school of the future.[89] In a similar vein, Party teacher Chris Hayes used educational research from the USSR and the GDR to expound an idea of education where 'serious work' could only be done where 'the teacher [is] completely in control and commands unquestioned discipline'.[90] Max Morris' 1953 book, *Your Children's Future*, which contained a chapter – revealingly titled 'People's Democracy and Education'– that sought to lay down a blueprint for a 'democratic' education system in Britain, was clearly influenced by this model. Although he agreed with pupils having 'an active rather than a passive *approach* to learning [my emphasis]' he was not effusive about teachers encouraging too much freedom in the classroom itself. 'Education should be systematic, programmes clearly defined' wrote Morris. Teachers should not depend 'as so often happens now, on accidental, individual predilections for particular theories. Freedom there must be to discuss and learn … but freedom should surely not result in confusion'.[91]

Morris' attitude had been considerably different five years earlier. In a July 1948 article for party weekly *World News and Views*, he celebrated the fact that '[a]ll over the country teachers are discussing how to modernise the content and methods of the school curriculum. New methods are being applied, the keynote of which is the development of the children's initiative through activity rather than the passive absorp-

tion of knowledge'.[92] But by November, when the NEAC launched its own journal, attitudes were beginning to change. *The Educational Bulletin* (later *Education Today* and then *Education Today and Tomorrow*) was launched at the height of a cold war 'witch hunt' against communist schoolteachers,[93] a time when the NUT's journal was increasingly hostile to communists and the Union was adopting a progressively more cautious attitude to the common secondary school. In this context *The Educational Bulletin* provided a medium for communist and left-leaning schoolteachers to conduct and discuss the fight against tripartism and intelligence testing both inside the classroom and the unions, and of course to publicise CPGB education policy and recruit teachers to the party. Its staff of party teachers were unpaid, and despite regular appeals for funding, it was selling 3000 copies an issue by the 1950s,[94] and was apparently widely read by non-communists inside the NUT.[95]

But during the late 1940s and early 1950s *The Educational Bulletin* in general advocated a very traditional attitude towards teaching and learning, which contrasted sharply with the potential for progressive change that leading communist teachers had espoused in the wake of 1944. Although the first edition pointed its readers to Joan Simon's article in *The Modern Quarterly*, and encouraged them to engage with 'activity and field of study' methods which relied much less on teacher instruction and more upon guiding the interests of the child, there were portents of a creeping scepticism towards such approaches. Readers were also warned to be wary of the danger that such methods could also lead to a 'failure to develop a coherent body of knowledge'.[96] Before long, a reasonable doubt such as this accelerated into dismissing activity methods as a US government plot, in conjunction with the Ministry of Education, who were promoting such methods at this time, 'to produce men incapable of thinking'.[97] As leading NEAC member and grammar school History teacher R.S. (Sam) Fisher put it: '[t]he apologists for capitalism desire a working class 'socially minded, co-operative', but ignorant, i.e. ripe for the illusions of class collaboration. Activity methods cater for that need'.[98]

Attitudes hardened on other new educational practice in schools as well. In contradiction to the NEAC's previous suggestion that History and Geography be merged as Social Studies or Social Science (in 1944's

the *Multilateral (or Common) School*, 1946's *The New School Tie* and 1947's 'The Content of Education'), when this practice was taken up in secondary modern schools on the recommendations of the Ministry of Education, an article in the *Educational Bulletin* framed it as 'depriving working-class children of the knowledge which is their birthright' in favour of 'a hotchpotch of unsystematic activities'. Yet again this was linked to ideas spilling over from America.[99] Other education methods which had once been advocated by communists were also subject to something of a *volte face*: visual aids were characterised as a slippery slope towards a form of 'visual education', apparently a powerful movement of American 'business concerns' and '[r]eactionary ideologists' whose aim was to 'limit as narrowly as possible the thinking done by the rising generation' and 'to deprive them of any serious education at all and raise up a generation conditioned to react mechanically and uncritically to certain shapes and colours'.[100] Thus, the CPGB leadership's rather dogged adherence to the 'two camps' thesis and the 'Battle of Ideas' was clearly making itself felt among the party's teachers. Educational theories emanating from America were liable to be seen as part of a US project of political, economic and cultural hegemony, even though communist teachers had previously advocated the same or similar methods in the schools. Some communist teachers involved themselves deeply in NCC activities. Peter Mauger was one example, speaking at NCC conferences on 'Communism and Liberty' and writing for *World News and Views* on the dangers posed to children by '[t]he insidious medium of the American comic [which] deals in brute force and direct sadism, disguised pornography, the unquestioned superiority of the capitalist way of life'.[101] Mauger was at the forefront of the movement against American comics, and he and other party teachers eventually formed an unlikely alliance with church groups and conservative moralists in the Comics Campaign Council, speaking all over the country on the menace the comics posed to young minds.[102]

However, not all Party teachers were as enamoured with the NEAC leadership's unsophisticated application of the 'Battle of Ideas' to education. Some were willing to defend the judicious use of activity methods and visual aids, or social studies, and their views were not censored from *The Educational Bulletin*.[103] Equally, some of the concerns expressed

about new methods were more reasonable, based not upon cold war hysteria, but upon activity methods' emphasis of the free development of the fixed and innate (rather than developable) potential of the individual divorced from his/her social relations.[104] But the conservatives generally had the last word in the journal, and it was those conservatives who held the leading positions on the NEAC. As Steve Parsons points out, such conservatism was not just a product of Soviet influence, but also reflects the fact that by the early 1950s the party teachers' leadership was dominated by secondary schoolteachers like GCT Giles, Max Morris and Sam Fisher. As activity methods and visual aids had more natural applicability with younger children in the primary schools, secondary school teachers naturally took less interest in them.[105] Eric Porter, a party primary school teacher put it thus: 'Morris and Fisher waged a strong campaign against 'free' methods from their secondary redoubt … [T]he Morris/Fisher attitude was designated generally by primary members as reactionary'.[106]

Added to this primary/secondary division between the teachers was a developing cleavage in the NEAC between 'intellectual' or 'academic' educationalists and classroom practitioners. In 1950, Brian Simon left school teaching in Manchester and Salford in order to take up a post in the Education Department at University College Leicester. He recalled feeling at the time that it was in a university, rather than the school classroom, that the theory and practice of education could be properly investigated.[107] This perspective was out of line with an NEAC dominated by working schoolteachers and increasingly concerned largely with professional questions in the trade unions. Shortly after taking up his academic post, Simon vented his frustration at the lack of attention being paid to theoretical matters by the NEAC. A June 1951 memorandum from him to the Committee laments the lack of 'organised attention to the ideological struggle in education'. Simon agreed that attempts to degrade the standard of education provided for the working-class based on 'American pragmatist theory' and the use of intelligence testing, but his underlining of the word 'organised' clearly suggested that the any existing attention to ideological matters was being applied unsystematically by the party's teachers. He stated bluntly that the NEAC was 'lagging behind' on clarifying a marxist theory of education, and the application of that theory in a specific manner to the use of intelligence

testing and to different age groups and different subject areas was an area 'virtually untouched by us'. He felt that there was a tendency to avoid such issues for fear of causing dissension among the party's teachers, and that this was 'short-sighted and wrong'. Simon recommended that the development of attention to theoretical issues in education be given to a sub-committee of the NEAC created for the purpose and 'consisting of a few comrades particularly interested in this area'. The sub-Committee was to establish contact with intellectuals and academics in the Historians' Group and Psychologists' Group and work more closely with them. The memorandum clearly demonstrates that Simon felt the current leadership of the NEAC avoided theoretical discussions in favour of more concrete professional matters. And where party teachers did stray into theoretical areas matters of classroom practice, Simon felt their pronouncements on these matters tended to be knee-jerk rather than grounded in marxist theory.[108] Certainly, Max Morris' election to the CPGB executive in 1952 was indicative of the extent to which he endorsed the party leadership's prescriptive imposition of cold war logic. Moreover, being part of the industrial department actually further diminished the prospects for theoretical advancement among the NEAC, as the committee was caught between two stools: education in schools was a cultural matter, but one perceived through the lens of a leadership focused more on its industrial politics.

Conclusion

Although they came late to the debate after a time at the margins during the third period and popular front, British communist schoolteachers and educationalists played an important role in the campaign for comprehensive education in England. This role has been largely overlooked by historians, and where it has been considered, communists have been portrayed as paying little or no attention to philosophical or cultural concerns, but as being instead essentially economistic, summed up by Deborah Thom as a 'trade union style of discourse … [which] did not advance the debate theoretically at all'.[109] Trade union matters were undoubtedly a strong feature of official party pronouncements and some discussion of education in schools in the party press, particularly during

the 'Battle of Ideas' of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Yet a closer reading of communist schoolteachers' and educationalists' contributions to party periodicals, alongside their books and unpublished archival material, shows that the official party line was not simply reflected faithfully. It was also developed in a manner which paid not inconsiderable attention to matters of educational content. Furthermore, communist educational print culture at times openly contested the party line. This was to continue as the CPGB went through the ordeal of Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin and the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956, the growing intellectual/'worker' divide among communist teachers and educationalists temporarily ameliorated, even if their respective key figures remained ultimately loyal to the party line. Max Morris was one of only two members of the CPGB executive committee to oppose Soviet intervention,[110] yet he bowed to democratic centralism and fell in line with the rest of the leadership in publicly supporting the USSR's actions. Brian Simon also swallowed his doubts about the invasion and took up a seat on the executive in 1957.[111] Joan also remained faithful to the leadership. No exact figures survive on how many party schoolteachers were among the 9000 CPGB members who had resigned in the wake of 1956. But on the whole the NEAC remained more 'loyal' than other 'brain workers'. Though the CPGB itself estimated it lost up to a quarter of its white collar cadres, schoolteachers were not noticeably among them. They made up eleven per cent of the total number of delegates at the 1957 congress, an increase on the seven per cent they made up in 1956, indeed they were one of only three occupational groups in the party which actually grew as a proportion of total delegates between those two years, and their growth was the largest of these three.[112]

However, there was a lively debate in *Education Today and Tomorrow* about the CPGB/NEAC's relationship with the USSR when it came to educational matters. This was a theme taken up by Beatrix Tudor-Hart. She published an article which damned the CPGB's subservience to the CPSU over questions of education:

> Many teachers, both in, and out of the Party, have been very disturbed for a long time at the Communist Party's attitude towards progressive ideas and methods in education, particularly in primary

> education. We have damned activity methods, play, individual work, project methods, assignments, because the Soviet Union disapproves of them.

For Tudor-Hart, Communist teachers in Britain would 'gain more support … if we discussed English methods and practice … from the viewpoint of marxists using our own experiences', rather than 'report[ing] on and prais[ing] only Russian methods, even when these are nonsense, incorrect … or obvious and trite'.[113] But Tudor-Hart was not alone in her misgivings about NEAC education policy in the wake of 1956. Peter Mauger felt that it was 'a fair comment that Communists have tended to propagandise Soviet education'. He emphasised the need 'to solve, *in our own way*, the very pressing problems facing British education'. He then echoed concerns that Tudor-Hart had expressed about the formal and academic style of education being delivered by Soviet schools since the reforms under Stalin in the 1930s.[114] As has been shown, Mauger was a practising teacher in a state school, and had played key role in the 'battle of ideas' campaign. Given these facts, he could not be easily dismissed as an unreliable ivory tower intellectual like Tudor-Hart, who taught in the independent sector. Nor could GCT Giles, who despite his loyalty to the party's position over Hungary also felt that the Party's teachers had neglected marxist theory.[115] Brian Simon also took the opportunity to repeat the similar point he had made earlier in the 1950s in the wake of 1956.[116] Clearly, 1956 stirred up concerns about the theoretical rigour of communist educational policy among CPGB teachers, and their journal was perceived as a safe space in which to dissent from the party line.

Indeed during the late 1950s and the very early 1960s party teachers worked in close collaboration with academic/intellectual educationalists like Brian and Joan Simon, developing an influential theoretical critique of selection which did not hang on the simplistic class reductionism, but engaged with questions of educational psychology, theory and method in the creation of a common curriculum.[117] However, when in 1961 Joan Simon was about to publish a pamphlet developing a marxist theory of education in Britain (which she had written at the request of the CPGB's publishers), Max Morris, Sam Fisher and other leading members of the NEAC became concerned that schoolteacher control over communist

educational policy was being threatened. They attempted to reassert their dominance by blocking publication, and were backed up by a CPGB leadership which did not wish to risk alienating a large 'worker' constituency then making significant advances in an NUT increasingly open to militancy on salaries as governments attempted to impose wage controls.[118] Paradoxically, the marginalisation of intellectual educationalists occurred at a time when King Street was beginning to assign a greater role for ideological and cultural struggle in other spheres, and whilst Brian Simon was to play a leading role in this as chair of the NCC, he found himself to some extent limited in his own field of expertise inside his own party. Yet, in another way, the struggle for the control of communist education policy was a portent of a wider schism developing in the CPGB by the mid-to-late1960s: between those advocates of a more pluralist, humanist approach which ascribed a greater role for culture and ideas as site of resistance; and those who wished to keep the battle for socialism more firmly rooted in industrial struggle.[119]

Notes

1 Raphael Samuel, *The Lost World of British Communism*, London: Verso, 2006, p194.

2 Schoolteachers present at the CPGB's foundation congress included Marjorie Brewer (later Pollitt), David Capper, and Margaret Clarke. See my 'British Communism and the Politics of Education, 1926-1968', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2015, p11, n14. There were also a number of prominent adult educationalists who were members of the party for its first eighteen months, including Plebs League figures Winifred and Frank Horrabin, Mark Starr, Raymond Postgate, JT Walton-Newbold, Morgan Phillips-Price, Ellen Wilkinson, Eden and Cedar Paul, TA Jackson, Willie Paul and Maurice Dobb. See Neil Macintyre, *A Proletarian Science: Marxism in Britain, 1917-1933*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1986, p80.

3 Steve Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions: The Organisation of Professional Workers by the British Communist Party, 1933-1956', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Warwick, 1990, p478 and p504, n17.

4 See Macintyre, *A Proletarian Science*, pp81-83; Brian Simon, 'The Struggle for Hegemony, 1920-1926', in Brian Simon (ed), *The Search for Enlightenment: The Working Class and Adult Education in the Twentieth Century*, Leicester: NIACE, 1992, pp60-63; and Andy Miles, 'Workers' Education: The Communist Party and the Plebs League in the 1920s', *History Workshop*, 18, Autumn, 1984, pp102-114.

5 Noreen Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1927-1941*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1985, p221.

6 See the table 'Occupational and Industrial Composition of National Congress Delegates', in Kenneth Newton, *The Sociology of British Communism*, London: Allen Lane, 1969, p162.

7 Geoff Andrews, *Endgames and New Times: The Final Years of British Communism 1964-1991*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 2004, p. 75.

8 Ruth Watts, 'Obituary: Joan Simon (1915-2005)', *History of Education*, 35, 1, Jan. 2006, p6.

9 *Ibid*.; and D Reeder, 'Brian Simon: A Tribute', *History of Education*, 31, 4, 2002, p308.

10 See, for example, Andy Croft, *A Weapon in the Struggle: The Cultural History of the Communist Party of Great Britain*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1998; Geoff Andrews, Nina Fishman and Kevin Morgan (eds), *Opening the Books: Essays on the Social and Cultural History of the British Communist Party*, London: Pluto Press, 1995; and Ben Harker, *Class Act: The Cultural and Political Life of Ewan MacColl*, London: Pluto Press, 2007.

11 Ken Jones, *Education in Britain: 1944 to the Present*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003, pp4-5.

12 The term 'Britain' refers here chiefly to the experience in English schools, since although Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland's schools were subject to varying levels of autonomy, the English experience significantly shaped educational policy across post-war Britain. See *ibid*, pp2-4. Moreover, by far the majority of communist schoolteachers and educationalists were resident and active in England.

13 See Roger Fieldhouse, *Adult Education and the Cold War: Liberal Values Under Siege 1946-51,* Leeds: Studies in Adult and Continuing Education, 1985; Thomas Linehan, *Communism in Britain 1920-39*, Manchester University Press, 2007, pp166-170; Macintyre, *A Proletarian Science*,

pp80-87; Miles, 'Workers' Education'; Jonathon Rée, *Proletarian Philosophers: Problems in Socialist Culture in Britain, 1900-40* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), chapter 4; and Simon (ed), *The Search for Enlightenment*, chapters 1 and 3.

14 Letter from Brian Simon to Nan McMillan, 21 September 1975, Brian Simon papers, Institute of Education, University of London, DC/SIM/2/26.

15 For further detail on the development of the public system of education by the 1920s, see, for example, Gerald Bernbaum, *Social Change and the Schools 1918-1944*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967, chapters 1 to 3; GAN Lowndes, *The Silent Social Revolution: An Account of the Expansion of Public Education in England and Wales 1895-1935*, Oxford University Press, pp97-120; Brian Simon, *The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-1940*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974, chapters 1 and 2; and Brian Simon and David Rubenstein, *The Evolution of the Comprehensive School 1926-1972*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973, pp1-10.

16 For further detail on the Labour Party and secondary education for all, see Rodney Barker, *Education and Politics 1900-1951: A Study of the Labour Party,* Oxford University Press, 1972, pp46-57; Denis Lawton, *Education and Labour Party Ideologies 1900-2001 and Beyond*, London: Routledge, 2012, chapter 2; and Michael Parkinson, *The Labour Party and the Organisation of Secondary Education 1918-65*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970, pp6-21.

17 Board of Education, *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent*, the Hadow Report, 1926, p95; p66; and p99.

18 TLL, *Schools, Teachers and Scholars in Soviet Russia*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1929, pxiii.

19 Ken Jones, *Beyond Progressive Education*, London: Macmillan, 1983, p122; Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions: The Organisation of the British Communist Party among Professional Workers, 1933-1956', p 480; and Martin Lawn, 'Deeply Tainted with Socialism: The Activities of the Teachers' Labour League in England and Wales in the 1920s', *History of Education Review*, 14, 2, 1985, p29. For a detailed discussion of how the former accounts can be contested, see my 'British Communism and the Politics of Education, 1926-1968', chapter two.

20 'Trade Unionist', 'Reorganisation, Rationalisation and Recommendations', *The Educational Worker: Organ of the Teachers' Labour League*, 2, 22, October 1928, pp6-8.
21 NALT, *Education: A Policy*, London: NALT, 1930.
22 Rubinstein and Simon, *The Evolution of the Comprehensive School*, pp15-17.
23 Edward Upward, *In the Thirties*, London, Quartet Books, 1978, p161.
24 Max Morris, *The People's Schools*, London: Gollancz, 1939, p95.
25 CPGB, *The Communist Party and the Way to Win: Discussions of the National Conference of the Communist Party, May 1942*, London: CPGB, 1942, pp38-39.
26 'Resolutions of Teachers' Conference', 28 December 1941, David Capper papers, Working Class Movement Library, Salford, PP/CAPPER, box 2.
27 For a detailed discussion of the numerous contributions to this debate, see Harold Dent, *Education in Transition: A Sociological Study of the Impact of War on English Education 1939-1943*, London: Kegan Paul, 1944, pp163-203.
28 For more on the contents of the Green Book, see Michael Barber, *The Making of the Education 1944 Education Act*, London, Cassell, pp12-30.
29 'National Association of Labour Teachers', memorandum of the CPGB Teachers' Bureau, 18 January 1942, Capper papers, box 2.
30 'Resolution on Post-War Educational Reconstruction', November 1941, Capper papers, box 2.
31 Handwritten minutes of Teachers' Bureau meeting, 19 June 1942, Capper papers, box 2.
32 Noreen Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1941-1951*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1997, pp80-81.
33 See the list of names elected to the executive committee in CPGB, *Unity and Victory: Report of the 16th Congress of the Communist Party*, CPGB: London, 1943, p59.
34 Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions', p487; and p507, n49.
35 'NUT Annual Conference 1943', *The Schoolmaster and Woman Teachers' Chronicle*, 6 May 1943, p272.
36 Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1941-1951*, p16.
37 CPGB, *Britain's Schools: A Memorandum Issued by the Communist Party of Great Britain*, Watford: Farleigh Press, 1942.

38 'Communist Education Policy', *The Schoolmaster*, 7 January 1943, p7.
39 See, for example, 'Unwelcome Allies', *The Schoolmaster*, 22 August 1940, no page number.
40 JR Brooks, 'The Council for Educational Advance During the Chairmanship of RH Tawney 1942-49', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 9, 22, 1977, p42.
41 NALT, *Reconstruction of Education*, typescript, 1941, NALT papers, London Metropolitan Archives, NLT/06/12/003.
42 CPGB, *Britain's Schools*, pp26-27.
43 Ted Bramley, *Communism and the Schools*, London: CPGB, 1943.
44 See *Educational Reconstruction*, London, Board of Education, 1943; and Report of the Committee of the Secondary School Examinations Council, *Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools*, the Norwood Report, London: HM Stationery Office, 1943.
45 Brian Simon, *Education and the Social Order 1940-1990*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1991, p104.
46 'Middlesex Honours GCT Giles', *The Schoolmaster*, 5 April 1945, p.225.
47 NEAC, *The Multilateral (or Common) School: A Memorandum issued by the Education Advisory Committee of the Communist Party, October, 1944*, London: CPGB, 1944.
48 Rubinstein and Simon, *The Evolution of the Comprehensive School*, p16.
49 'Multilateral or Common', *Modern Education*, 1, 1, July 1946, p. 5. This distinction is pressed further in NALT, *The Comprehensive School*, London: NALT, 1948.
50 Olive Banks, *Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education: A Study in Educational Sociology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955, p134.
51 Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions', p399; and Beatrix Tudor-Hart, 'British Teachers and Moscow', *Education Today and Tomorrow*, 9, 2, November-December 1956, p13.
52 Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1941-1951*, p83.
53 GCT Giles, *The New School Tie*, London: Pilot Press, 1946, pp63-67.
54 Harry Pollitt, *Answers to Questions*, London: Central Books, 1945, p37.
55 Brian Simon, *A Life in Education*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1998, p54.

56 'The Content of Education', typescript, January 1947, Simon papers, DC/SIM/4/6/39.
57 *Ibid*., pp6-9.
58 Jones, *Beyond Progressive Education*, pp108-110.
59 Harry Pollitt, *Looking Ahead*, London: CPGB, 1947, p104.
60 Francis Beckett, *Enemy Within: The Rise and Fall of the British Communist Party*, Suffolk: Merlin Press, 1998 p116.
61 Harry Pollitt, cited in Willie Thompson, *The Good Old Cause: British Communism, 1920-1991,* London: Pluto Press, 1992, p79.
62 See Joan Simon 'Educational Theory and Practice' and K.D. Sotiriou, 'The New Humanism in Education', abridged and translated version of a speech delivered to the Greco-Soviet League of Youth, with a foreword by GCT Giles, *The Modern Quarterly*, 3, 4, Autumn 1948, pp35-61; and Joan Simon, 'Educational Policies and Programmes, *The Modern Quarterly*, 4, 2, Spring 1949, pp154-168.
63 Joan Simon, 'Educational Theory and Practice', p38.
64 *Ibid*., p42.
65 See Fred Clarke, *Education and Social Change*, London: The Sheldon Press, 1940.
66 Joan Simon, 'Educational Theory and Practice', p40.
67 *Ibid*., pp44-45.
68 *Ibid*., pp47-48.
69 Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1941-1951*, p113.
70 For a detailed and excellent discussion of this see Parsons' work on the CPGB Psychologists' Group in 'Communism and the Professions', pp394-401.
71 See, for example, 'Thoughts on Selection for Secondary Education', *The Educational Bulletin*, 1, 4, March-April 1949, pp4-5; and Joan Simon, 'Mental Development in Children', *The Educational Bulletin*, 3, 1, Oct 1950, p8 and p12.
72 See a report of the conference in 'IQs Under Fire', *The Educational Bulletin*, 3, 2, January 1951, p12.
73 Simon, *A Life in Education*, pp56-59.
74 See Brian Simon, *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1953.

75 *Times Educational Supplement*, 15 January 1954, cited in Simon, *A Life in Education*, p. 76.
76 Deborah Thom, 'Politics and the People: Brian Simon and the Campaign Against Intelligence Testing in British Schools', *History of Education*, 33, 5, September 2004, p. 525.
77 Leslie Hearnshaw, *Cyril Burt Psychologist*, London: Hodder and Arnold, 1979, p. 241.
78 Brian Simon, *The Common Secondary School*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955, pp64-70; and 79-90.
79 John Callaghan and Ben Harker (eds.), *British Communism: A Documentary History*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011, p166. For an excellent collection of edited primary documents on the CPGB's 'cultural front' at this time, see pp168-183.
80 Emile Burns, 'Why Not a New Outlook?', *The Educational Bulletin*, 3, 4, May-June 1951, p. 7.
81 This claim was made by GCT Giles at the Party's 21st Congress, see '2000 Communist School Teachers', *The Times*, 29 November 1949.
82 Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions', p473.
83 Membership fell from 45,435 in 1945 to 38,853 in 1950, see Thompson, *Good Old Cause*, p218.
84 Branson, *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain 1941-1951*, p171.
85 'The Cultural Work of the Party: Resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, January 1952', *World News and Views*, 32, 5, 2 February 1952, p56.
86 Jack Woddis, 'Battle of Ideas: Another American Export for Britain', *World News and Views*, 28, 22, 5 June 1948, p235.
87 Callaghan and Harker (eds), *British Communism*, p. 167; Henry Pelling, *The British Communist Party: An Historical Profile*, London: A&C Black, 1958, pp164-167; Gary Werskey, *The Visible College*, London: Allen Lane, 1978, pp298-304; Andy Croft, 'The Boys Round the Corner: The Story of Fore Publications', in Croft (ed.), *A Weapon in the Struggle*, pp142-162; and Andy Croft, 'Authors Take Sides: Writers and the Communist Party, 1920-56', in Andrews, Fishman and Morgan (eds.), *Opening the Books*, pp97-100.
88 Alexander Karp, ''We Were in a Very Difficult Situation': Anti-Semitism in Soviet Education During the 1950s', *East European Jewish Affairs*, 40, 1, 2010, p2.

89 Daphne May, 'Soviet Ten-Year Schools', *The Educational Bulletin*, 3, 2, January 1951, p8.
90 Chris Hayes, 'Raising the Standards', *Education Today*, 7, 1, September -October 1954, p10.
91 Max Morris, *Your Children's Future*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1953, p84 and p91.
92 Max Morris, 'Education – the Problem Today', *World News and Views*, 28, 27, 10 July 1948, p292.
93 For a detailed account of this, see my 'British Communism and the Politics of Education 1926-1968', pp164-170.
94 Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions', p500.
95 Geoffrey Partington, *Party Days*, Xlibris, 2015, p158.
96 'Discussion – Education for What and How?', *The Educational Bulletin*, 1, 1, November 1948, p7.
97 'Discussion – The Content of Education', *The Educational Bulletin*, 1, 2, January 1949, p12 and p11.
98 Sam Fisher, 'Correspondence and Controversy – Activity Methods', *The Educational Bulletin*, 4, 4, April-May 1952, p9.
99 S. Sellars, 'Social Studies', *The Educational Bulletin*, 4, 4, January-February 1952, p8.
100 'B.P.', 'Visual Education or Visual Aids', *The Educational Bulletin*, 1, 4, June-July 1949, p12.
101 'P.G.M.', 'Children and the Battle of Ideas', *World News and Views* 29, 46, 12 November 1949, p552.
102 Martin Baxter, *A Haunt of Fears: The Strange History of the British Horror Comics Campaign*, University Press of Mississippi, 1992, pp11-12.
103 See, for example, contributions to *The Educational Bulletin* 'Correspondence and Controversy' section, by J. Miles and A. Rosen, 3, 4, May-June 1951, p11.; and E. Scott, 4, 4, April-May 1952), p9.
104 See Brian Simon, 'Activity Methods', *The Educational Bulletin*, 3, 3, March-April 1951, p12.
105 Parsons, 'Communism in the Professions', p496.
106 Eric Porter, cited in *ibid*., p496.
107 Simon, *A Life in Education*, p61.
108 'Ideological Struggle in Education', memorandum from Brian Simon to the NEAC, June 1951, Simon papers, DC/SIM/4/6/36.

109 Thom, 'Politics and the People' p. 525.

110 See minutes of meetings of the CPGB executive committee, November-December 1956, CPGB archive, People's History Museum, Manchester, CP/CENT/EC/04/01-03.

111 CPGB, *25th Congress Report*, London: CPGB, 1957, p76.

112 The percentage of engineering delegates, for example, went down from 25 per cent to 18 per cent, and building from 10 to 7 per cent. The only other occupational groups to increase their proportion were professional and technical (from 2 per cent to 5 per cent) and distribution (from 2 per cent to 3 per cent). As well as highlighting that teachers represented the largest growth of any occupational group in the wake of 1956, these figures also complicate the widespread notion that the 1956 membership flight was a largely middle-class one. See the table 'Occupational and Industrial Composition of National Congress Delegates, 1944-63' in Newton, *The Sociology of British Communism*, pp. 162-163.

113 Beatrix Tudor-Hart, 'Are We Subservient to Moscow?', *Education Today and Tomorrow*, 8, 6, 1956, p5.

114 Peter Mauger, 'British Teachers and Moscow', *Educational Today and Tomorrow*, 9, 2, 1956, p13.

115 G.C.T. Giles, 'The Party Congress: an Impression', *Education Today and Tomorrow*, 9, 5, 1957, p1.

116 Brian Simon, 'British Teachers and Moscow', *Education Today and Tomorrow*, 9, 3, 1957, p3.

117 See the Brian Simon edited *New Trends in English Education*, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1957, which contains many chapters written by communist schoolteachers.

118 See the substantial folders of correspondence on the issue in the CPGB archive, CP/IND/IND/13/02 and CP/CENT/IND/MATH/07/03; and my 'British Communism and the Politics of Education', pp197-201.

119 See Phil Cohen 'Introduction', in Phil Cohen (ed.), *Children of the Revolution: Communist Childhood in Cold War Britain*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1997, p. 17; and Mike Waite, 'Sex 'n' Drugs 'n' Rock 'n' Roll (and Communism) in the 1960s', in Andrews, Fishman and Morgan (eds.), *Opening the Books*, p219; and Andrews, *End Games and New Times*, pp96-97.