

A.S. Neill and Scotland: attitudes, omissions and influences

WALTER HUMES,

University of Stirling

ABSTRACT

Alexander Sutherland Neill (1883- 1973) is well-known as the leading figure in the 20th century movement for progressive, child-centred education, a movement which attracted both supporters and critics. The independent school which he founded, Summerhill, was located first in Lyme Regis, Dorset and later in Leiston, Suffolk, both in England, but many of Neill's ideas need to be understood as a reaction against his experiences as a pupil and young teacher in Scotland. This paper examines his attitude to Scotland and Scottish education, drawing on his own writings, including his autobiography, the work of Jonathan Croall, Neill's biographer and editor of a collection of his letters, and the testimony of Scottish educators whose work was influenced by Neill. Detailed examination is given to Neill's 1936 book, *Is Scotland Educated?*, which has received limited attention from commentators. This volume is particularly interesting in relation to Neill's political, cultural and psychological perspectives on Scottish life and their relevance to his educational views. The book reveals the strength of his (mainly negative) feelings about his native land but also his limited awareness of some important developments that were taking place, especially in the field of child guidance. In addition, the paper explores Neill's links to other Scottish progressive educators, most notably John Aitkenhead and R. F. Mackenzie, both of whom sought to introduce qualified versions of Neill's philosophy into schools in Scotland. It is argued that it is not necessary to subscribe to every aspect of Neill's approach to education to appreciate his value as a source of an alternative narrative to official accounts of the Scottish educational tradition.

INTRODUCTION

In accounts of progressive, child-centred education in the twentieth century, the name A. S. Neill features consistently (see Stewart, 1968; Entwistle, 1970; Lawson and Petersen, 1972; Smith, 1983; Darling, 1994). His work at Summerhill, the independent school he founded, is regarded as providing a striking alternative to the pedagogic approach adopted in most state schools. In particular, his belief in freedom and democratic self-government presented a strong challenge to conventional assumptions about the need for authority and discipline in schooling

(Hopkins, 1976). Even those hostile to his ideas and practices, have to acknowledge that his thinking, set out in a series of widely-read books, was highly influential. For example, a recent, strongly critical study of child-centred education in Britain identified Neill as 'the leading prophet of Britain's progressive education movement' (Peel, 2014, p. 15), characterised by a blend of romanticism and a radical view of child psychology influenced by Sigmund Freud (see also Bantock, 1952; Barrow, 1978). More comprehensive accounts can be found in two informative full-length studies, one published in the 1970s, the other much more recently (Hemmings, 1972; Bailey, 2013).

The aim of this paper is not to revisit the many controversies which have surrounded Neill and Summerhill but to focus specifically on his Scottish heritage and the extent to which early influences helped to shape his subsequent career. Neill did not travel beyond Scotland until the age of twenty-nine (Neill, 1973, p. 89). It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the experiences of childhood and young adulthood played a significant part in shaping his outlook, whether positive or negative, towards his native country. The paper will also consider how his subsequent travels in England and Europe enabled him to encounter different ideas, values and attitudes which contributed to the formulation of his own educational philosophy. It will note gaps in his knowledge of important developments that were taking place in Scotland, particularly attempts to address the psychological problems which some children encountered. Despite this, Neill's reputation continued to grow: other Scots were influenced by his thinking and sought to implement aspects of his libertarian thinking back in his native land. Thus the precise nature of Neill's Scottishness is a topic worthy of investigation.

SOURCES

There is no shortage of material on Neill. He himself published numerous books and articles explaining his thinking over a period of some 60 years, including his autobiography, *Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!* (1973). This was written in two parts, the first in 1939, consisting of an account of his boyhood and career up to that point: the second part was written in 1972 and contains Neill's reflections on his own character, as revealed through his thoughts on a wide range of topics. The two parts were first published in the United States in 1972 and in the UK (in a revised form) in 1973. There is a detailed biography of Neill by Jonathan Croall, as well as a useful selection of Neill's letters, edited by Croall. In addition, there is a substantial body of secondary sources which include audio and film material, as well as academic and journalistic articles. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to cite everything that has been written by and about Neill. The principle of selection that has been employed is relevance to the particular focus of this study – namely, Neill's attitude to Scotland and Scottish education. Special attention is given to Neill's book, *Is Scotland Educated?*, written in 1935 and published the following year (Neill, 1936). Careful analysis of this text suggests lines of enquiry that allow for a deeper understanding of Neill's somewhat ambivalent attitude towards his own country.

EARLY LIFE AND CAREER

. . . our first years determine our lives, and no matter where a Scot goes and no matter how long he lives there is in him a deep emotion that is fixed on the home of his infancy. (Neill, 1936, p. 135)

Given the substantial literature on Neill that is readily available, a brief biographical sketch is all that is required here (a useful chronology of Neill and Summerhill is given as an appendix in Bailey, 2013, pp. 187-190). He was born in Forfar, Angus in 1883, the son of George Neill, the schoolmaster (or 'dominie') of Kingsmuir school which was situated about two miles outside the town. Neill's mother, Mary, had also trained as a teacher before her marriage. He felt that his father did not care for him and treated him harshly, while his mother was socially aspiring and over-concerned with respectability. As a child, Neill was known as Allie and, compared with his brothers and sisters, did not do well at school. In his autobiography he observes: 'I was obviously the inferior article, the misfit in a tradition of academic success, and automatically I accepted an inferior status' (Neill, 1973, p. 13). It was decided that there was no point in sending him to secondary school at Forfar Academy and so at the age of 14 he entered employment, first as a clerk in Edinburgh and then as a draper's assistant in Forfar. Both employments were short-lived and unfulfilling and, despite his lack of academic success, he became a pupil-teacher at his father's school (1898-1903), then an assistant master at Kingskettle school, Fife (1903-06) and Newport Public School, also in Fife (1906-08). He entered Edinburgh University in 1908 as a relatively mature student but gained greater enjoyment and satisfaction from his involvement in student journalism, including a year as editor of the university magazine, *The Student*, than from his formal studies. He came to regard Edinburgh as 'a dead city, parochial and pompous' (Neill, 1973, p. 88). After graduating in 1912, he hoped to have a career in journalism and for a time worked in publishing, first in Edinburgh and then for an art magazine in London. As noted above, he was nearly 30 before he crossed the border and encountered attitudes and values that gave a different perspective to his own narrow upbringing. It took Neill a long time to overcome his sense of failure in childhood, assert his independence and make his own way in the world. It would, however, be simplistic to suggest that his educational outlook can be explained purely as a reaction against his early experiences. As will be seen, other, more positive, influences came into play.

The First World War brought his journalistic career to an abrupt end. Initially rejected for military service because of a leg infection, he had to find work and was appointed temporary headmaster of Gretna Public School. It was during this period that he wrote the first of his 'Dominie' books 'A Dominie's Log' (Neill, 1986: first published 1916), which marked the beginning of a substantial output of educational writings. Four other 'Dominie' books followed (Neill, 1917; 1920; 1923; 1924). During his time at Gretna, Neill's thinking was loosely formulated and largely experiential: later it was to be influenced by philosophical and psychological writing. Towards the end of the war he was called up and this time given a commission. However, much to his relief, he never saw active service and, when health problems recurred, he was discharged on medical grounds. While

undergoing his military training in Wiltshire, however, Neill had the opportunity to visit The Little Commonwealth, an establishment for young delinquents run on progressive lines. It was led by a charismatic American, Homer Lane (1875-1925), who came to Britain in 1912 after similar work in the USA (Wills, 1964). Lane introduced Neill to psychoanalytic thinking and the two remained in contact in London after The Little Commonwealth was forced to close following a scandal. In his autobiography, Neill pays this tribute to Lane: 'What he said about freedom was the gospel I had been looking for; a scientific foundation for the vague yearnings shown forth in my Dominie's log' (Neill, 1973, p. 112). Henceforth, Neill employed psychoanalytic terminology in much of his own writing, particularly in explaining the problems presented by children: for example, in *Summerhill* the following terms all appear – unconscious, neurosis, repression, egoism, trauma, wish-fulfilment, psychic damage, transference, regression, fantasies (Neill, 1968, *passim*: see also Phillips, 1977).

He taught at a progressive school, King Alfred's in Hampstead, from 1918 to 1920, but his approach was too radical for most of the staff and he was asked to leave. He then co-edited a progressive journal *Education for the New Era* (later *New Era in Home and School*) with Beatrice Ensor (1885-1974), founder of the New Education Fellowship (Boyd and Rawson, 1965; Lawson, 1981; Brehony, 2004). Again his approach was too revolutionary and he offended high-minded idealists within the Fellowship who saw themselves as helping to create a better world but who stopped well short of Neill's vision of a new approach to education. The first principle of the New Education Fellowship – 'to train the child to desire the supremacy of spirit over matter' (cited in Hemmings, 1972, p. 98) was far too ethereal and other-worldly for Neill's taste. However, before he parted company with Mrs Ensor, he had the opportunity to visit progressive schools in Europe: he made contact with kindred spirits in Germany and Austria from 1921 to 1924, establishing an international school first at Hellerau near Dresden and then at Sonntagberg in the mountains of lower Austria. His European experience also brought him into direct contact with the psychoanalytic ideas introduced by Lane and he had an opportunity to engage with progressive thinkers in the arts, literature and philosophy. Throughout his life, Neill had a capacity to make productive contacts with a wide range of people: the glossary of names at the end of his autobiography (Neill, 1973, pp. 245-256) gives an indication of his skills as a networker.

Neill's best-known book is *Summerhill*. It was first published in 1962 but is actually a compilation of extracts from four earlier books (Neill, 1926; 1932; 1937; 1953). Timing was an important factor in the huge popularity of *Summerhill*. The 1960s are often seen as a period of revolution, with significant changes in popular culture, social attitudes and political expression. Neill's philosophy of freedom had a receptive audience among the young and, although his message was too radical to have an immediate impact on mainstream educational practice, it appealed to many teachers entering the profession and contributed to what came to be known as the progressive movement. The issues were, however, strongly contested and provoked a counter-movement by traditionalists, most evident in the publication of a series of Black Papers in the late 1960s and 1970s (Cox and Dyson, 1969).

Neill's approach to education can be summed up in a few fundamental principles:

- Human nature is basically good
- Children are innately wise and, given freedom, will develop in creative and positive ways
- Freedom is not to be confused with licence: it is more accurately defined as 'self-regulation'
- Religious and moral education have negative effects, causing fear and psychological damage
- Attendance at classes should be optional: interest rather than compulsion should be the stimulus to learning
- Any school rules should be decided by a system of democratic self-government, with children themselves deciding on suitable penalties for those who transgress
- Book learning and formal knowledge are less important than character and self-determination
- An understanding of child psychology is an essential requirement for teachers

These principles had been tried and tested at Summerhill in the decade preceding the writing of *Is Scotland Educated?* They can thus serve as a reference point for the criticisms which Neill advanced about the state of education in his native country in the mid-1930s.

IS SCOTLAND EDUCATED?

It should be acknowledged that *Is Scotland Educated?* cannot be regarded as one of Neill's best books, as he himself conceded a few years later. Writing to a correspondent in 1942, he said that he considered it 'a poor book, full of padding to hide my gross ignorance of Scotland today, or rather 1935'. However, he hoped that the reader would find a 'few wee diamonds in the mass of blue clay' (Croall, 1983, p. 136). Part of the explanation for the variable quality of the text may be the hasty circumstances in which it was commissioned and written. The Scottish novelist, Lewis Grassie Gibbon (Leslie Mitchell), author of *A Scots Quair*, and the controversial Scottish poet, Hugh MacDiarmid (Christopher Grieve) had collaborated on a volume of essays and short stories entitled *Scottish Scene* in 1934 (Gibbon and MacDiarmid, 1934). Subsequently Grassie Gibbon was asked by the publisher George Routledge to act as general editor of a series of volumes under the title 'The Voice of Scotland'. Contributors to the series included the well-known Scottish writers Compton Mackenzie, Eric Linklater, Neil Gunn and Edwin Muir. According to Croall, Neill was recommended by MacDiarmid, who knew and admired his work (Croall, 1984, p. 227). Grassie Gibbon died in 1935 which may have meant that Neill's book was not subject to much in the way of editorial scrutiny.

Whatever the explanation, the unevenness of the text – evident in its preference for pawky humour and provocative generalisations over well-researched evidence and sustained analysis – does not mean that it lacks value in terms of gaining insight into what Neill thought and felt about Scotland at the time of composition. Indeed, its frank and controversial tone, and the absence of careful qualification of the kind found in more academic writing, means that the reader gains direct access to the emotional roots of Neill's feelings about Scottish education. Moreover, as

will become apparent, this particular text prompts questions that lead to other sources in the Neill *oeuvre*.

A flavour of Neill's attitude to Scottish education at the time of writing *Is Scotland Educated?* can be given by the following quotations:

The sad truth is that Scots education is of no value whatsoever so far as anything that matters in life is concerned. (Neill, 1936, p. 17)

'If education is learning then Scotland is educated, but if education is creation then Scotland is uneducated. And if education means culture Scotland is barbaric. (ibid, p. 11)

My work is education . . . and I cannot work in Scotland because Scotland has little interest in education. (ibid, p. 13)

The Scots dominie is a dull devil, fearful of compromising his little respectability, alarmed at anything that might detract from his petty dignity. (ibid, pp 87-88)

Holding these views, it is not surprising that Neill has relatively little to say about the topics that feature prominently in more conventional approaches to schooling – curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. He doubts the educative value of most school subjects: 'the only things necessary are reading, writing and counting numbers. The rest is ballyhoo.' (ibid, p.22) Likewise, teaching methods cease to matter if pupil interest is to be the driving force in the work of the school: in *Summerhill* Neill states 'We have no new methods of teaching, because we do not consider that teaching in itself matters very much' (Neill, 1968, p. 20). As for assessment, Neill is consistently critical of examinations: 'All prize-giving and marks and exams sidetrack proper personality development' (ibid, p. 38).

Of greater interest than Neill's assertions about Scottish education, which are more fully developed in his other books, are his comments on Scottish politics and culture and, especially, on the importance of psychology, as discussed below.

Politics

As a student at Edinburgh University, Neill had been impressed by writers such as H. G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw, both of whom were early supporters of the Fabian Society. Hemmings describes his early political stance as 'a kind of compassionate and utopian socialism' (Hemmings, 1972, p. 13). During his time in London before the outbreak of the First World War, Neill joined the Labour Party (Neill, 1973, p. 75). In his autobiography, however, he admits that his understanding of political issues was poor: 'My ignorance of politics and economics was profound' (ibid, p. 76). His subsequent political journey might best be described as one of disillusionment.

The political views found in *Is Scotland Educated?* range from the naïve to the prescient. In common with many left-oriented writers of the 1930s, Neill expresses admiration for developments in Russia, unaware of the horrors perpetrated by Stalin. A simplistic socialism is contrasted with the oppression of capitalism. Education's function within this context is explained in these terms:

Scotland is a capitalist country, and its educational system must be one that favours the continuance of the present economic system. My views on Scottish education,

therefore, will be coloured by my views of the system of which it is a part. (Neill, 1936, p. 10)

Scottish education is a bulwark of entrenched capitalism, and instead of being proud of it we should raise our voices against its subservience and reaction. (ibid, p. 35)

Our schools are conditioned and regulated by the State. The state is a capitalist, imperialist State, apparently ruled by a sham democracy, but in reality ruled by the minority who hold the wealth and power. (ibid, p. 21)

Neill acknowledges that Scottish education may appear to be relatively classless, compared with the English system, and he has some positive things to say about rural schools, in which youngsters of varied social backgrounds are taught together. However, he deplores both the narrow educational diet that is offered, which he regards as largely irrelevant to the lives the pupils will subsequently lead, and the way in which bright working-class children are assimilated into the prevailing political order:

Capitalism very cleverly selects the brighter children of the proletariat, sends them to secondary schools and then to the university, thus taking them away from the class to which they belong and for which they might conceivably fight, and turning them into castrated black-coated servants of capitalism. (ibid, p. 34)

Holding these views, Neill might be expected to be in favour of Scotland becoming an independent socialist republic, not least because of his links with some of the leading figures in the Scottish literary renaissance. However, he says unequivocally, 'A Nationalist Scotland I do not want to see and a Soviet Scotland I know I am most unlikely to see' (ibid, p. 172). He is pessimistic about the possibilities:

If a country has no Home Rule you may be sure it does not want Home Rule. Not that Home Rule would make a scrap of difference to Scotland; the rulers (finance, monopoly capital, vested interests, etc.) would simply make Edinburgh their headquarters instead of Westminster. (ibid, p. 16)

The prescient part of Neill's analysis comes near the end of the book when he shows awareness of the increasingly inter-dependent nature of the modern world, a world in which small nations have limited capacity to shape their future: 'We can only see Scotland as a part, and a very small part, of world civilization' (ibid, pp. 187-8). He offers the advice, 'let us cease to be national and begin to think internationally' (ibid, p. 188). No doubt Neill's own early experience travelling and working in Europe encouraged this breadth of outlook. His comments could be seen as an anticipation of globalisation.

Neill gradually became deeply pessimistic with the possibilities of political change of the kind he wished. In a letter to the Scottish academic, James Young, in 1972 he wrote: 'I lost interest in politics years ago, partly cos [sic] of the enforced insincerity . . . And I also think I lost interest when early communism, with its school and sex freedom, ended in the present police state' (Croall, 1983, p. 133). Young later published a study of Scottish reformers, provocatively entitled *The Very Bastards of Creation*, which included a chapter on Neill and R. F. Mackenzie, who together represented 'our real radical educational history' (Young, 1996, p. 261).

Culture

Neill's position on Scottish culture is characterised by strong opinions – perhaps more accurately described as prejudices – unsupported by much in the way of evidence. He devotes a chapter to 'The Kirk and Education' and asserts: 'The history of the Scots kirk has been one of the ugliest stories in history . . . It had neither love nor charity: it was a hate institution.' (Neill, 1936, p. 49). The influence of John Knox, whose 1560 *Book of Discipline* was a key document in asserting the importance of education in post-Reformation Scotland, is seen as pernicious:

It is impossible to have a free healthy education in a land that is kirk-ridden. Calvinism and Roman Catholicism have this in common, that they insist on interfering in education, and in both cases the interference is soul-destroying. (ibid, p. 57)

Neill contrasts the 'lovable, loving Jesus' with the 'emptiness of spirit' of the Scots kirk (ibid: p.50). He also blames the church for a repressive attitude towards sex: 'In Scotland, where Puritanism was extreme, sex became a vile thing' (ibid, p. 70). He detects sadism in the use of corporal punishment in schools and links it to religious prohibitions on various forms of emotional expression, including the display of sexual feelings. He also suggests there is a connection between 'the complete absence of emotion from the curriculum' (ibid, p. 75) and the lack of emotional honesty in bourgeois morality.

For Neill, the dead hand of the kirk is responsible for what he sees as the lack of creativity in Scotland. He draws a contrast between 'creation' and 'possession' (ibid, p. 36). 'Creation is life itself, movement, love, joy, happiness' (ibid, p. 36). Possession, on the other hand, 'seeks ever to be safe and static: its ultimate goal is the security of death' (ibid, p. 36). He asserts: 'Scotland is not a creative country' (ibid, p. 38), citing the disproportionate value attached to formal academic qualifications, which he regards as worthless. He even makes the sweeping judgement that Scotland lacks great literature and art, a view that may not have been appreciated by some of his literary associates. The one Scottish novel that gets a favourable mention is George Douglas Brown's *The House with the Green Shutters* (published under the name George Douglas in 1901). In a letter to the American novelist Henry Miller, Neill later said: 'It is the only Scottish novel I consider of any merit' (Croall, 1983, p. 121). The appeal of the novel to Neill is not hard to understand. It is set in an oppressive small town, Barbie, in which the inhabitants take a perverse delight in commenting adversely on their neighbours. The central character, John Gourlay, is a strong-willed, self-made man who treats his family and neighbours with arrogance and contempt. The story has something of the quality of Greek tragedy, ending in death and suicide. Towards the end, Gourlay's wife reads from chapter 13 of the First Letter to the Corinthians, in a passage which concludes, 'And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity' (Douglas, 1961, p. 284). The lack of charity in this small Scottish town, its small-mindedness and hostility to new ideas and the destructive force of an oppressive personality must have resonated with Neill's early experience in Kingsmuir and Forfar.

The depth of Neill's feelings on the 'mean and narrow and wretched . . . soul of Scotland' (ibid: p. 41) is evident in the following passage:

Scotland hugs death to its heart because Scottish life seeks death. Calvinism was death, for it was the negation of joy. Calvinism was accepted by Scotland because it fitted into the psychology of the Scot, the death-seeking psychology. (ibid, p. 43)

Images of death recur throughout *Is Scotland Educated?* They refer both to the lifeless, passive attitude of individual Scots and to the collective attitude of the nation as a whole. On Neill's account, schooling and religion are the main agencies which promote and sustain this outlook.

There is one other, rather surprising, aspect of Neill's attitude to the culture of Scotland. It concerns the Scots language. His earliest writings – the Dominie books – make extensive use of Scottish dialect, vocabulary and idiom. The dominie character (who stands for Neill) is frequently presented in conversation with rural figures (ploughmen, cobblers, road workers) as well as a stock representative of conservative-minded teachers (Macdonald). This allows Neill to introduce elements of pawky humour as well as providing a stylistic contrast to more conventional texts on education. He handles these exchanges with skill, demonstrating familiarity with the everyday language of ordinary Scots. It is rather unexpected, therefore, to find in *Is Scotland Educated?* the statement that 'There is no Scots language . . . the so-called Scotch tongue is English with provincial pronunciation and provincial words' (ibid, p. 160).

Neill's reasons for taking this line are interesting. He says 'To speak dialect all your days is to admit that you live in a small world' (ibid, p. 161) and is keen to dissociate himself from narrow nationalism:

I do not agree with some Scottish Nationalists who deplore the anglicising of northern dialect . . . In spite of the craze for intense nationalism, the future is one of internationalization (ibid, p. 163)

The educational message he wants to convey is aimed at a much wider audience than the people of his native land. Thus, although he might make use of homely Scottish stories for narrative effect, he does not align himself with MacDiarmid and others who wanted to reassert Scottish cultural identity partly through linguistic means.

Despite this, Neill's writing and reputation have been influential in constructing and maintaining a certain version of Scotland's national identity in general and its educational system in particular. In this regard, reference must be made to a sharply critical article by David Limond (1999). The article is mainly concerned with Neill's early Dominie books published between 1916 and 1924, but it develops into a more general critique of Neill's characterisation of Scottish identity and includes reference to *Is Scotland Educated?* Only the first of the Dominie books was based directly on Neill's experience as a young teacher: it refers to his short time as head of Gretna Public School. The others in the series are essentially works of fiction, occasionally interspersed with anecdotes that may have some basis in reality. However, many readers and, argues Limond, even some historians, took them as factual accounts of what was going on in Scotland's schools. Not only that, but Neill did little to disabuse his readers of their true status. Limond puts it bluntly:

The case for the prosecution is that he misled, manipulated and allowed to be misled and manipulated successive generations of readers. Further, that in this process he

permitted himself to be elevated so as to seem to deserve to be taken very seriously indeed when he spoke on the general nature, merits and demerits (far more often the latter than the former) of Scotland's schools. (Limond, 1999, p. 303)

The effect of this, on Limond's account, is that Neill helped to create a climate 'in which Scottish schooling is widely imagined to have long been antithetical to freedom and all that for which educational progressivism stands' (ibid, p. 304).

How does this relate to *Is Scotland Educated?* written some twenty years after the Dominie books? Limond argues that it is still the voice of the Dominie speaking in the later book, uninformed by any recent or relevant experience of Scottish schools:

It is the Dominie who speaks to us through these pages and it is the Dominie's experiences which inform the reader. And this despite the fact that many of the Dominie's experiences are at best attenuated extrapolations from Neill's own life and time and at worst are manipulated and manipulative constructions designed to make predetermined polemical cases. (ibid, p. 309)

At one point in *Is Scotland Educated?* Neill does acknowledge that his account may be somewhat dated and he has a coda to his chapter on rural schools in which he reports a conversation with a Scottish teacher which suggests that some progress has been made. However, Limond does not pull back from his severe judgement of Neill's disqualifications to pronounce on the state of Scottish education: the fact remains that 'he had not set foot in a Scottish school for some twenty years, not taught in any manner of state-financed school for equally long, not been resident in Scotland in that time and not made any formal study of education in any sense at any time' (ibid, p. 309). Neill's writing, he concludes, is driven more by 'a spirit of rhetoric and polemic than out of concern for rigour and precision' (ibid, p. 310).

A full assessment of this serious charge would involve an investigation beyond the scope of this paper. It would include scrutiny of a range of sources: official accounts contained in the annual reports of the Scottish Education Department; teachers' perspectives as reflected in publications by the Educational Institute of Scotland, the main teachers' organisation; pupils' experiences of schooling in the 1930s. Sources for the last of these are thin but some useful starting points can be found in David Northcroft's anthology, *Scots at School* (Northcroft, 2003). Academic studies do not suggest that Scottish schooling at the time *Is Scotland Educated?* appeared were much more enlightened than the picture Neill paints, even if it is acknowledged that his account was not informed by recent evidence. Humes (2000) refers to the period 1918-39 as one of 'Authority without Vision' (Humes, 2000, pp. 91-94). Paterson (2003) notes the pressure in the late 1930s for 'relaxation of what was seen as the excessively rigid form of elementary education' (Paterson, 2003, p. 49). He also notes that calls for democratic reform of post-elementary education led only to a sharply demarcated form of secondary education, separating the 'academic' minority from the 'non-academic' majority. Even after 1945, as McPherson and Raab have shown, resistance within the SED to major reform, led by the Secretary of the Department from 1940 to 1952, and supported by senior members of the inspectorate, remained strong (McPherson and Raab, 1988, chapter 4). As for the vexed question of corporal punishment in

schools – one of Neill's main criticisms of Scottish education – that was not formally abolished until 1982 and then only because a challenge to the practice by parents in Strathclyde region, who took their case successfully to the European Court of Human Rights. What all this suggests is that, although Neill can justly be accused of not being as well informed about what was happening as he might have been, the general thrust of his critique – that Scottish education retained many of its traditional features and was resistant to the kind of progressive reforms he advocated – cannot be entirely dismissed. However, as the next section will show, he is open to criticism in relation to his lack of awareness about Scottish developments in psychology.

Psychology

One chapter of *Is Scotland Educated?* is devoted to 'Psychology in Scotland'. The opening sentences indicate that he thinks the country remains benighted in relation to psychological understanding: 'Modern psychology travels slowly. It took time to travel from Vienna to London, and it will be some time before it reaches Scotland.' (Neill, 1936, p. 138) He explains this in terms of the power of Calvinism, especially its repressive attitude to sex, and the Scot's 'unholy dread of showing any emotion' (ibid, p. 139). Referring to both Freud and Adler, he says that their theories are 'dynamic, emotional' whereas Scotland is 'reason-minded, practical' (ibid, p. 139). He asserts that 'Scotland needs modern psychology badly, both Freudian and Adlerian psychology' (ibid, p. 140). The need is both individual and collective. As well as the complexes from which individuals suffer, there is 'a tremendous guilt complex, a crowd complex' (ibid, p. 140) that afflicts the nation as a whole. In Neill's view, the family is at the centre of both:

The problem of Scotland is not a problem of schools: it is one of family life. It is psychological rather than educational. It is the problem of how Scotland can get rid of its clannish family tradition of camouflage and absence of emotion. (ibid, pp. 146-147)

He describes Scotland as 'an introverted country' and says that when he is there he often experiences 'a vague depressive emotion of being in a land that is stifling' (ibid, p. 158).

All this paints an extremely negative picture of attitudes to psychology in Scotland but there are grounds for thinking that this is one area in which Neill was ill-informed about the situation. In fact, Scotland has some claim to be considered in the vanguard as far as child guidance is concerned (Stewart, 2013). In 1926, on the initiative of Dr William Boyd, Head of the Education Department at Glasgow University, the first Scottish child guidance clinic was established (Boyd, 1955, pp. 174-6: see Note 1). The aim was 'to study and advise on "problem children", boys and girls who because of physical, mental or social handicap found themselves maladjusted to their environment, or mentally unable to take full advantage of their schooling' (Scotland, 1969, p. 90).

Furthermore, Neill's apparent ignorance of this development is all the more surprising for two reasons. Firstly, he had actually met Boyd in the early 1920s and had published a report of a talk given by Boyd on the subject of moral education in *New Era* (Boyd, 1955, p.184). Secondly, early in *Is Scotland Educated?* Neill

makes a highly favourable reference to an article by Boyd in a special Scottish edition of *New Era* published in 1935. Boyd is quoted as saying that, while much good work goes on in Scottish schools, there is a lack of innovation and experiment: Scottish teachers prefer a 'canny' approach to one that might involve some risk (Neill, 1936, pp. 22-24).

While this was probably true of the majority of teachers, it omits the highly innovative work which Boyd himself undertook, not only in relation to child guidance, but also in trying to promote teaching as a research-based profession. As early as 1919, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), the main teachers' organisation, had a Research Committee, chaired by Dr Boyd, which encouraged teachers to take part in the systematic collection of research evidence (Brett *et al*, 2010). The classroom was to be regarded as a laboratory, in which observation, experiment and analysis would be carried out to the benefit of pupils, as well as serving to enhance the professionalism of teachers (Lawn and Deary, 2008). Now while this approach may have been far too organised for Neill's taste – his interest in psychology was always more intuitive than scientific – it is not unreasonable to expect him to have been at least aware of what was going on. Here, as elsewhere, his fondness for provocative generalisation led him to make statements that were far too sweeping and failed to take proper account of relevant evidence about what was happening in Scotland.

Boyd is not the only person who deserves a mention in any account of the development of child guidance services in Scotland. Hilda Gertrude Marley (Sister Marie Hilda) had a pivotal role in the creation of the Notre Dame Child Guidance Clinic in Glasgow in 1931, serving as its founding Director and remaining closely involved in its work until her death in 1951 (Stewart, 2006). Her pioneering work was well-known in both London and the United States and she steered a skilful course in reconciling traditional Catholic teaching with the insights to be gained from psychological understandings of children who presented problems of various kinds. The aim of the clinic was the 'study and treatment of children who, though given average home and school conditions, remain an enigma to parents, and by their undisciplined behaviour form one of the chief difficulties of the classroom' (ibid, p. 61). Diverse approaches were to be employed: the child was to be studied 'from all angles, the physical, emotional, intellectual and environmental' (ibid, p. 61). Given that Neill had a particular interest in working with 'problem' children, and a successful track record in helping them to recover from damaging experiences, it might be expected that he would have shown an interest in the establishment of the Notre Dame Clinic just a few years before he wrote *Is Scotland Educated?* However, if he was aware of its existence, it may be that its Catholic ethos would have been sufficient to repel him: his hostility to all forms of religion increased over the years. A contemporary account of the work of the clinic can be found in Dickson (1938). Its approach was essentially medical in orientation whereas the clinic started by Boyd placed education at the centre (Stewart, 2010).

By the late 1930s child guidance, though a contested field, was quite well established in Scotland, particularly in Glasgow, with the city setting up its own service in addition to the voluntary provision of Boyd's clinic and Notre Dame. Indeed, compared to England, educational psychology in Scotland was in a

relatively strong position (Stewart, 2013, pp. 49-50) with good links to teacher training and the provision of in-service courses for teachers who wished to gain specialist qualifications.

Despite the gaps in knowledge evident in *Is Scotland Educated?* Neill's ideas continued to appeal to teachers and parents who were dissatisfied with the formality and discipline of traditional schooling. Summerhill attracted many visitors and he was in great demand as a speaker. The Second World War necessitated a five-year evacuation of the school to North Wales – for Neill not a happy experience, reminding him of the narrowness of his Scottish upbringing (Neill, 1973, pp. 123-124) – but the appeal of freedom continued to gain adherents. These included other Scots who sought to implement qualified versions of the Summerhill philosophy within Scotland. The next section looks at Neill's influence on these followers.

NEILL'S LINKS WITH OTHER SCOTTISH EDUCATORS

John Aitkenhead (1910-1998), a secondary teacher in Ayrshire, had read *Is Scotland Educated?* and visited Summerhill in 1937, and again in 1938 (Croall, 1984, p. 291). He was impressed by what he saw: 'To say that it was exciting was an understatement: I was bowled over' (ibid, p. 291). He was inspired to start his own school, Kilquhanity House, near Castle Douglas in south-west Scotland, despite Neill's view that 'Scotland was too benighted to support a free school' (as reported by Aitkenhead in Lawson, 1990, p. 16). Although independent, like Summerhill, it took a proportion of challenging pupils paid for by the local authority – children who had encountered difficulties in the mainstream system. Kilquhanity offered a version of Neill's philosophy of freedom, with some modifications over the years. Younger children were encouraged to attend classes while older pupils entered into an informal contract to join in particular activities. Lessons, even in traditional subjects, were very different from those in conventional schools and stimulated creative engagement by the pupils. Reviewing the achievements of Kilquhanity 50 years after its founding, one commentator stated: 'The main characteristics of the school were that it had no authoritarianism, no militarism, no religion, no prefects or hierarchy, and no corporal punishment' (Lawson, 1990, p. 16). The importance of practical work (painting, music, theatre, woodwork and crafts) and life outside the classroom was emphasised: a small farm attached to the school offered scope for various forms of 'non-academic' learning.

Aitkenhead and Neill exchanged letters over many years, sharing problems (especially regarding the appointment of suitable staff), discussing difficult pupils and parents, and encouraging each other, particularly in the face of bureaucratic constraints on the way independent schools could operate. For example, the requirements of government inspection programmes prompted Neill to write to Aitkenhead in 1959: 'The whole world is moving away from freedom and the bleak future looks like Orwellism (Croall, 1983, p. 63).

One difficulty facing researchers is that Aitkenhead himself published very little about his ideas and practices at Kilquhanity. Apart from a book chapter describing Kilquhanity (Aitkenhead, 1962) and a short magazine article (Aitkenhead, 1986) there is little to go on. However, a biography is currently in preparation by Andrew Pyle who has had access to Aitkenhead's personal papers and correspondence

(see Note 2). When published, this should add greatly to knowledge about Aitkenhead's work and to the network of progressive educators within and beyond Scotland. Of particular interest might be the link with William Boyd. Aitkenhead studied for a postgraduate degree in education at Glasgow University and stated that Boyd was an important influence on his thinking (Lawson, 1990, p. 16).

R. F. Mackenzie (1910-87) was also inspired by Neill, despite having applied unsuccessfully for a job at Summerhill. He had worked at the experimental Forest School in Hampshire between 1934 and 1936 and had travelled extensively in Europe, witnessing developments in Germany at first hand. Unlike Aitkenhead and Neill, he was not a pacifist and served as an RAF navigator in Bomber Command. After the war he worked in state schools in Scotland, becoming head teacher of Braehead Junior Secondary School in Fife in 1957. Junior Secondary Schools were designed for pupils who had failed their 'qualifying' examinations (the Scottish equivalent of the English 11+) at the end of primary school, and offered a limited curriculum up to the (then) leaving age of 15. At Braehead Mackenzie carried out original and innovative work, supported by a committed and open-minded staff. His approach was broadly progressive, with an emphasis on learning outside the classroom, a humane approach to discipline and the encouragement of democratic processes (Murphy, 1998; Humes, 2011). When he moved to the headship of a large comprehensive school in Aberdeen (1968-74) he found it much harder to implement his philosophy and ran into serious opposition from some of his staff and the local authority. He was suspended and eventually dismissed. His educational thinking can be traced in a series of engaging books – *A Question of Living* (1963), *Escape from the Classroom* (1965), *The Sins of the Children* (1967), *State School* (1970) and *The Unbowed Head* (1977).

Mackenzie and Neill kept in touch by letter, sharing ideas and offering supporting comments when the going got rough (Murphy, 1998, p. 134). Neill clearly admired Mackenzie for trying to implement progressive ideas within the state sector: in a letter dated September 1st, 1966, he said, 'guys like you are the heroes who work inside the system with all the handicaps that never touch me' (Croall, 1983, p. 20). In the same letter Neill described himself, Mackenzie, Aitkenhead and Michael Duane (a non-authoritarian head of a comprehensive school in London which was closed following adverse reports by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools - see Berg, 1968) as 'the only rebels in the great scholastic Establishment' (ibid, p. 20). As Mackenzie came under pressure for the course he was trying to pursue in Aberdeen, Neill expressed sadness, concluding that 'Scots education is where I left it over 60 years ago' (Croall, 1983, p. 24). Later, he was driven to declare: "Guys who are a generation ahead of their time can't expect anything else than hatred from the stupid anti-life buggers named the teaching profession' (Croall, 1983, p. 27).

Less well-known than Neill's influence on Aitkenhead and Mackenzie is the impact his ideas had on the headteacher of Craigroyston Community High School in Edinburgh, Hugh D. MacKenzie (no relation to R. F. Mackenzie). Writing in 1985, in the introduction to an edition of *A Dominie's Log*, MacKenzie explained the impact Neill's writing had on his own educational approach:

His books completely altered my view of education – as it has those of so many others, teachers, pupils and parents alike. His emphasis on the importance of play in childhood, the self-pacing of learning (or individualised learning, as it is now called), on democratic assemblies where teacher and pupil meet as equals and, most important, his belief that education should be enjoyable – a heresy to some, not least in his Calvinist Scotland – have sustained me throughout my career. (MacKenzie, in Neill, 1986, p. 1)

When Hugh MacKenzie met Neill in the 1950s, the latter ‘acknowledged the particular difficulties that face a state school teacher who wishes to follow the basic tenets of the progressive movement’ (ibid, p. 3). Mackenzie was perhaps fortunate in encountering an enlightened member of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate, who equated the atmosphere at Craigroyston with that of Aitkenhead’s school, Kilquhanity House: ‘To be given this accolade was the high water-mark of my career, making me glad that I had managed to follow, to some extent, Neill’s pioneering work in large state schools’ (ibid, p. 5).

Mackenzie’s approach at Craigroyston, situated in a disadvantaged part of Edinburgh, was highly innovative in a number of ways, including its enlightened treatment of students (as he insisted they should be called), its responsiveness to the needs of the community, and its development of a curriculum that gave ‘non-academic’ youngsters a sense of real achievement. Throughout the book which documents the challenges he and his staff faced, including a fair amount of bureaucratic resistance, he constantly refers to the ideas of Neill as the inspiration for what he was trying to do. The school received a number of awards for its achievements but, MacKenzie notes with some regret, ‘nobody worked out the importance of the Neillian connection, or even the possible contribution that the Neillian approach could make to Scottish education and to future generations of Scots’ (MacKenzie, 1995, p. 158).

DISCUSSION

Writing in 1967, Neill considered the question, ‘You are a Scot. Why didn’t you start your school in Scotland?’ (Neill, 1967, p. 120). His initial response was to say: ‘Yes, I am one of the rats that left the ship that did not sink. I love my native land . . . but do not want to live there; one has to live where one’s job is’ (ibid, p. 120). He went on to question how receptive Scotland would have been to his ideas, pointing out that very few Summerhill pupils had come from Scotland. He linked this to his argument about emotions, set out thirty years earlier in *Is Scotland Educated?* – ‘the Scots are afraid to have emotions. Thus, since Summerhill is based on emotions, it would not have found a foundation in Scotland’ (ibid, p. 121). He also doubted the extent to which the Scottish educational establishment was open to fresh ideas: ‘Apart from John Aitkenhead’s school at Kilquhanity, how many pioneer schools are there in Scotland?’ (ibid, p. 120).

It is tempting to explain Neill’s approach to education simply as a lifelong protest against the harsh authority of the Scottish school and Presbyterian kirk which restricted his own childhood. That was certainly important and stimulated his desire to liberate others from what he regarded as various forms of physical, emotional and intellectual oppression. But between his early attempts to develop a new approach at Gretna Public School and the reputation that Summerhill had

acquired by the time *Is Scotland Educated?* appeared in 1936, his thinking had been stimulated by a number of important influences: by his contact with Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth; by his reading of Freud, Jung and Adler; by his travels in Germany and Austria and his contact with European intellectuals; by his involvement with the New Education Fellowship, which helped him to define his more radical position compared with the majority of 'progressive' educators of the time; by his practical work with many children, including quite a few who were psychologically disturbed. He also had opportunities to give lectures on education and psychology, including some in Scotland, and to have serious conversations with many teachers and parents who were interested in what he was attempting to do. Thus, while the original motivation, may be regarded as negative, Neill's subsequent experiences enabled him to turn it into something much more positive – a desire to celebrate childhood, to give children the opportunity to develop freely, without the usual battery of prohibitions from adults, in a setting that was very different from conventional schools, which he regarded as factories and prisons.

However, his desire for change did not lead him in the direction of radical political action, which was the response of many who were discontented with the old order during the 1920s and 1930s. As we have seen, Neill acknowledged his own naivety in political matters and lost faith in the capacity of political leaders to bring about the reforms they promised. Likewise, although he remained interested in social and cultural changes, the main focus of his efforts was on the psychology of individual children. For Neill, the principle of freedom took precedence over all ideologies: 'I hold that moulding of the young mind is criminal, whether the moulding is moral or religious or political' (Neill, 1932, p. 132). Thus in the decades that followed the publication of *Is Scotland Educated?* the strongest intellectual influence on his thinking, especially in relation to sexual freedom, came from Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957), undoubtedly the most controversial of the second-generation psychoanalysts: the two men corresponded from 1936 until Reich's death in 1957 (Placzek, 1981). In an echo of Neill's comment on his first encounter with Homer Lane, he said of Reich. 'you are the man I have been searching for for years' (quoted in Croall, 1983, p. 250).

The value of Neill's work was not that it provided a blueprint for the reform of mass state education. Any attempt to apply his ideas in this way, even in modified form, was bound to encounter major political, professional and logistical problems, as the experiences of Michael Duane in London and R. F. Mackenzie in Aberdeen clearly demonstrated. What Neill did succeed in doing was challenging everyone involved in education to think seriously about a number of very fundamental questions: the nature of childhood and child development; the relative rights and responsibilities of children and adults; the emotional, not just the intellectual, dimensions of learning; the extent to which schools can be democratic institutions. Instead of simply adopting the assumptions embodied in traditional practices, teachers were encouraged to go back to first principles and produce justifications for what they believed. In this sense, his work remains highly educative, even if we may conclude that some of his recommendations are naïve, impractical or even dangerous.

What would Neill have made of the current state of Scotland and of Scottish education? Any account is bound to be speculative, but some tentative

conclusions can be drawn. He would certainly have welcomed the move from harsh, authoritarian discipline to a more enlightened approach, with some recognition of children's rights, greater emphasis on the importance of the early, pre-school years and increased understanding of a range of special educational needs. He might have been encouraged by the fact that a small, but significant, minority of parents now choose to educate their children at home rather than submit them to demands of formal schooling (see Lees, 2013), though his belief in the educative value of 'community' would have served to qualify this. At the same time, he would have deplored the stranglehold of educational bureaucracy over the work of teachers, evident in the powers of curriculum and examination bodies and the unquestioning commitment of teachers to 'professionalism' as defined by the General Teaching Council for Scotland. A recurring theme of his writing is his disappointment at the conformity of Scottish teachers, their timid respectability and their easy compliance to the wishes of the inspectorate. He might also point to the absence in the early twenty-first century of any figure comparable to John Aitkenhead or R. F. Mackenzie, suggesting that any potentially dissident voices have been effectively silenced. Limited 'progressivism' has, in effect, been domesticated.

He would have approved of certain social developments, such as a more open and tolerant attitude to sexual behaviour and a reduced respect for various forms of authority. The decline of religious observance he would also have regarded as evidence of a healthy assertion of freedom from institutional control. It is unlikely, however, that he would have been any more optimistic about the capacity of politicians to bring about meaningful change, particularly in an ideological climate which encourages endless consumerism and judges human endeavour principally in economic terms. What is less certain is whether his hostility to nationalism, so forcefully expressed in *Is Scotland Educated?*, would have remained the same. He died just before the Scottish National Party enjoyed an upsurge of support in the 1974 general election and its advances in the years that followed may have caused him to rethink his position. John Aitkenhead, a staunch nationalist, is likely to have encouraged him in this direction. Throughout his writing Neill comes across as someone who is proud of his Scottish identity, despite the necessity of exile in order to pursue his educational ideals. It is not inconceivable that he may have seen the prospect of independence as an opportunity for Scotland to carve out a new future, one which would have allowed for the possibility, though not the certainty, of a cultural climate more in harmony with his beliefs. During 2014 the debate about independence was often portrayed as a conflict between the heart and the head: given the importance Neill attached to the emotions, it is just possible that the appeal of romantic nationalism may have caused him to shift his stance, particularly when it was framed as a preference for hope over fear. And, of course, a significant number of people who voted in favour of independence were not SNP supporters.

LEGACY

It is a commonplace to observe that prophets are rarely honoured in their own land. Although A. S. Neill's name is very well known not only within Scotland but also in Europe, America and the Far East (especially Japan), there has been little

official recognition by the Scottish educational establishment of his importance. During his lifetime he received three honorary degrees, none of them from a Scottish university. This neglect contrasts markedly with the tribute of the American writer Henry Miller when *Summerhill* first appeared: 'I know of no educator in the Western world who can compare with A. S. Neill. It seems to me he stands alone . . . Summerhill is a tiny ray of light in a world of darkness' (cited in Neill, 1973, p. 268).

The appeal of Neill as a writer was evident from his first book, *A Dominie's Log*, published in 1916. The stylistic qualities which it exhibited – simplicity, frankness, anecdote, humour – ensured that its many challenging statements about education caused less offence than they might have done, if they had been expressed in a more aggressive fashion. Moreover, what comes across above all is his deep affection for children and his profound understanding of childhood. There is something childlike in Neill himself as he enters into the imaginative worlds of the youngsters in his charge – the stories that appeal to them, the games they play, their capacity for fun. Towards the end of *A Dominie's Log*, he observes, 'My writing is like my teaching, it is an irresponsible ramble' (Neill, 1986, p. 203). This freedom of expression and lack of formality is very different from the style found in official educational documents of the period (and indeed now): it is not hard to see how many readers found Neill's fresh approach and engaging accounts of everyday school life so attractive.

In the introduction to his autobiography, Neill offers this comment on his lasting influence:

If I am to be remembered at all, I hope it will be because I tried to break down the gulf between the young and the old, tried to abolish fear in schools, tried to persuade teachers to be honest with themselves and drop the protective armour they have worn for generations as a separation from their pupils. (Neill, 1973, p. xii)

There is another important reason why he should be remembered. The ideas he advocated and the practices he followed at Summerhill allow us to question the official narrative of Scottish education. Although the radical tradition which he represents (and which includes John Aitkenhead, R. F. Mackenzie and Hugh Mackenzie) is minor in comparison to the dominant tradition of Scottish education, it enables us to understand that making educational provision for the young always involves deep political, cultural and psychological questions about human nature and human society. At a time when so much educational debate is dominated by pragmatic questions of resources, systems and structures, it is well to be reminded that, underlying the whole educational enterprise, there are much more profound questions of aims, meanings and values to be addressed.

Note 1

I am grateful to Hugh Boyd, William Boyd's son, for providing me with an electronic copy of his father's unpublished autobiography. Page references here are to this version. A typescript copy, with different pagination, is held in Glasgow University Archives. The Archives also hold a bibliography of the writings of William Boyd.

Note 2

I am grateful to Andrew Pyle, the Head of Kilquhanity Children's Village, for providing me with a copy of an article written by John Aitkenhead and for enabling me to identify the location of another publication. He has also been helpful in informing me about the progress of his biographical study of Aitkenhead. It is hoped that the book will be finished some time in 2015. Mr Pyle has had access to unpublished papers, including some 10,000 letters written to Aitkenhead, which will provide valuable insight into not only the work of Kilquhanity, but also the wider network of progressive educators.

REFERENCES

- Aitkenhead, J. (1962) Kilquhanity House. In H. A. T. Child (Ed.) *The Independent Progressive School*. London: Hutchinson: 75-85.
- Aitkenhead, J. (1986) That Dreadful School, *Resurgence*, 118: 6-9.
- Bailey, R. (2013) *A. S. Neill*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bantock, G. H. (1952) *Freedom and Authority in Education*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Barrow, R. (1978) *A Critique of Freeschooling and Deschooling*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Berg, L. (1968) *Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Boyd, W. (1955) *William Boyd's Life Story 1874 to 1962. Autobiographical Notes made in Devon after 1955*. Unpublished typescript edited by Hugh Boyd in 2008.
- Boyd, W. & Rawson, W. (1965) *The Story of the New Education*. London: Heinemann.
- Brehony, K. J. (2004) A New Education for a New Era: the contribution of the conferences of the New Education Fellowship to the disciplinary field of education, *Paedagogica Historica*, 40 (5): 733-755.
- Brett, C. E., Lawn, M., Bartholomew, D. J. & Deary, I. J. (2010) Help will be welcomed from every quarter: the work of William Boyd and the Educational Institute of Scotland's Research Committee in the 1920s, *History of Education*, 39 (5): 589-611.
- Cox, C. B. & Dyson, A. E. (1969) (Eds.) *The Black Papers on Education*. London: Harper Collins.
- Croall, J. (1984) *Neill of Summerhill: The Permanent Rebel*. London: Ark Paperbacks.
- Croall, J. (1983) (Ed.) *All the Best, Neill: Letters from Summerhill*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Darling, J. (1994) *Child-Centred Education and its Critics*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Dickson, M. D. L. (1938) *Child Guidance*. London: Sands & Co.
- Douglas, G. (1961: first published 1901) *The House with the Green Shutters*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson.
- Entwistle, H. (1970) *Child-Centred Education*. London: Methuen.
- Gibbon, L. G. & MacDiarmid, H. (1934) *Scottish Scene; or, The Intelligent Man's Guide to Albyn*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hemmings, R. (1972) *Fifty Years of Freedom: A Study of the Development of the Ideas of A. S. Neill*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Hopkins, R. (1976) Freedom and Education: The Philosophy of Summerhill, *Educational Theory*, 26 (2): 188-213.
- Humes, W. (2000) State: the Governance of Scottish Education 1872-2000. In H. Holmes (Ed.) *Scottish Life and Society: A Compendium of Scottish Ethnology, Volume 11, Education*. Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press, 84-105.
- Humes, W. (2011) R. F. Mackenzie's 'Manifesto for the Educational Revolution', *Scottish Educational Review*, 43 (1): 56-72.
- Lawn, M. & Deary, I. (2008) *A Backward Look at the Future*, CES Briefing, No. 48. Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh.
- Lawson, A. (1990) Fifty Years Young: the story of a free school, *Radical Scotland*, 47: 16-18.

- Lawson, M. D. (1981) The New Education Fellowship: the Formative Years, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 13 (2): 24-28.
- Lawson, M. & Petersen, R. (1972) *Progressive Education: An Introduction*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
- Lees, H. E. (2013) Alternative Forms of Schooling. In T. G. K. Bryce, W. M. Humes, D. Gillies & A. Kennedy (Eds.) *Scottish Education, Fourth Edition: Referendum*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 129-137.
- Limond, D. (1999) '[A]ll our Scotch education is in vain': The construction of Scottish national identity in and by the early Dominie books of A. S. Neill, *History of Education*, 28 (3): 297-312.
- MacKenzie, Hugh (1995) *Craigroyston Days: The Story of an Educational Revolution*. Edinburgh: Mainstream.
- McPherson, A. & Raab, C. D. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy since 1945*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Murphy, P. A. (1998) *The Life of R. F. Mackenzie: A Prophet without Honour*. Edinburgh: John Donald.
- Neill, A. S. (1986: first published 1916) *A Dominie's Log*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Neill, A. S. (1917) *A Dominie Dismissed*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1920) *A Dominie in Doubt*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1923) *A Dominie Abroad*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1924) *A Dominie's Five*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1926) *The Problem Child*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1932) *The Problem Parent*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1936) *Is Scotland Educated?* London: Routledge.
- Neill, A. S. (1937) *That Dreadful School*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A.S. (1953) *The Free Child*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1967) *Talking of Summerhill*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Neill, A. S. (1968) *Summerhill*. London: Penguin.
- Neill, A. S. (1973) *Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Northcroft, D. (2003) (Ed.) *Scots at School*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Paterson, L. (2003) *Scottish Education in the Twentieth Century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Peel, R. (2014) *Progressively Worse: The Burden of Bad Ideas*. London: Civitas.
- Phillips, S. (1977) Psychoanalysis and Childhood Education: A Historical Review, *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 17 (2): 378-385.
- Placzek, B. R. (1981) *Record of a Friendship: the correspondence between Wilhelm Reich and A.S. Neill 1936-1957*. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux Inc.
- Scotland, J. (1969) *The History of Scottish Education, Vol. 2*. London: University of London Press.
- Smith, M. P. (1983) *The Libertarians and Education*. London; Allen & Unwin.
- Stewart, J. (2006) An 'enigma to their parents': the founding of the Notre Dame Child Guidance Clinic in Glasgow, *Innes Review*, 57 (1): 54-76.
- Stewart, J. (2010) Child Guidance in Scotland 1918-1955: Psychiatry versus Psychology? *History and Philosophy of Psychology*, 12 (2): 26-36.
- Stewart, J. (2013) *Child Guidance in Britain, 1918-1955: the dangerous age of childhood*. London: Pickering and Chatto.
- Stewart, W. A. C. (1968) *The Educational Innovators – Volume II: Progressive Schools 1881-1967*. London: Macmillan.
- Wills, W. D. (1964) *Homer Lane: A Biography*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Young, J. D. (1996) *The Very Bastards of Creation: Scottish international radicalism, a biographical study, 1707-1995*. Glasgow, Clydeside Press.

35] Bailey felt that this omission discredits Neill's position against external influence. Bailey also cited "adaptive preferences" literature, where human interests change based on their surroundings and circumstances, as evidence of how intrinsic interest can be externally influenced.[36] Bailey also dubbed Neill's views on intelligence as "innatist" and fatalist "that children had naturally set capabilities and limitations.[37] Neill saw contemporary interventionist practice as doing harm by emphasising conformity and stifling children's. Critics regard Neill's influence and importance with mixed opinion.[71] Supporters counted Neill amongst the world's most influential educationists.[71] UNESCO listed Neill within its 100 most important educationists worldwide. Neill and others founded an international school near Dresden, Ger., in 1921. The school was moved to Sonntagberg, Austria, three years later but was soon closed because its unconventional curriculum and teaching methods were opposed by the local authorities. In 1924 Neill moved the school to Lyme Regis, Dorset, in England, and named it Summerhill after the building he had leased for its quarters. In 1927 he moved the school to its permanent home in Leiston, Suffolk. Summerhill School became internationally known for its self-governing student-teacher body and its flexible curriculum that emph Educators will find Neill's refreshing viewpoints practical and inspiring. Reading this book is an exceptionally gratifying experience, for it puts into words the deepest feelings of all who care about children, and wish to help them lead happy, fruitful lives. Summerhill. A radical approach to child rearing. By A. S. NEILL. With a Foreword by Eric Fromm. 1960. To Harold Hart.